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Abstract

The Post-Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), offered by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in partnership with schools, is an established route into teaching. Typically pre-service teachers (PSTs) are supported by an HEI-based subject tutor who visits during school placements. An interpretivist, qualitative approach was taken to investigate the practices and knowledge tutors used during visits, and the PSTs’ perceptions of how they benefited.

Six science tutors working in different HEIs were accompanied on their visits to one PST throughout a one-year PGCE course. Audio recordings and field notes supported in-depth interviews that were used to construct tutors’ practice. The PSTs’ perspectives were elicited through semi-structured interviews. Through a thematic template analysis of the interview data three main dimensions to tutors’ knowledge and practice were identified: support, development and management.

The findings revealed that tutors’ knowledge of PST development, combined with their external perspective, leaves them well-positioned to play an important role in initial teacher education. Whilst PSTs’ characteristics and school context contributed to variation in outcomes, it was the tutors’ underlying aims, view of PST development and the extent to which their practice was PST-centred that were most significant.
Tutors’ management practices indicated that separatist or HEI–led views of partnership dominated. Although the intention was to support, when PSTs were left to make sense of the conflicting advice of teachers and tutors they rejected both, opting to rely on their existing beliefs about teaching. School and HEI partners must work collaboratively with PSTs if the contribution of each is not to be undermined by the other and PSTs are to understand the value of each. This would be enhanced if the rationale behind tutors’ practice was shared and their expertise made explicit. In addition, tutors need to know the PST’s expectations and beliefs and have regard for these.
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<thead>
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<th>Acronym</th>
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<td>Institute of Education</td>
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<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
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<tr>
<td>PISA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Pre-service teacher (AKA trainee, student teacher, associate teacher, novice teacher, beginning teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Tutor (PT)</td>
<td>Senior teacher who has overview of all PSTs in the school and is the main person liaising with the HEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTS</td>
<td>Qualified Teacher Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Teaching Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTA</td>
<td>Teacher Training Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>Teacher educator based in the HEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCET</td>
<td>University’s Council for the Education of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UST</td>
<td>University Subject Tutor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1 Introduction and background

1.1 Introduction

The focus of this study was the practice of science teacher educators based in higher education (also known as university subject tutors) working on Post Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) courses during their visits to pre-service teachers (PSTs) on school placements. This chapter sets out the rationale for the research and its intended aims. It begins by providing a brief historical overview of initial teacher education (ITE) before examining the current context. An examination of tutors as a professional group is followed by an account of my personal professional background and motivation for conducting this study. The chapter concludes with a brief overview of the structure of the thesis and focus of each chapter.

Various terms are used in initial teacher education to denote the roles of those involved, and this nomenclature is examined in more detail later in the chapter. However, for the purposes of this study the trainee or student teacher is referred to as the ‘pre-service teacher’ (PST), the school-based teacher educator designated to support the PST in school is referred to as the ‘mentor’ and the teacher educator based in the Higher Education Institution (HEI) is referred to as the ‘tutor’. Before examining tutors as a group of practitioners, it is necessary to outline the context in which they work.
1.2 Initial teacher education in England

Teacher education in England has undergone significant reform over the past century due to changing and increasingly politicized ideological views of education. At the beginning of the nineteenth century teaching was regarded as an occupation that did not warrant specialised education or training. The first signs of change were seen in the mid-1800s with the introduction of government qualifications (IoE, nd). Universities became involved in the training of new teachers in 1890 through the establishment of ‘day training colleges’ (IoE, nd), which later evolved into university Departments of Education engaged in educational research. By the early twentieth century a dual system of teacher training existed; teacher training colleges offered the Teachers’ Certificate and universities provided training for graduates. The status of teaching was raised further in 1944 by the abolition of uncertificated training routes (IoE, nd).

Although the need for qualifications and training indicated a rise in the status of teaching, the predominant apprenticeship approach to training positioned it as a craft or technical activity, rather than a profession. The education of new teachers developed in the 1960s when teaching became a graduate entry profession and the university and training college systems began to merge (Furlong, 2013). By the 1970s increasing numbers of graduates were being trained as secondary teachers through university-based one-year postgraduate courses that placed greater emphasis on education theory and research (Childs, 2013). Although PSTs spent some time in schools, learning to teach was
positioned as a higher education activity, which moved learning to teach away from apprenticeship towards a more academic activity. However, the attempt to broaden PSTs’ formal knowledge of teaching was at the expense of development of the practical skills needed. This led to a theory-into-practice model of learning that did not equip PSTs for the reality of the school and classroom context (Furlong, 2013). The accusation that teacher educators based in universities resided in ivory towers encapsulated the resultant theory-practice divide. The emphasis on theory by the universities, along with the relegation of the role of practice in learning, may well have contributed to the current situation for ITE.

Other professions, such as law and medicine, regarded practice as of equal importance to theory in the education of new entrants. In the model of clinical supervision used in the caring professions, supervision is seen as a managerial role, provided by a person in authority with accountability for the supervisee (CQC, 2013). In addition, the supervisee is employed and the concern is for the clients’ experience. Underpinning this clinical model of professional learning is the notion that practice requires evidence and judgement and is situated in a community of practice (Burn & Mutton, 2013). This model of support is significantly different to the current arrangements in PGCE courses. The PST is not employed by the school and neither the school-based nor HE-based teacher educator is accountable for the PST. More significant perhaps is the lack of an integrated approach to theory and practice. The elevation of theory over practice in ITE resulted in the accusation
that HEI courses were too theoretical and paid insufficient attention to practice (James Committee Report in 1972). At the same time, there were concerns about the variation in provision and standard of newly qualified teachers. As a result, the Conservative government of 1972 turned its attention to bringing more uniformity into initial teacher education and making it more school-based (Childs, 2013).

Over the next two decades additional school-based routes into teaching were created, for example the Articled Teacher and Licensed Teacher Schemes (DES, 1989). These were distinguished by an increase in the time PSTs spent in school and reduced the control of HEIs. One significant development in ITE was introduced through Circular 9/92, Initial Teacher Training (Secondary Phase) (DfE, 1992). This legislation required PSTs to spend two-thirds of their ITE course in school, underlining the belief that teacher quality, however measured, is directly dependent on the amount of time spent in school. It also required HEIs to work in partnership with schools to plan and deliver courses. Although this recognised the value of the contribution of higher education, it was a significant step in reducing its control and influence. This was taken further by the introduction of a wholly school-led, school based route into teaching. The School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) initiative allowed groups of school to develop and manage their own training programmes and opt out of partnership with HEIs. Not only did this period signal a return to the view of teaching as a largely school-based, practical activity, but it also
failed to address the issue of the relationship between theory and practice and the role played by both in the training and education of new teachers.

The increase in the responsibility of schools for ITE was accompanied by the transfer of funding, leading HEIs to review their provision. Partnership with schools also led to the development of new courses in which roles and responsibilities were deliberated. Arrangements between HEIs and schools varied, with the role of the tutor and the nature of visits being reconceptualised by some partnerships. For example, in a few programmes, the tutor role focused on supporting and developing the mentor rather than the PST. However, the majority of courses retained the traditional tutor role as being focused on the professional development of the PST.

Faced with developing new courses in partnership with schools, some HEIs turned their attention to a pioneering course developed at the University of Oxford prior to Circular 9/92 (DfE, 1992). The Oxford Internship Scheme, established in 1987, had features that distinguished it from its contemporaries. It was not based on either the apprenticeship or theory-into practice models of teacher development. Apprenticeship, as conceived as the novice learning from the expert, is potentially limiting if the knowledge needed for teaching as seen as uncontested and only practical in nature. This view of apprenticeship is predicated on the assumption that experienced teachers are experts who are able to pass on their practical knowledge to novices learning the ‘craft’. Putting aside this
questionable assumption, learning as an apprentice can be restrictive; PSTs are bound by the practice observed. Neither are they well positioned to question the received wisdom or try different approaches. Crucially, the apprentice might not be helped to understand the reasons behind an experienced teacher’s complex decisions and actions, how context and values affect those decisions, or how insights from research might inform practice. The result is that the apprenticeship approach tends towards replicating existing practice in school, rather than developing innovative, adaptable practitioners.

Despite the potential drawbacks of apprenticeship, it is likely to be part of the experience of learning to teach as it involves learning complex skills under the supervision of experienced practitioners. This was recognised by the Oxford Internship Scheme, which valued the expertise of teachers. Rather than spending blocks of time in school and university, the PSTs (called interns) experienced periods of time when they spent half of each week in school and half in the university. The purpose of this was to ‘make student-teachers into interns, into something like staff members’ (McIntyre & Haggar, 1992:266) so that they could acquire the situated knowledge of teachers alongside learning the more general, theoretical aspects of education in the university. In this attempt to integrate theory and practice, the course was planned with the teachers so that the interns would learn about an issue in the university before exploring it in the school setting. The roles of the university and school staff involved were made explicit and based on the position and expertise of each. Interns were supported in accessing the
‘professional knowledge’ of experienced practitioners; teachers in turn were asked to articulate and share their knowledge with the interns. The course drew on Schön’s (1983) notion of the reflective practitioner; interns were encouraged to take a questioning approach to both theory and practice, look critically at the policies, procedures and structures in schools, and problematize teaching and its context. Other HEIs drew on this model to inform the development of their own courses.

Since the introduction of HEI-school partnerships, diversification in ITE has continued. In 2011 the coalition government published its proposals for the further development of school-based, school-led teacher training with the School Direct scheme being introduced in 2012 (DfE, 2011). School Direct places schools at the centre of the recruitment, training and assessment of new teachers. Training places are allocated to schools rather than the HEIs, and even though they are required to work in partnership with a training provider, this does not have to be an HEI. The government claimed that School Direct was developed in response to demand from schools to have greater control and influence over the training of teachers (DfE, 2011), although the evidence for this is questionable. The School Direct guidance reinforces the message that it is schools are seen as leaders of training:

‘This is a school-driven model of ITT and the TA would expect that the models of training developed should reflect the leading role of the
school. TA and DfE are keen that schools are able to design their own relationship and programmes with accredited ITT providers...’

(DfE, 2012b:2)

School Direct was also designed address a perceived mismatch between teacher supply and geographic demand, as schools are expected to employ the PST once qualified (DfE, 2012b:2). Although this may increase schools’ commitment to the training of the novices they recruit, it seems likely to result in a return to an apprenticeship approach to their development. It is clear from the government White Paper, The Importance of Teaching (DfE, 2010), and statements made by the then Minister of State for Education that the intention to increase the ‘proportion of trainees to learn on the job’ (DfE, 2010:23), has a strong ideological component rooted in his own beliefs about teaching and initial teacher training:

‘Teaching is a craft and it is best learnt as an apprentice observing a master craftsman or woman. Watching others, and being rigorously observed yourself as you develop, is the best route to acquiring mastery in the classroom.’

(Gove, 2010, np.)
The return to apprenticeship as it appears to be regarded by Gove (2010) is contrary to the conclusion being drawn by the European Commission and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The European Commission report *Improving the Quality of Teacher Education* (2007) pointed to the importance of teacher quality in improving student attainment and the need for quality teacher education. Investigations, such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), have contributed to a competitive environment in relation to the effectiveness of national education systems. Reports such as *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers* (OECD, 2005) and *Improving the Quality of Teacher Education* (OECD, 2007) have identified the seemingly most effective approaches to ITE in terms of outcomes for students in school, for example, in Finland, Singapore and Shanghai. Some have asserted that this influence on policy is causing nations to lose control of their education systems resulting in greater uniformity between nations (Haugen, 2013). However, although the OECD may have an influence, its findings and reports are being interpreted in different ways, possibly to suit different political agendas. Although education policy in England has incorporated elements from OECD findings, such as recruiting the best graduates and those with higher degrees, other findings have been ignored, resulting in ITE in England becoming ‘an outlier’ (Beauchamp *et al*, 2013). Although other countries recognise the importance of experience of teaching in schools as part of ITE, the majority, including the most successful nations, retain a strong commitment to the contribution of higher education in teacher education (Furlong, 2013).
Within the UK political devolution has allowed for increasing divergence in educational policy and ideology. In Scotland and Northern Ireland, ITE is provided through HEIs and there are no school-centred (SCITT) or employment based routes (Beauchamp et al, 2013:2). In Wales, the majority of ITE is provided by regional centres that involve collaborating HEIs. The range of providers and diversity of routes into teaching is far greater in England, reflecting a market-driven approach to ITE (McBeath, 2011).

Differences within the UK are also apparent in the nature and level of government prescription, for example in what teacher education courses should include and how PSTs should be assessed. All the UK nations set out the expectations of entrants to the teaching profession that reflect a view of the ‘good enough’ teacher (Beauchamp et al, 2013). Again, there is a divergence in this view that sets England apart from other parts of the UK and internationally. The standards for qualifying to teach (DfEE, 2002; TDA, 2007) were predominately skills-based and present teaching as a technical activity that involves the ‘acquisition of trainable expertise’ (Beck, 2009:8). The current ‘Teachers’ Standards’ in England ‘set a clear baseline of expectations for the professional practice and conduct of teachers, from the point of qualification’ (DfE, 2013). The government’s marginalisation of higher education in ITE was apparent by the absence of members from University Schools of Education in the Review Group responsible for the development of the latest Teachers’ Standards (DfE, 2012a).
The standards in Scotland and Northern Ireland are notably different in positioning teaching as a research-based profession. In Scotland, importance is placed on recruiting people who ‘have the capacity to know about research and scholarship and, where appropriate in the future, be actively able to practise research through, for example, professional enquiry’ (GTCS, 2013:3). This is reinforced by reference to engagement in research in the standards for newly qualified teachers (NQTs), which requires them to:

‘...know how to access and apply relevant findings from educational research; know how to engage critically in enquiry, research and evaluation individually or collaboratively, and apply this in order to improve teaching and learning.’

(GTCS, 2012:12)

A similar view of the teaching as a research-based profession has been promoted by the General Teaching Council for Northern Ireland (GTCNI) (Beauchamp et al, 2013). This is embodied in the Code of Values and Professional Practice, which accompanies the competence framework for teachers (GTCNI, 2007):

‘The notion of the teacher as a researcher is complementary to the Council’s concept of reflective practice. Teachers should engage in
action research within their own classroom, school or institution and, in addition, they should take cognisance of research within the teacher education community.’

(GTCNI, 2007:12).

In England however, there has been a shift away from the view of teaching as a research-based profession. Instead, the government’s discourse surrounding ITE reveals is one of valuing of experiential knowledge and subject knowledge over theoretical and pedagogical knowledge (Beauchamp et al, 2013). This has been reinforced by academy schools being allowed to employ unqualified teachers and on the emphasis on recruiting highly qualified graduates. This suggests that policy is predicated on the belief that all knowledge required for teaching can be acquired through experience. The introduction of Teaching Schools reinforces this message:

‘Teaching Schools are outstanding schools that work with others to provide high-quality training and development to new and experienced school staff. They are part of the government’s plan to give schools a central role in raising standards by developing a self-improving and sustainable school-led system.’

(National College for Teaching and Leadership, 2014: online)
Teaching Schools are modelled on teaching hospitals and are conceived as the means by which outstanding practice can be spread across the education system (Gove, 2011, n.p). This analogy is limited however, because teaching hospitals are aligned with universities and are themselves centres for research. Teaching Schools have to be deemed outstanding by Ofsted and have excellent leadership, but research is not part of their remit and they do not have to work with universities. Therefore, this position has the potential to marginalise higher education in ITE still further.

In order to enforce the articulated view of course quality and accurate assessment of PSTs, each nation state has its own inspection body. In England, this is The Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). It is notable that the transfer of responsibility for training to schools has not been accompanied by a transfer of accountability. Despite being in partnership with HEIs, schools are not affected by the outcomes of inspections, as the HEI retained sole responsibility for the quality of provision. How this will change as School Direct is embedded is as yet unknown.

Initial teacher education in England is still in a period of change and uncertainty as additional school-led routes into teaching have emerged, such as the teaching school alliances. The government has also increased the number of academies and free schools not under Local Authority control, which like independent schools, are not obliged to employ qualified teachers. Nevertheless, the PGCE remains a popular route into teaching,
although the number of places on courses has reduced due to the increase in school-based training. Of the 40,000 or so ITE places allocated by the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) in 2013/14, half were allocated to the seventy-five HEIs offering post-graduate places and of these over 1,800 were for the training of science teachers.

The most recent factor impacting on the involvement of higher education in ITE was the introduction of tuition fees for courses in 2012. For a postgraduate PGCE course, PSTs are now required to pay a substantial fee. In England this is typically about £9,000, which is considerably more than in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. This has implications for both schools and HEIs, as PSTs paying such fees are quite understandably adjusting their expectations of providers and holding them to account. It is becoming increasingly important to understand the nature of the work of the tutor and establish their value to PSTs. This is not only needed to support informed future decision-making about how HEIs deploy tutors and best use their time with PSTs, but also to inform the wider debate on the contribution of higher education to initial teacher education.

Although the legislative regulatory framework (NCTL, 2014) reflects particular views and assumptions about teaching, teacher knowledge and the education of new teachers, these are not necessarily enacted in practice. Rather, they are mediated through the underlying values and goals of those developing courses and working with PSTs. The
tensions between the government’s view of teaching as a craft requiring training, and the higher education stance that it is an educative process drawing on different sources of knowledge, are apparent by the language used to describe the various roles in ITE. In England, policy documents refer to ‘trainees’ and ‘initial teacher training’. This nomenclature is rejected by many in higher education in favour of terms such as ‘student teacher’, ‘beginning teacher’ and ‘initial teacher education’, even though many of those involved may agree that courses contain elements of both. For the purposes of this study however, the terms pre-service teacher (PST) and ‘initial teacher education’ (ITE) are used. The underlying views about ITE and PSTs that tutors hold are likely to affect their practice. Questions are also raised about how tutors operate in the current environment to try to achieve stated goals through the school visits and the extent to which they are successful.

The training and development of new teachers will continue to be the subject of contention and debate, as stakeholders argue about how and where teachers should be educated. There are no voices arguing against the importance of experience in the classroom as part of ITE. However, in England the ITE landscape is changing and there are no political factions championing HEI-led initial teacher education. This rapidly changing and competitive external climate is now threatening the future of higher education in ITE. Currently HEIs are attempting to re-position themselves in ITE, but the role will have to one that Universities are willing to adopt; administrative or accreditation roles may not
be regarded as academically or financially justifiable. Despite reassurances from government that there will still be a role for higher education in ITE, the underlying messages in recent policy suggest that its involvement in the preparation of new teachers is of little value. It is therefore not surprising that teacher educators currently working in the HEI sector on ITE programmes feel increasingly marginalised, under attack and uncertain about their future (Nobel-Rogers, 2013; UCET, 2013). It is this complex and challenging national context in which tutors work and my research was conducted.

1.3 Teacher educators in higher education

Teacher educators are a heterogeneous population. Recent reforms in England have led to a further diversification of this group of professionals, which includes teachers mentoring and supervising PSTs in schools, academic staff in HEIs, and those working across school and HEI contexts occupying a ‘hybrid’ role (Zeichner, 2006). Even teacher educators working in higher education are a diverse group. The shift towards school-based ITE has resulted in a decrease in the number of full-time academic staff employed in HEI education departments and an increase in the use of more casual, ‘itinerant’ teacher educators (Childs, 2013). These teacher educators are employed on a sessional basis to tutor PSTs and visit them in school. Often they are retired teachers or ‘portfolio’ workers who work for several organisations in different roles. However, this research was focused on teacher educators working in university faculties of education on one-year
Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) programmes, who are commonly referred to as ‘tutors’ by PSTs.

Although a great deal of research has illuminated the lives and work of teachers, teacher educators working in higher education ‘remain an under-researched and poorly understood occupational group’ (Murray, 2014:7). This situation is beginning to change as recent studies on their professional identity and work have emerged (see for example, Murray et al, 2011; Ellis et al, 2011, 2013; Murray, 2014). The picture developing shows that these teacher educators are usually qualified teachers who have had substantial experience of teaching in schools (Murray et al, 2011). In many cases, their transition to the role was accidental, rather than a calculated career move.

Once individuals are in higher education, they undertake different types of work, including administration and contributing to the teaching of undergraduate and postgraduate students (Zeichner, 2006). They may also be expected to engage in research and produce academic publications, although ‘teaching only’ contracts are becoming more common. Consequently, there are many different demands on their time and they need a wide-ranging set of skills to fulfil the different aspects of their work.
Tutors’ ITE role encompasses a diverse range of activities through which they introduce PSTs to the theoretical frameworks, educational research, subject pedagogy and practical issues concerned with teaching. These are taught through lectures, seminars, subject sessions, workshops and tutorials. Typically tutors visit PSTs during the school placements, negotiating with school staff in the school context where they are considered to be an outsider.

Although most tutors enter higher education with the practical knowledge and skills of teachers, they have to acquire new, formal knowledge as well as new skills (Murray, 2004). Unlike teachers who are required to meet a prescribed set of performance standards, neither school-based nor HEI-based teacher educators have to meet any national definition of competence in the UK. A professional standard for teacher educators has been developed in the USA and the Netherlands, with other EU countries in the process of developing competence requirements. In the UK it is assumed that experienced teachers have the skills and knowledge required, even though it is widely argued that this is not the case (e.g. Furlong, 2000; Meuller, 2003; Murray 2004; Murray & Male, 2005; Dinkleman et al, 2006).

As no agreed set of skills and knowledge has been identified for teacher educators in England, limited attention has been paid to their formal induction and professional development. In addition, Murray (2008) argued that the changes in teacher education
over the last twenty years have had ‘a significant and detrimental impact on HE-based teacher educators’ (2008:19), resulting in an erosion of their professional identities and confidence. This, she asserted, has led to the poor ‘communal articulation of expertise’ (2008:19) and a re-evaluation of their contribution to ITE is needed.

1.4 Personal professional context

My own career in ITE began prior to the transition to HEI-school partnerships in 1988. Like many who move from school to ITE, I received no formal induction or guidance in relation to my role or practice with PSTs. I found the role challenging, particularly when visiting PSTs on school placements. My current role, as a university lecturer working on a national flexible PGCE course, involves supporting and developing the tutors who work with the PSTs. These tutors are part-time and many are retired teachers or still working in school. As part of the quality assurance measures, I accompany tutors on their visits to PSTs. On one such visit with an inexperienced tutor, the co-observed lesson raised a potentially challenging issue and the tutor was unsure as to how to approach the subsequent discussion. Through this I realised that much of my own practice is internalised and that inexperienced tutors have knowledge and skills to learn.

This incident also prompted me to reflect on my own practice as a tutor. Each PST has different needs, strengths, and characteristics – all are challenging in different ways.
Through experience I have learned to tailor my practice to help each PST make progress, but this has been a solitary activity - my practice has been unobserved. Subsequently, I became interested in how tutors conduct school visits and the knowledge that informs their decision making. This raised my awareness of the need to focus on this aspect of the role with the tutors I work with as part of their induction and continuing professional development. In addition, I was responsible for developing the expertise and effectiveness of tutors. As such, I became interested in developing my understanding of how PSTs gain from the tutor visits and which practices and approaches they find particularly beneficial.

Despite practice being heavily context dependent, this study aims to develop general theoretical insights and conclusions that go beyond the specifics of particular events. Through this, the intention is to contribute to a deeper understanding of how tutors’ knowledge and expertise is deployed on visits to PSTs in school. It is based on the assumption that tutors have developed expertise and knowledge that is distinct from that of school-based teacher educators through their experiences as teachers, mentors, researchers and ITE tutors, and that this knowledge is situated in the context in which they practice.

The ultimate goal of ITE is to ensure that learners in school have effective teachers. In order to achieve this, PSTs need effective support and development. This research has the
potential to contribute to an understanding of the knowledge and skills that experienced tutors use during their visits and how this helps PSTs develop as teachers in the school setting. It also intends to promote reflection on practice, thereby increasing the efficacy of tutors and the contribution of higher education to ITE. The beneficiaries would not only be the PSTs, but also the young people they teach. It could also contribute to the debate on the value of higher education in initial teacher education and inform the induction and professional development of tutors. Finally, it should also be of interest to other professions that have practice-based placements as part of initial training, such as health and social care.

### 1.5 Research questions

The research questions developed as a result of consideration of the literature and a review of previous research, which is presented in the next chapter. The final research questions were:

1. What practices do experienced science PGCE tutors use to achieve their goals when visiting PSTs on school placements and what does this suggest about their role?
2. What knowledge underpins tutors’ practice during the school placement visits to PSTs?

3. What are PSTs’ perceptions of how the tutor contributes to their school placement experiences and what does this suggest about their influence?

1.6 Overview of thesis

The thesis is organised as follows:

Chapter 2 explores the theoretical underpinnings of the study and reviews the previous research on higher education in ITE, particularly those aspects related to or impacting on the practice of the tutor.

Chapter 3 provides an account of the research design, philosophical position and rationale, before presenting the research questions. This is followed by a brief overview of the key methods used and examination of the ethical issues involved.
Chapter 4 presents the findings in terms of the key themes identified. The findings from the tutor data were examined alongside those from the PSTs. The key differences, similarities and common threads are focused upon, with interpretations supported by evidence in the form of the words of the tutors and PSTs. Through this the research questions are addressed.

Chapter 5 interprets and discusses the findings in five parts. The first examines the theoretical framework for tutors’ practical knowledge; the second and third sections examines tutors’ knowledge and practices in relation to existing literature; the fourth reflects on the findings from the PSTs and what these suggest about optimising the influence of tutors; and the fifth section considers what the findings suggest about the tutor role and the nature of partnership with schools.

Chapter 6 reflects on what has been learned and the implications of these new understandings before suggesting further areas of research. This is followed by a reflective critique that examines the methods used. The chapter concludes with recommendations for policy and practice at a national, HEI and individual level.
Chapter 2 Literature review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out the purpose of the literature review and the strategy adopted. It provides an overview of relevant research found prior to commencing the field work before critically examining the previous studies most pertinent to the research questions and implications for this study. This is followed by an examination of the theoretical framework underpinning the research and the potential of this study to contribute to the existing knowledge base. Finally, the review was up-dated by examining relevant empirical research published as the study progressed.

The literature review is positioned within the political climate for ITE that exists in England, as examined in Chapter 1. This research focused on the practice of HE-based PGCE tutors when they visited PSTs on school placements. As practice is underpinned by knowledge, the literature review includes an examination of research on professional practical knowledge. Several other strands of literature relevant to practice were also identified. Relevance was determined by the research questions, the context of studies and the extent of the contribution made to understanding the practice of ITE tutors as a particular group of professionals. These strands have been used within this review.
**Literature search strategy**

The field of teacher education as a whole has been, and continues to be, the subject of a great deal of research. Much of this has focused on the professional development of qualified teachers, although increasing attention is now being paid to teacher educators based in higher education. However, as there are significant differences between experienced teachers and PSTs, only research focused on initial teacher education was selected for this literature review. As the purpose of the review was to establish the existing knowledge base and investigate the theoretical frameworks and methodologies used, empirical research was the main focus. However, philosophical, theoretical work is included where relevant, and policy documents have been referred to in Chapter 1 in order to identify the legislative framework and provide the context and background to ITE.

The initial literature search used terms associated with teacher educators’ work in ITE and their influence on PSTs (Appendix 1). These terms were used to search social science databases (EBSCOhost, SCOPUS, ERIC and BEI) and publishers’ databases. This initial search was not date limited as the intention was to scope the extent and nature of previous research focused on teacher educators in higher education. The second stage of the search focused on the most relevant studies. From these, additional search terms, relevant references and key journals were identified. Once key papers were found, a search for citations of these papers was also carried out. As the political and legislative context affecting initial teacher education is likely to impact on tutors, studies conducted
in the UK, particularly England, were the prime sources examined. However, research conducted in other countries has been included where particularly relevant.

Overview of literature review

Research into initial teacher education is typically conducted by teacher educators based in higher education, which is perhaps why a great deal has focused on the development of PSTs and mentoring. This situation began to change in England and Wales as schools became more involved in the training and assessment of new teachers in the early 1990s, and attention turned to the responsibilities of those involved. Teacher educators based in higher education began examining themselves as they questioned their role and responsibilities under the new arrangements.

The question of who researches the researchers in teacher education was in part answered by the emergence of a new periodical - *Studying Teacher Education: A Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*. This journal was a response to ‘the work of the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices special interest group within the American Educational Research Association’ (Loughran & Russell, 2005:1). This provided a platform for teacher educators to contribute their reflective self-studies about their work and transition from teacher to teacher educator. However, no studies examining their work and practices with PSTs in school were found and most are reflective narratives situated in the context of the United States. Although these studies have not proved to be a
source of relevant empirical evidence of tutors’ practice during school visits, they do provide some insights into the knowledge they have acquired.

 Whilst there is a great deal of literature discussing and theorizing initial teacher education, empirical research on HE-based teacher educators as practitioners is fragmented and relatively limited. The research literature identified as a result of the initial search was grouped within five key categories:

1. Tutors’ identities, roles and responsibilities
2. Tutors’ practice
3. Tutors’ professional knowledge
4. Practical knowledge and its development
5. The influence of the tutor

These categories have been used to structure the following review of the literature.
2.2 Identity, roles and responsibilities

Chapter 1 highlighted the diversity of teacher educators as a group of professionals, having different backgrounds, qualifications and routes into the role (Murray & Male, 2005). Consequently, multiple professional identities are found, even within those working in higher education (Murray & Male, 2005; Swennen et al, 2010; Murray & Kosnik, 2011). Those entering from school can take several years to transform their teacher identity to that as a teacher educator (Murray & Male, 2005), but what identity do they develop? Those entering through an academic route may position themselves primarily as researchers. Those moving from school to higher education may struggle with the move from the primary to the secondary field of practice, fearing a loss of credibility with the community in which they once had status and success (Clemans et al, 2010). This might explain the different ways in which HE-based teachers educators describe themselves, for example, as ‘teacher of teachers’ (Swennen et al, 2010), rather than as teacher educators.

The identity of the teacher educator is important in understanding their practices, goals and motivations. This is a research that is still relatively new, which is surprising given the importance of teacher education to the outcomes for learners in schools (European Commission, 2013). Understanding the identity of teacher educators is also central to providing a more secure basis for the profession, as well as supporting their development in the role (Swennen et al, 2010). However, identity is not easily articulated, particularly
in the context of HE-based teacher education. Tutors’ work in higher education often involves working in different contexts, such as schools, HE administration and research (Ellis et al, 2011). Therefore, tutors may have different dimensions their identity, which they use to adapt to the context in which they are working. In this way, identity may be multi-faceted, particularly in the case of those in the early years of their career.

The four sub-identities found by Swennen et al (2010) as a result of their meta-analysis of the literature were ‘teacher educators as school teachers, teacher educators as teachers in higher education, teacher educators as researchers and teacher educators as teachers of teachers’ (2010:136-137). The first of these sub-identities is not surprising given that most HE-based teacher educators have successful experience of teaching in school (Murray & Male, 2005). The second sub-identity of ‘teachers in higher education’ is one that may develop over time as the teacher educator becomes part of the higher education community (Dinkleman et al, 2006). However, Swennen et al (2010) pointed out that such development is not inevitable. The low status of teacher education in universities can result in the isolation of teacher educators and therefore reduce the opportunities for development of a higher education teacher identity (Murray, 2004). The transition to ‘teacher educator as researcher’ is even more problematic given the workload associated with the role in higher education and the lack of induction and professional development (Murray, 2004).
The identity of the teacher educators is likely to influence how they see their role, although even those identifying themselves as teacher educators are likely to have different conceptions of the role, what they perceive as important, and what constitutes quality in its execution. Therefore, a tutor’s identity will in turn influence their practice. For example, tutors with a strong teacher identity may be more concerned with support, than tutors with an academic or research identity. Consequently, consideration of tutors’ identity and role is important in understanding their actions and motivation.

As new courses were developed by HEIs and school partnerships in the 1990s, roles and responsibilities were described and studied. This research provides an historical perspective that is still relevant as HEIs continue to work in partnership with schools even though the policy context is changing. The literature identifies some key roles and responsibilities for higher education in ITE. The three roles most associated with higher education are engaging PSTs with educational theory, research and innovation in the subject (e.g. Edwards, 1995; Davies & Ferguson, 1997; Burton, 1998; Field & Philpott, 1998; Smith, 2000; Williams & Soares, 2002), assessing and monitoring progress (e.g. Williams & Soares, 2002) and quality assurance (e.g. Davies & Ferguson, 1997; Field & Philpott, 1998; Hopper, 2001; Williams & Soares, 2002). These roles position the HEI as the senior partner with the power and knowledge needed. Quality assurance is predicated on the assumption that there is a clear understanding of quality of ITE provision in school, yet this has not been clearly articulated. What guidance there is has
been imposed by government and reinforced by inspection bodies such as Ofsted, thereby placing the HEI in an enforcement role. Critical attention is rarely given to the criteria used to judge quality, or how such a role is carried out in practice and what interventions can be made to assure quality. Quality assurance might be interpreted as a low-level checking activity, such as ensuring PSTs have the allotted mentor time and an appropriate timetable. How quality is assured in terms of the practice of mentors and other teachers working with the PSTs is more difficult. Again it assumes an understanding of what constitutes quality in mentoring and that this is fixed and uncontested. In addition, HEIs may find that they are not in a strong position to affect the quality of provision for PSTs in school when they have little choice in the schools with which they work.

Another role identified for HE is supporting PSTs’ critical evaluation of teaching and reflection on practice (e.g. Burton, 1998; Furlong, 2000), even though school-based teacher educators are seemingly best placed to occupy this role given that they have more contact with PSTs in school. One role that the HE tutor is well placed to fulfil is that of trouble-shooter and advocate is proposed by several researchers (e.g. Furlong et al, 1996; Blake et al, 1997; Slick, 1997, 1998; Burton, 1998). This role has the potential to be significant, as HE tutors’ external position to the school may afford them a more independent perspective. Developing mentors’ practice is one role less frequently
considered, although adopted by some HEI-school ITE partnerships (Blake et al, 1997; Burton, 1998).

Although the roles and responsibilities identified were largely based on the opinions and views of those involved rather than observed practice, they suggest that higher education has some potentially important roles to play in ITE. Accompanying the research into roles and responsibilities have been theoretical and philosophical arguments about how they should be decided. McIntyre (1997), a significant contributor to this debate, argued that roles should be based on what each partner is best placed to offer. Some partnerships used such arguments to reconceptualise the role of the HE tutor on school visits, moving away from what Burton (1998) termed the ‘old supervisory system’ whereby tutors supported and guided PSTs, to a quality assurance role or one focused on training the mentor (Blake et al, 1997; Burton, 1998). However, the majority of courses retained the traditional role of the personal tutor as being focused on the PST.

Of the studies that have examined the roles of those in ITE, many investigated the perceptions of stakeholders (for example, Blake et al, 1997; Williams & Soares, 2002; Youens & McCarthy, 2007) or determined which of the partners had responsibility for pre-defined aspects of training, such as introducing educational theory, assessment of teaching skills and subject knowledge development (Williams & Soares, 2002; Youens & McCarthy, 2007). Some were small-scale, evaluative qualitative studies focused on one
HEI (e.g. Dunne & Lock, 1996; Hopper, 2001). Complementing these were a few, large-scale studies that used a mix of qualitative interviews and quantitative surveys.

One large-scale study by Furlong et al (1996) used data from the Modes of Teacher Education (MOTE) project. This involved 44 HEIs, focusing on twelve for more detailed interviews with PSTs, mentors and tutors. Three models of partnership were identified: HEI-led, separatist and collaborative. In partnerships that were HEI-led, the tutor role was characterised by being controlling and concerned with monitoring. In separatist partnerships roles were divided between the school and HEI; visits to PSTs were minimal or non-existent. Collaborative partnerships were characterised by shared roles and negotiation. This implies that tutors’ conduct of school visits will depend on the nature of the HEI-school partnership, as well as how tutors perceive their role and that of the school. However, such divisions in roles and responsibilities are not necessarily internalised by individuals. Tutors’ practice therefore may not conform to the published expectations and is also likely to be affected by context and circumstances. Nevertheless, it suggests that the nature of the partnership with schools should be considered, as this is part of the context in which the tutors are working.

Another large-scale survey conducted by Williams and Soares (2002) investigated the value that PSTs, mentors and tutors attributed to the role of higher education and sought to identify any distinctive aspects. Possible roles identified from the literature were used
as the basis for a questionnaire sent to all HE providers of primary and secondary ITE courses. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of the different roles and indicate where the responsibility lay for each. A return rate of 43.5% resulted in 1527 completed questionnaires and from these focus group interviews were conducted to probe issues in greater depth.

The data suggested that whilst most respondents believed roles should be shared, PSTs thought HE staff were ‘crucial to maintaining the consistency and quality of the training’ (Williams & Soares, 2002:103). The secondary PSTs believed that pastoral support was a joint school and HE role. One aspect found to be almost wholly located with the HEI was introducing PSTs to theory and research, supporting the findings of previous studies (Edwards, 1995; Davies & Ferguson, 1997; Burton, 1998; Smith, 2000). However, the survey was limited by the pre-defining of roles so that other possible roles were not identified. In addition, many partnerships articulated the roles in course documentation, which may have affected stakeholders’ responses. Perhaps the most significant limitation of the survey was the unquestioned use of terminology. For example, Williams and Soares (2002) found a high level of agreement that HEIs should be responsible for ‘Learning about educational theory’. There was less agreement about who was responsible for ‘Learning about how children learn’ and ‘Training that examines the principles behind the practice of teaching’, which were seen as a shared responsibility. It could be argued that all of these statements include ‘theory’, yet respondents’ view of them appeared to vary.
Respondents’ interpretation of these statements was not considered and the reasons behind their views not explored, thus weakening the reliability of the findings.

The same criticism can be made of the *Teachers as Learners Project* (Davies & Ferguson, 1997), which examined the role of ITE in the formation of teachers’ professionalism through a large-scale, national study of teachers in secondary and primary schools. Three categories of response identified from interview data included the terms ‘*subject theory*’, ‘*academic rigor*’ and ‘*professionalism*’ (1997:48). However, these terms were not defined and how the teachers construed them was not treated as problematic. Davies and Ferguson (1997) themselves pointed out the difficulties with defining ‘professionalism’ and acknowledged that classical descriptions include skills based on theoretical knowledge. This suggests a potential overlap between the categories and therefore a lack of clarity in the findings.

A smaller survey by Capel (2003) investigated the roles of the staff involved in PGCE Physical Education courses in four HEIs in England. The study aimed to find out who was perceived to have major responsibility for PSTs’ development and how this compared to the responsibilities set out in course documentation. A questionnaire was given to all mentors, professional mentors, tutors and PSTs in each of the four HEIs involved part way through the course. Participants’ perceptions of responsibilities for aspects of supporting and assessing PSTs were presented as tabulated percentages. From this data, Capel
concluded that tutors’ perceptions of their responsibilities matched those identified in course documents. However, as tutors may have been involved in defining the roles in the course, they may have simply been voicing what they thought they ought to be doing. The data also revealed a lack of agreement about some responsibilities, which may have been due to differences in participants’ interpretations of the roles or to differences between the four courses and how roles and responsibilities were communicated and reinforced. The return rate of the questionnaires is not given and data were not provided for the individual institutions, so the extent of agreement within the HEIs cannot be ascertained. In addition, the survey was done once after only one term, indicating an underlying assumption that the tutor role and PSTs’ perceptions are unchanging through the course. This would be surprising given the nature of learning to teach and what is known about PST professional development.

An evaluative survey of PSTs and tutors used by Smith (2000) to examine the provision made by one course, found that PSTs did not consider the theoretical underpinning to practice to be addressed appropriately, although the meaning of this was not examined. This finding was then tested by asking 48 PSTs to write down one piece of educational theory learned during the course, giving the name of the researcher involved. However, this was a test of memory, rather than of what was actually provided by the tutors. Smith’s conclusion was that the role of the tutor had ‘moved towards that of trainer and away from that of educator’ (2000:142), with tutors focusing on teaching as a practical,
technical activity, rather than as a complex activity involving theory and reflection on practice. Not only was the evidence for this conclusion questionable, but an implicit assumption was that a survey of PSTs prior to the changes in ITE would have revealed a higher level of PST engagement with theory. Again, the conclusion was based on PSTs’ perceptions and not on the direct evidence of the tutors’ practice.

Only one study that focused specifically on the role of the tutor when PSTs are on school placements was found prior to the field work phase of my study. Hopper (2001) critically reviewed mentoring issues in ITE from the perspective of the tutor. The basis of Hopper’s examination of the tutor role during school placements was not explicitly stated, although her points are illustrated with quotations from PSTs, suggesting it draws on her own experience as a HE-based teacher educator, as well as the literature on mentoring. On this basis, Hopper examined the issues in mentoring and suggested important roles for the tutor on school visits. She concluded that ‘tutors have a crucial role to play in minimising the limitations and maximising the undoubted benefits of professional placements’ (Hopper, 2001:221). This implies that an important role for tutors is ensuring the quality of the school support and that tutors need to tailor what they do to the deficits in the school’s provision. This would entail being alert to the context and adapting practice. However, whilst Hopper’s conclusions are well argued, they are not supported by empirical research. My research aims to contribute to this gap in the evidence concerning the role tutors enact on school placement visits.
Identifying roles presents a simplistic view of ITE partnership. Roles and responsibilities may be identified in theory, but in practice are fraught with difficulties. Views about the roles and responsibilities for higher education in ITE are changing as more responsibility is transferred to schools. The main roles for HE tutors identified in the literature have implications for tutors’ practice on school visits and raise questions about the knowledge and skills needed by the tutor in order to fulfil them. However, the evidence from empirical studies is based on the perceptions of those involved, or from those in which roles were pre-defined. These studies provide an indication of what participants think ought to be happening or perceive to be happening at a particular time in a particular context. However, it cannot be assumed that the role tutors believe they fulfil is the same as the roles they carry out in practice. Neither do these studies contribute to an understanding of how these roles can be fulfilled effectively. As Ben-Peretz (2001) argued, education is an intentional enterprise and teacher educators’ educational practices are an embodiment of their own educational beliefs and images (2001:55). This lack of linking of perceptions to practice may result in a misleading picture of what HE tutors actually do in reality.

Although the findings from the large-scale studies appear to be more generalizable, this is reduced because partnerships vary in how roles are conceived and the contextual detail is lost. Small-scale studies are open to the criticism of bias, many being evaluative in nature and conducted by staff working on the courses being researched. In addition, the findings
of such studies are embedded in the context of the institution in question, reducing applicability to other contexts. Both approaches have the potential to contribute to understanding the roles of those involved in ITE, but no studies found have used an in-depth qualitative approach to research the roles tutors fulfil in practice during visits across different HEIs. This approach could potentially reduce bias and lead to more generally recognisable findings.

2.3 Tutor practice

The research reviewed thus far was limited in that it examined perceptions of roles rather than roles enacted in practice; in other words the actions, approaches and strategies used to achieve explicit and implicit intentions and goals. Blake et al (1997) asserted that for teacher educators working in higher education this practice ‘has been elusive and shadowy’ (1997:202). Little has changed in subsequent years, as noted by researchers in the field (for example John, 2002; Korthagen, 2005; Murray & Male, 2005, Smith, 2005). There remains only limited empirical research on the practice of HE tutors.

The existing research can be categorised in terms of its focus. Some studies have investigated specific elements of practice, such as the written feedback (e.g. Bunton et al, 2002) or the discussions between tutor and PST (e.g. John & Gilchrist, 1992; John, 2001). Others have examined the pedagogy tutors use in the HEI, or focused on their expertise
and work more generally (e.g. John, 2002; Murray, 2004; Loughran & Berry, 2005; Lunenberg et al, 2007, Ruys et al, 2013).

One study reported by Murray (2004) examined the demands made of HE-based teacher educators, comparing their professional practices with those of medical, social work and nurse educators. Data from semi-structured interviews with ten tutors were used to identify the broad issues facing them and the ‘similarities and differences between the practices of medical educators and those of teacher educators’ (2004:2). However, this study did not develop an understanding of the nature of those practices with PSTs, although Murray noted the ‘elaborate pedagogies’ required (2004:9).

Another study that examined tutors’ professional lives was The Work of Teacher Education (WoTE) project (Ellis et al, 2011). Thirteen tutors with a range of experience and specialisms, working in a variety of HEIs in England (8) and Scotland (5), participated in this one year study. Data from interviews, observations and work diaries completed at two different points in the year were analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. Activity was categorised and the number of hours spent on each type examined. The most significant finding relevant to my research was that a defining characteristic of tutors’ work is ‘relationship maintenance’ (2011:14). Relationship maintenance included actions that aimed at developing and maintaining relationships with PSTs and staff in schools, including those focused on the PST’s health and well-being (Ellis et al, 2011:11).
A cautious approach must be taken to the WoTE data for several reasons. First, the recording and observation could have affected the tutors’ activities. Second, the typicality of the two weeks recorded and the day they were observed is questionable. Tutors’ work is multifaceted and through personal experience I know tutors do not engage in all types of activity in a single day, or even in a single week. For example, research is quite often confined to the summer when ITE courses are not running. At best, the time spent on each type of activity is an estimate. A significant omission was analysis of their activity during visits to schools. The authors concluded that HE tutors appear to make partnership with schools work effectively, but that roles and responsibilities need to be redefined. However, the basis for this conclusion lacks the views of school partners and PSTs.

**Pedagogy and practice in university**

Studies that have examined the pedagogy of ITE (theories, strategies and approaches) have focused on the teaching sessions in the HEI. The two key aspects identified are reflection on practice and modelling of the practices that tutors want PSTs to adopt with pupils in school (John, 2002; Murray, 2004; Loughran & Berry, 2005; Lunenberg et al, 2007, Ruys et al, 2013).

A more detailed examination of what tutors focused on and how they approached issues was undertaken by Burn (2006) through a case study that explored and evaluated the nature of the contribution of higher education to ITE. Unlike other studies, Burn
investigated both tutor and mentor practice in order to identify similarities and
differences, and establish the distinctive nature of each. The study focused on history
tutors in one HEI and their selection and use of activities for lessons. Data were collected
by recording sessions in the university and interviewing the tutors teaching the sessions.
Four history mentors recorded mentor sessions with PSTs during school placements.
Semi-structured interviews were conducted each term with each mentor to explore the
themes identified from the transcripts, but these interviews (with mentors and tutors)
were regarded as subsidiary data and used to illuminate the analysis of the data from the
sessions.

The analysis of this data focused on what mentors and tutors actually contributed, rather
than how each performed in relation to expectations. Burn (2006) found some degree of
overlap between the foci of tutors and mentors, but also some significant differences.
Tutors alerted PSTs to more ambitious teaching approaches and focused on pupil learning
rather than on behaviour and class management, and were more concerned with
decision-making when planning. Of particular significance was that mentors’ suggestions
were based on their own experiences, whereas tutors’ suggestions were supported by
literature and research. This is not surprising perhaps, given that university sessions are
planned and the tutors were working for an organisation with a strong research ethos.
Mentors on the other hand were responding to the immediacy of events and their advice
connected to specific observed incidents. It would have been more valid to have
compared mentors’ and tutors’ contributions in the same context i.e. the school placement. A less context dependent finding was that tutors encouraged PSTs to be critical of sources of knowledge, but mentors did not. This research points to some potential orientations and practices that may be part of tutors’ work in schools with PSTs.

**Practice during school placement visits**

Few studies have examined tutors’ practice in the context of the school placement. One study carried out in the Republic of Ireland by Chambers and Armour (2011) examined how the tutor and school staff supported the learning of Physical Education PSTs during school placements. An in-depth, detailed analysis of five cases situated in the school context was used to ‘capture its authentic conditions’ (2011:528). Data were collected over one academic year through qualitative research methods, including recording key events through participant observation, focus group interviews and the collection of artefacts and in-depth interviews with all participants. The data were analysed using a grounded theory approach and interpreted through the theoretical lens of what Lave and Wenger (1991) referred to as ‘communities of practice’.

From this study Chambers and Armour (2011) concluded that official policy was not being realised in practice and that the ‘unofficial curriculum of teaching practice’ (2011:541) did not support PSTs’ learning as members of the community. They argued that ‘university personnel must work in an effective partnership to educate [...] students in the intended
or official curriculum’ (2011:541). Although this study was conducted in a different context to that of England, it supports the argument that examining perceptions of the role or teacher educators’ intentions is not sufficient to understand the reality of practice and its efficacy in supporting PSTs. It also supports the argument made by Haigh and Ward (2004) that those involved in partnerships must understand each other’s roles to ensure that the school experience is of the quality ‘necessary for their preparation to enter a complex and creative profession’ (Haigh & Ward, 2004:137).

Other relevant studies have concentrated on the triad discussions between tutor, mentor and PST following an observed lesson (e.g. Wood, 1997; Haigh & Ward, 2004; Nguyen, 2009; Hutchinson, 2011). Following his review of the literature, Hutchinson (2011) concluded that the triad discussion ‘is an area that remains under-researched, especially using data drawn from real live encounters rather than interviews or questionnaires’ (2011:178). Using a case study approach, Hutchinson focused on the relationship between mentor, PST and tutor within four triads of music specialists on a distance learning ITE programme. Discussions were recorded to find out how the triads talked about teaching and learning as they planned a lesson collaboratively and when they talked about it afterwards. Content analysis was used to identify the sources participants drew on and any disagreements and tensions. Hutchinson’s analysis revealed that tutors make few references to university material (literature and research), and like mentors drew on their own teaching experiences, personal theories and school-based sources.
Hutchinson concluded that there was little difference between the role of the mentor and tutor:

‘The emerging picture shows the university tutor leading through initiating and questioning discussions about practice, drawing frequently on personal, or personalised, experiences or theories. With a student teacher and mentor who are focused on the pupils they will teach and the resources they will use, the university tutor is drawn (to various degrees) into the process of modelling the actual lesson or possible strategies to the lesson, with the outcome that there is little or no difference between the role of university tutor and mentor.’

(Hutchinson, 2011:186)

This study revealed the content of the triad discussions and suggested who contributes what to the PST’s development as a teacher through such discussions. However, what is not revealed is how the tutor manages the whole visit and the triad discussion. Through personal experience I know that such discussions are not always part of the schools visits or take the form of hurried exchanges between the tutor and mentor. Neither does the analysis of triad discussions reveal the tutors’ goals and rationales.
The conclusion drawn by Hutchinson (2011) differs from that drawn by Burn (2006), possibly because Hutchinson’s research was situated in the school setting, whilst Burn examined tutors in the university setting. The differences may also be attributable to the tutors’ backgrounds and identities. In Hutchinson’s study the tutors were part-time associate staff, rather than full-time established lecturers. The backgrounds of the tutors are not given, but many such part-time tutors are retired teachers or still teaching. They are therefore unlikely to have the same teacher educator identity as tutors who are central members of university faculties of education. In other words, they may be teachers and mentors in terms of their professional knowledge of and orientation towards PSTs and ITE.

How tutors work with individual PSTs and navigate the potentially difficult discussions with PSTs following lesson observations is of interest to all teacher educators, whether they be school or university based. The only research found to focus on this dyad exchange was John’s (2001) case study of the sessions between one university tutor and PST during school placements. Using the concept of ‘theories-of-action’, John (2001) aimed to understand the espoused theories and the theories-in-use of the tutor. The tutor and PST were selected because of their typicality of the group as a whole. Details of the ways in which the participants were typical are not provided, although personal experience suggests that typicality does not exist. Both participants were interviewed at length about their beliefs about professional learning and their expectations. The post-
lesson conversations were recorded and followed by a brief open-ended discussion about the exchanges to establish the tutor’s initial thoughts regarding the lesson and the discussions with the PST.

In his analysis, John (2001) focused on the language used, the nature of the relationship, expectations, conceptions of teaching and learning, as well as patterns of interaction. The excerpts from the conversations between the tutor and PST provide a tantalising glimpse of the tutor’s practice as he tried to achieve his goals. John concluded that a ‘potential learning event turned into a learning bind’ (2001:163). However, John’s report does not explore the decision-making of the tutor or his knowledge, goals and underpinning theories. Most striking is the absence of the voice of the PST and tutor in the interpretation of the events, even though they were interviewed at length. The interpretations are the author’s and there is no indication that the tutor or PST recognised his interpretations, as the words of the participants were not used to support the interpretations or understand the practice and its outcomes.

Another of John’s (2001) stated aims was to investigate ‘the contextual features upon which the success or otherwise of a supervised practicum depends’ (2001:153). It is difficult to identify which contextual features are crucial to success in the complex set of inter-related contextual factors of the school setting. Relevant contextual information might include the requirements of the school and the PSTs’ expectations of the tutor role.
Important contextual detail is not presented in John’s (2001) report or analysed in terms of its impact. Nevertheless, this study has implications for my research in terms of the nature of the involvement of the tutor and PST and ways of conceptualising exchanges.

The research on tutors’ practice is scarce, particularly in relation to how they negotiate the school visits, their underlying goals, motivation and values, and how these influence their practice. Studies of pedagogy in ITE do not capture the entire repertoire of practice, particularly in situations that are not pre-planned and rely on reacting to unknown situations and circumstances. In the school setting, tutors have to draw on their experience and knowledge, the nature of which is explored next.

2.4 Practical knowledge

How tutors develop their knowledge and use it in practice provides the theoretical framework for this research. The nature of ‘practical knowledge’ and how it is shaped by experience provides the lens through which tutors’ practice will be examined.

The review of research on teacher educators’ knowledge revealed that there are differences and similarities to that of teachers, and it is this knowledge that informs practice. There are several questions that are pertinent to this study. What is the nature
of the knowledge tutors use in their interactions with PSTs and school staff during their
visits? How do tutors acquire this knowledge? How does it guide their decision making
and practice during the visit? Whilst the literature examined previously suggests different
dimensions to tutors’ knowledge, it says nothing about how such knowledge is used in
practice.

The knowledge of teachers, its status and how it used in practice has been the focus for a
great deal of study and debate. A number of terms have been used to describe this
knowledge, resulting in research that has been ‘plagued by conceptual and
methodological inconsistencies’ (John, 2002). This is perhaps unsurprising given the
complex nature of knowledge and epistemological arguments at the heart of the different
interpretations. Fenstermacher (1994) attempted to make sense of the ideas emerging
about teachers’ knowledge and bring some clarity to the various epistemological
conceptions found in the research literature on teaching. He noted the many terms used,
for example strategic knowledge, local knowledge, personal knowledge and propositional
knowledge, and distinguished these from discrete, epistemological categories or ‘types’ of
knowledge, which he identified as formal knowledge and practical knowledge (1994:7). In
the context of teaching, Fenstermacher (1994) defines formal knowledge as knowledge
derived from educational studies. Formal knowledge, also referred to as ‘propositional’
and ‘theoretical’ knowledge, is purposively acquired and universally available. It is the
type of knowledge gained through study, for example, the knowledge that PSTs meet as
part of their PGCE studies in the university. However, it is widely recognised that formal knowledge alone is not sufficient to make sense of the knowledge and practice of teachers, although it is part of their knowledge (Elbaz, 1981, 1983; Clandinin, 1985; Leinhardt, 1990; Fenstermacher, 1994; Black & Halliwell, 2000). What is missing is the knowledge that practitioners acquire over time through experience, and what is widely referred to in the literature as *practical knowledge*.

*Practical knowledge: nature and content*

Although the concept of practical knowledge is now firmly established in the literature, as Gholami and Husu (2010) noted, ‘there is no concrete agreement about the concept of practical knowledge’ (2010:1520). The inconsistencies that have arisen may in part be due to attempts to analyse and categorise it. This has resulted in different ways of viewing practical knowledge and the many terms used to describe its components, dimensions, forms and types. For example, the notions of ‘case knowledge’, ‘strategic knowledge’, ‘craft knowledge’ ‘technical knowledge’ and ‘situated knowledge’ are used to describe types or forms of practical knowledge (Fenstermacher, 1994). Even these categories are open to interpretation however. For example, Leinhardt (1990) conceives craft knowledge as including "deep, sensitive, location specific knowledge of teaching", as well as "fragmentary, superstitious and often inaccurate opinions" (Leinhardt, 1990:18). A different view is offered by Grimmett and MacKinnon (1992) who aligned it with the act of crafting "in the dexterous, ingenious sense" of the term (1992:429). In some respects,
such differences are irrelevant, because it is the nature of the knowledge tutors hold and how they use it that is most pertinent in my research.

Although there are some differences, there are many commonalities between the different conceptions of practical knowledge, which encompass how such knowledge is acquired, how it is held and how it is used in practice. First, practical knowledge is acquired by individual practitioners through experience (e.g. Elbaz, 1983; Fenstermacher, 1994; Black & Halliwell, 2000). Closely connected to this is the personal nature of practical knowledge; it is a blend of formal knowledge, personal theories, situated contextual knowledge, beliefs, values and motives that guide the actions of practitioners in practical settings (Beijaard & Verloop 1996; Gholami & Husu, 2010). The description by Clandinin (1992) encapsulates her conception of what she termed ‘personal practical knowledge’:

‘We see personal practical knowledge as in the person's past experience, in the person's present mind and body and in the person's future plans and actions. It is knowledge that reflects the individual's prior knowledge and acknowledges the contextual nature of that teacher's knowledge. It is a kind of knowledge carved out of, and shaped by, situations; knowledge that is constructed and reconstructed as we live out our stories and retell and relive them through processes of reflection.’

(Clandinin, 1992:125)
In this way, practical knowledge is more than just content knowledge, as it involves making value judgements in practice and acts as ‘as a “glue” that brings all of the knowledge bases to bear on the act of teaching (Grimmett & McKinnon, 1992:387). Lastly, practical knowledge can be tacit in nature, meaning that it is not easily recognised and verbalised. It is to some extent used instinctively and routinely as practitioners carry out complex activities in social settings.

One of the first researchers to identify practical knowledge was Elbaz (1981; 1983; 1991). Through her study of one teacher, “Sarah”, Elbaz (1981) developed an understanding of the practical knowledge she used to carry out instructional tasks, resolve conflicts, make judgements about competing considerations, and execute plans in order to achieve her goals. This knowledge embodied Sarah’s experience of schools, learners and teaching. In her analysis of this teacher’s practical knowledge, Elbaz identified three dimensions: content, orientation and structure. Content knowledge included knowledge of subject matter, the curriculum, practical matters (e.g. classroom routines), self-knowledge (e.g. of goals and disposition) and knowledge of the ‘milieu of schools’ that captures how the school worked. Content knowledge therefore was regarded as what is known.

The dimension of ‘orientation’ was characterised by the ‘way it is held’ (1981:49). Elbaz (1981) identified 5 orientations of knowledge: situational, personal, theoretical, social and experiential knowledge. These orientations reflect the way the teacher’s knowledge is
shaped and the role of their knowledge in practice. Situational orientation helps the practitioner ‘toward making sense of, and responding to, the various situations of teaching’ (1981:49). The personal dimension pertains to ‘working in personally meaningful ways’ (1981:49), whilst social orientated knowledge is shaped by social conditions and informs their role and actions in different social settings. Experiential knowledge is not simply knowledge derived through experience, as this applies to the other dimensions identified by Elbaz. Rather, it is represents how knowledge is related to experience (1981:49). The theoretical orientation explains the practitioner’s orientation to theoretical knowledge.

In the third dimension of ‘structure’, Elbaz (1981) classified knowledge in terms of how ‘Sarah’, the teacher, used her knowledge. Practical knowledge, Elbaz argued, is manifested in practice in three ways: as rules of practice, which are "a brief, clearly formulated statement of what to do or how to do it in a particular situation frequently encountered in practice’ (1981:61); as practical principles, which are "broader, more inclusive...(that) embody purpose in a deliberate and reflective way’ (1981:61); and as ‘images’, which is how Elbaz referred to knowledge used intuitively and defined as ‘brief metaphoric statements of how teaching should be’ (Elbaz, 1981:61). These images incorporate emotionality, values, morals, and are used to guide thinking and organize knowledge.
The concept of image was also central to Clandinin’s (1985, 1986) work. Images supported her narrative approach to her research on personal practical knowledge. She conceived ‘images’ as being the "the coalescence of a person’s personal private and professional experience" (1986:166) and as being embodied and enacted in practice, guiding teachers in making sense of future situations. She maintained that images entail ‘emotionality, morality, and aesthetics’ (Clandinin, 1985:365) and that these personal meanings are at the heart of actions. Clandinin attributed great significance to these images because they embody a person’s perspective on situations and new experiences, thereby influencing reactions and what is learned. Such images are communicated by how teachers talk about their work and the comparisons, metaphors and similes they use. A similar notion was also used by Zanting et al (2003a), who described the practical knowledge of experts as ‘organised; stored in patterns, scenes and procedures’ (2003a:198). Tutors are likely to have aims and intentions regarding the visits to PSTs and make decisions as to how to achieve a particular end. Through experience, they will have developed images and maps that guide their practice.

These views of practical knowledge link to Argyris’s (2004) concept of ‘Theory-of-Action’, whereby action is produced by the activation of procedural knowledge, which depends on causality. It is causality that helps people to operate successfully in complex environments, and from this arises theories-of-action ‘that specify the actions and their causal sequencing required in order to act effectively’ (2004:8). Theories-of-action are of
two types: espoused theory composed of values, beliefs and action strategies; and theories-in-use, which are used spontaneously to guide action. This resonates with the notion of practical knowledge, supporting the contention that such knowledge is unique, constructed by an individual according to their intentions and beliefs.

Some have argued that practical knowledge stabilises over time and becomes less open to innovation or change (Beijaard & Verloop, 1996). However, it is also noted that practical knowledge can be developed through reflection (Fenstermacher, 1994; Beijaard & Verloop, 1996). A definition of practical knowledge by Clandinin (1985, 1986) stressed the personal nature of this knowledge being value-laden and purposeful, but also “dynamic, firmly grounded in the individual's inner and outer experience, and open to changes (1986:67). The role reflection plays in the development of practical knowledge is central to Schön’s (1983) notion of reflective practice, which is closely linked to personal practical knowledge; what Schön referred to as "the epistemology of practice". Schön’s conception of practical knowledge however differs to that of Elbaz (1981) and Clandinin (1985, 1986) as he argued that practical knowledge does not incorporate formal knowledge, but is distinctly separate and embodied by actions. At the heart of this are the concepts of knowing-in-action, reflecting-in-action, reflecting-in-practice, reflection-on-action, framing and reframing experience. Reflecting-in-action occurs rapidly in the context of the action and is underpinned by practical knowledge. Reflection-on-action occurs after the event and is seen as a means of supporting professional development.
through the use of theory (formal knowledge) to interrogate practice (Schön, 1983). In this way formal knowledge has to be brought intentionally together with practical knowledge. An argument made by Black and Halliwell (2000) is that practical knowledge ‘encompasses theoretical knowledge, though adapted to the relevant teaching situations’ (2000:276), which resonates with the situated nature of practical knowledge. Clandinin (1985) also referred to the dialectical relationship between theory and practice and how the world of practice shapes the teacher’s knowledge and, conversely, how the teacher ‘structures the practical situation in accordance with knowledge and purposes’ (1985:364). These perspectives suggest that it is experienced tutors who are the most likely to have developed their practical knowledge and practice in ITE and therefore the practitioners on which to focus my research.

Research has focused on the practical knowledge of teachers and other practitioners, but not of HE-based teacher educators. John (2002) noted the lack of an ‘overarching theoretical framework within which to make sense of their knowledge and practice’ (2002:323). Whilst HE tutors are no longer classroom teachers, they work with PSTs in practical settings, drawing on their own knowledge, experience and skills to achieve their goals. Like classroom teachers, they face multi-dimensionality, needing to react to events and make decisions as the visit proceeds. The limited time available means that choices have to be made. Having been teachers themselves, the knowledge they develop as teacher educators is integrated into their teacher knowledge (Tzur, 2001). A significant
difference for tutors is that they are not members of the school communities they visit and therefore not familiar with the contexts in which their PST teachers are situated. This adds to the complexity of the practical knowledge needed by tutors, making them an interesting group of practitioners upon which to focus. Like Clandinin (1985) I sought to try to understand how they think about their work and what knowledge they use as the basis for their actions.

2.5 The influence of the tutor

The practices and knowledge of tutors are legitimate and worthwhile foci for academic study. However, an opportunity is lost if consideration is not given to what PSTs gain from them. Graber (1995) found from her small, qualitative study of twenty PSTs with their tutors and mentors that PSTs believed that they had been influenced by one particular tutor. This led her to conclude that ‘A single powerful individual may be more important in shaping pre-service student beliefs than an entire program of courses and experiences’ (Graber, 1995:157).

Despite this study being in the context of the USA and conducted at a time before PSTs spent significant time in school as part of their training, it suggests that tutors’ expertise and practice has idiosyncratic components. It also implies that some are more effective at influencing PSTs than others. Graber’s study was focused on the teaching in the
university, but it would not be unreasonable to assume that tutors’ practice on schools visits will also vary. Unless successful practices are identified and an understanding developed as to why these are successful in the context in which they are used, then all that will be discovered is what a particular group of tutors do. Finding out how PSTs respond, what they gain from the visits and what prevents them learning from tutors is an important step in identifying successful practice.

An important point to note is that Graber (1995) identified the PSTs’ beliefs about what had influenced them. Impact and influence are difficult to evidence directly because of the complexity of the potential sources of influence that PSTs encounter. This was noted by McNamara (1995) who warned that establishing a causal link between tutors’ practice and PSTs’ observed classroom practice is fraught with difficulties (McNamara, 1995:51). McNamara argued that focusing on the advice provided by tutors to PSTs and how this influences their planning and teaching would provide a more valid basis for claims about what HEI contributes to PSTs’ development. His contention was that PSTs’ interpretations of their tutors’ advice would provide a proximate indicator of the contribution made to their practical teaching.

Although it is not possible to attribute changes in practice or attitudes to a single event with any certainty, significant shifts in thinking may stem from ‘critical incidents’. Such critical incidents in teaching were used by McNamara (1995) when he investigated who
and what influenced the content of lessons - what was taught by PSTs, and who and what influenced how they taught. McNamara’s exploratory study of 28 triads (PST, mentor and tutor) involved examining their practice and ideas about teaching and learning, along with how they developed. The participating PSTs from one HEI were undertaking a one-year primary PGCE course during which they spent half of their time in school. To avoid jeopardising this ‘crucial phase in their professional education’ (McNamara, 1995:52), only PSTs judged to be competent and in supportive placement schools participated. It therefore automatically excluded consideration of the value and influence of the tutor in situations where the PST was experiencing difficulties, which might have revealed additional important dimensions to their role and practice. McNamara’s choice of a small sample was informed by his belief that PSTs’ experience of learning to teach is affected by the school context, as well as the individual tutor and mentor involved. Interviews were conducted with all participants during the school placement. Additional classroom observations that identified “critical incidents” in the PST’s teaching were also discussed. The analysis of the data was not reported in any detail, but McNamara asserted that the evidence showed that what the PSTs taught (content) was determined by the school, but the tutors had some influence over how PSTs taught.

Although this study was set in a different context for ITE than exists now, and focused on primary PSTs, it points to some important implications for my study. First, the extent to which PSTs were aware of the tutors’ influence is questionable, as McNamara’s (1995)
approach relied on their perceptions, rather than on probing the knowledge behind their
decision-making. Second, examining where PSTs had obtained their ideas for teaching
limited the dimensions of the tutors’ influence that were captured. For example, the
extent to which the tutor had developed PSTs as critically reflective practitioners or
supported their confidence in taking risks in their teaching was not considered.
McNamara recognised that the evidence should be regarded with caution as PSTs were
asked ‘what was particularly useful and not asked to cover all the sources which may have
had some impact upon their practice’ (1995:56). He cautioned that PSTs may absorb
information and advice and not be able to attribute it to a particular source as they
develop their working knowledge (McNamara, 1995:56).

McNamara’s (1995) tentative conclusion was that there is some evidence that mentors
and tutors were equally important sources of advice and influence during the school
placement. This finding is contrary to earlier studies in the 1980s cited by John (2001),
which suggested that tutors have little effect on the development of PSTs. Later research
also indicated that the schools, rather than HEIs, contributed most significantly to the
development of teaching competencies (John, 2001; Capel, 2003). However, there is
more to the journey from novice to qualified teacher than developing teaching
competence, as has already been examined in the exploration of the role of the HEI. Since
McNamara (1995) conducted his study, the nature of ITE and the context in which it
occurs has changed considerably, with tutors adopting different practices to meet new
goals and roles. John (2001) noted that the ‘supervisory’ process is ‘potentially one of the most singularly important learning events in the student teacher’s professional development cycle’ (2001:154). What contributes to achieving this is worthy of investigation.

Studies that have investigated impact or influence more broadly have, in the main, done so from a general perspective, or examined a component of influence such as the use of theory (e.g. Postlethwaite & Haggarty, 2012) or been linked to the role of higher education in ITE, as examined previously. Large-scale research provides a broad indication of what PSTs gain from their tutors. One prominent six-year, longitudinal phenomenological study culminated in the report ‘Teachers’ Experiences of Initial Teacher Training, Induction and Early Professional Development’ (Hobson et al, 2009). This project explored new teachers’ experiences of ITT and early professional development in England through a mixture of case study (85 PSTs) and survey methods across all types of provision and all HEIs. Although the scope of the project was much wider than simply examining the influence of the HE tutor, PSTs were asked about their training. Many said that they found that the HEI component had helped them develop specific aspects of their knowledge, for example in lesson planning, policy, classroom management and behaviour, differentiation and children’s learning. Pre-service teachers were particularly appreciative of those elements of HEI-based preparation that they saw as having clear practical utility for their work in schools, for example where their tutors
suggested specific strategies or modelled specific approaches to facilitating learning in their own teaching (Hobson et al, 2009:42). Twenty PSTs also highlighted the role tutors played in supporting them and resolving issues and problems they encountered in their school placements. Many were sceptical of educational theory, confirming findings from other studies (e.g. Davies & Ferguson, 1997). However, Hobson et al (2009) were conscious of the difficulties of separating theory from practice, arguing that the perception would be affected by how it was presented by tutors and that the perceptions of different individuals would vary depending on their existing knowledge.

This study has suggested areas of tension and success for higher education in terms of their contribution to PSTs’ professional development, although PST appreciation does not equate to influencing their practice. A difficulty that all studies seeking PSTs’ opinions face is that the PSTs know their tutors, who have supported them through what is often an emotional and stressful time. It would not be surprising therefore if they tried to find something positive to say in return. This ‘filtering’ of responses to questions about effectiveness and influence through the relationship PSTs develop with their tutors becomes even more of an issue in small studies focusing on tutor-PSTs relationships.

A psychological study conducted in Portugal by Caires and Almeida (2007) examined the emotional aspects of the relationships PST-tutor relationship, and PSTs’ perceptions of their mentor’s and HE tutor’s performance. Data were obtained from the reflections of
224 PSTs and focused on their perceptions of their learning and progress. The PSTs were all based at one institution and in the final stages of an undergraduate program for secondary school teachers. Pre-service teachers had weekly meetings with their tutor in the university and the tutor visited the PST three times during the ten-month placement in school. Pre-service teachers’ perceptions were gathered one month into the placement and one month before the end. A specifically designed instrument required PSTs to indicate the extent of their agreement with statements on a Likert scale. A few qualitative items sought PSTs’ opinions about the most significant aspects of the teaching experience and it was only these that allowed PSTs to distinguish between their opinions of their mentor and tutor. Steps were taken to maintain PSTs’ confidentiality so that they would feel able to respond honestly. The results showed that PSTs’ opinions changed from the start to the end of the course. They rated tutors’ competence more highly at the end, but their support much less highly. Feedback from the tutor was not valued by the PSTs, who rated their ‘pedagogical competence’ and ‘emotional support’ as much more important. The responses were grouped in six categories. What was included in each is only alluded to, but they were broad and encompassed many different aspects. For example, ‘Competence’ included subject expertise, experience, professionalism and efficiency. A consequence of this broad categorisation is that the fine detail was lost in the reporting.
The PSTs participating in the study by Caires and Almeida (2007) attributed several virtues to the university tutor, including accessibility, good sense and sympathy (2007:522). In addition Caires and Almeida reported that:

‘The calmness and confidence transmitted concerning the student teachers' abilities, as well as the autonomy conceded to their practice were indicated as important sources of motivation and self-efficacy/confidence. Regarding the quality of the relationship maintained with this supervisor, the student teachers' comments accentuated the good relationship held...’

(Caires & Almeida, 2007:522)

What this study did not reveal was how tutors influenced PSTs’ practice, thinking or development. Perhaps the most significant and interesting finding was that PSTs’ perceptions were not the same at the beginning and end of the school placement. Reasons suggested for these changes included the ‘refinement of student teachers’ “evaluation grids”’, their changing demands and the emergence of more specific needs, as well as growing familiarity, although these were only informed suppositions.
This study was conducted in a very different context, which may have impacted on PSTs’ responses. Therefore different data and findings may emerge from similar research conducted in the current UK context. It does however suggest that PSTs’ perceptions change as they develop professionally and that data collected at one point in a course would provide limited evidence of what they perceive they gain from tutors’ visits. One limitation of the study by Caires and Almeida (2007) was the general categorisation of PSTs’ responses, which is understandable given the large number of participants. A smaller scale study would enable a more detailed examination of how tutors influence PSTs and how PSTs perceive they benefit from the visits.

A smaller, evaluative survey study conducted by Fayne (2007) in the USA focused on evaluating the feedback provided by tutors to PSTs during school placements. Specifically, Fayne set out to find out whether tutors added value to PSTs’ teaching experience and whether they distinguished between the roles of the tutor and mentor. The also wanted to know how PSTs ‘characterise good supervision’ (2007:53). To answer these questions, Fayne surveyed 222 pre-service teachers over 5 years and 4 experienced tutors via email at the end of the 10 week teaching placement. The survey consisted of open prompts that asked PSTs to identify positive and negatives aspects of the experience, and met and unmet needs (2007:57). They were also asked to judge how well their tutor had met given responsibilities and their particular needs. The tutor survey focused on what they thought were the traits of a good tutor and how these had been demonstrated.
The PSTs’ responses indicated that they believed that the tutors had ‘added value to the student teaching experience’ (2007:59) and that they ‘appeared to be making important distinctions between roles played by supervisors and cooperating teachers’ (2007:60). Successful visits (supervisions) were seen by PSTs as those focused on skills, practical reasoning and problem solving. Fayne concluded that the PSTs had been ‘unwilling or unable to develop critical competence at this early stage’ (2007:62). This supports the finding of previous research that PSTs in the school setting are concerned with the immediate problems facing them. However, this only indicates what the PSTs were willing to share through email and does not reveal how their tutors influenced them. Their immediate needs and how well the tutor met these are likely to be remembered more clearly than the more subtle, long term influences on them such as developing critical thinking.

The literature on the influence of tutors on the PSTs during school placements is limited, possibly because of the difficulty in identifying who or what has influenced their learning. Even though surveys are limited in that they do not describe the detail of practice and are not supported by observation, they do point to common phenomena, such as that PSTs are not influenced by tutors’ attempts to engage with the theory because their needs at that time are dominated by the emotional and sometimes personally threatening prospect of practical teaching. The smaller, qualitative studies are potentially more
illuminating as they offer the opportunity to understand the influence tutors have more deeply and link that to the practices these individuals use.

2.6 Tutors’ professional knowledge

Behind tutors’ practice is a complex set of knowledge that encompasses knowledge of teaching, schools, research and PSTs. There are no prescribed standards or competences that describe the skills required of teacher educators in the UK, although a professional standard, describing a set of skills and knowledge for school-based and HE-based teacher educators was introduced in the Netherlands in 2001 (VELON, 1999). This professional standard was used by Lunenberg (2002), along with the ‘limited and fragmented’ literature (2002:266), case studies and discussions with colleagues, to develop a proposed curriculum for beginning teacher educators in the Netherlands. From a review of the literature he identified four ‘extra facets’ in addition to being a good teacher that are needed. The first extra facet identified was an understanding of PSTs as adult learners. Lunenberg (2002) asserted that teacher educators need ‘to have knowledge about beliefs, concerns and pre-concepts of student teachers and understand these’ (2002:266).

Pre-service teachers may hold very firm notions about what ‘good’ teaching is, based on their own experience of schooling. Understanding the nature of PSTs’ learning does not automatically lead to effective practice in changing their long held conceptions, which is unlikely to be achieved by simply instructing them. The question that arises is what practices might tutors use to elicit and change these pre-existing ideas?
The other extra facets of competence needed by teacher educators were bridging the gap between theory and practice, awareness of their own pedagogical decisions, and reflecting on two levels - on their own teacher education practice and supporting the reflective practice of PSTs. From this general consideration of the skills and knowledge required for the role Lunenberg (2002) proposed six groups of competences around subject, pedagogy, organisation, communication, development and the requirements of the institution. Lunenberg (2002) expanded on these competences with examples of what teacher educators should be able to do in order to demonstrate the competences. These competences provide a framework for analysing teacher educator knowledge and skills, but do not further an understanding of the nature of the skills in practice. Neither do they differentiate between the school-based and HEI-based teacher educator roles.

The literature on roles examined earlier, along with studies into the induction and professional development of HEI tutors, suggests that whilst there is some overlap, there is a difference between the roles (Furlong, 2000; Tzur, 2001; Meuller, 2003; Murray & Male, 2005). Drawing on previous research into PST development and roles of the HE tutor, Furlong (2000) argued that the difficult transitions in PST teacher development require external support and different strategies from those of the mentor. He contended that these strategies draw on knowledge of how children learn and practices that encourage PSTs to think more deeply about the educational purposes underlying their teaching. Furlong (2000) concluded that the HE tutor has a wider perspective and
different kinds of professional knowledge that can support deeper, critical evaluation of teaching. Whilst the mentor is rooted in the context of a particular institution, the tutor can support the PST in examining their practice in light of different forms of professional knowledge.

In a subsequent study, John (2002) developed an understanding of science tutors’ knowledge by means of a person-in-context case study, focused on twelve tutors in the university sessions. From interviews and observation data, he derived four dimensions to their knowledge. ‘Intentionality’ described tutors’ goals to improve PSTs’ decision-making and professional judgement. In particular, tutors sought to develop PSTs’ ability to engage with different sources of knowledge through critical thinking. ‘Practicality’ was concerned with developing professional judgement and reflective capacities through focusing on practical discourse (2002:337). ‘Subject specificity’ encompassed knowledge of their subject, its pedagogy and curriculum. The final dimension, ‘ethicality’, consisted of the ethics of pluralism, professionalism and caring. Although this framework was developed from tutors’ work with PSTs in the university, it has the potential to inform the analysis of tutors’ knowledge and practice manifested through the school visits.

Smith’s (2005) framework for the analysis of tutors’ professional knowledge was developed through a qualitative study of tutors in Israel. The resulting list of features of teacher educator professional expertise had similarities to those put forward by
Lunenburg (2002). She also identified knowledge of how to create new knowledge, teaching children and adults and of the education system. Like Lunenburg (2002), Smith identified reflectivity and meta-cognition as an important feature of tutors’ knowledge and expertise. The need for reflection on and understanding of the theoretical grounds for praxis was also highlighted by Tzur (2001:275) through his self-reflective analysis of his own development. This dimension of tutors’ knowledge has emerged from studies in different contexts, which suggests that reflection on and awareness of the theories that govern practice is fundamental to being an effective teacher educator.

These studies, which identify the knowledge and skills needed by teacher educators, support the conclusion drawn by Murray and Male (2005) that extended knowledge skills are required by tutors. This conclusion was based on evidence from their study of 28 teacher educators working in different HEIs in their first 3 years of working on ITE courses. The ‘extended’ skills are not described however, and this omission is acknowledged as they contemplated ‘what professional knowledge teacher educators need’ and ‘what pedagogical understanding and skills they require’ (Murray and Male, 2005:136). In addition, like Smith (2005), they did not exemplify the knowledge in terms of how tutors use this knowledge in practice.

Murray and Male (2005) did not aim to describe tutors’ practices, but like others (e.g. John, 2002 and Smith, 2005) they highlighted that there is knowledge and a pedagogy to
acquire. This suggests that more is needed to be learned about the expertise of HE-based teacher educators (Smith, 2005). The question still remains as to how tutors use their knowledge in the support of PSTs, particularly in the context of the school placement.

2.7 Recent research

The shift in national policy in England towards giving schools the responsibility for ITE has resulted in renewed interest and debate in the role of higher education in the education and training of new teachers. The report *Supporting Teacher Educators for Better Outcomes* by the European Commission (2013) signifies the growing interest in this overlooked group of professionals and recognition that teacher educators are ‘crucial players for maintaining - and improving - the high quality of the teaching workforce’ (European Commission, 2013:4). Drawing on empirical evidence, this report confirms that there remains a lack of education and professional development for teacher educators, and highlights the need for explicit frameworks that set out the skills and knowledge needed. The fragmented nature of teacher education within and across countries reveals that the expectations of these professionals are not in line with other professions. However, before frameworks explicating the skills and knowledge of teacher educators can be developed, more needs to be known about their roles and how these can be fulfilled effectively in practice. Although there have been recent critiques of policy and well-argued cases in support of the involvement of higher education in ITE (for example, Furlong, 2013; Gewirtz, 2013), the evidence of its value and worth to both schools and
PSTs remains scarce. As a result, the European Commission (2013) has called for ‘an intensive research agenda to develop the knowledge on teacher educators’ (2013:28) in order that the profession can have access to information about the ‘activities and practices seem to work in educating teachers, or what competences are needed in specific contexts’ (2013:28).

Further studies focused on the HE-based teacher educators who support PSTs have recently been published. One particular focus has been the nature of their work and their position within higher education (Ellis et al, 2012; Childs, 2013; Ellis et al, 2013; McNicholl et al, 2013,), much of which builds on the work already examined in this chapter, for example the WoTE project (Ellis et al, 2011). The professional identity and development of tutors has also come under further scrutiny (Murray et al, 2011; White, 2013; Murray, 2014). Through a case study, Murray (2014) highlighted the centrality of professional identity to understanding the relationships between PSTs and teacher educators. This identity, she argued, encompasses different sets of knowledge, attitudes and values and is exemplified by practice. The three modes of professional identity presented – new teacher educator; teacher of teachers and education academics – provides a potentially useful lens through which to examine tutors’ professional knowledge and the practices they use on school visits.
The practices deployed by tutors on school visits remains under-researched. Two relevant studies recently published were those conducted by Berry and Driel (2013) and levers et al (2013). Berry and Driel (2013) focused on the specific expertise that secondary science tutors bring to the subject sessions with PSTs in the university, and their concerns and purposes in relation to teacher education. Four HEIs with good reputations for ITE participated, two in Australia and two in the Netherlands, and twelve tutors with various backgrounds recruited, although all had experience of teaching. A qualitative approach was taken, using interviews to explore their backgrounds and motivations. In addition their pedagogical approach was probed through interviews that focused on how they prepared PSTs to teach a specific topic. The data were analysed using an interpretative phenomenological approach. The most salient features of each individual account were summarized focusing on (a) their concerns and purposes, (b) the emphases in approaches to teaching about teaching science, and (c) the personal and professional experiences that had shaped purposes and approaches. Cross-case analysis was carried out to identify differences and commonalities.

A significant finding was that the tutors were concerned about the quality of science teaching in school and sought to develop science teachers who would inspire and motivate learners, as well as promote meaningful learning. They talked of challenging traditional teacher-led approaches and promoting interactive, student-centred teaching aimed at developing conceptual understanding. A particular feature of their practice was
making PSTs think critically about science education and helping them to articulate their thinking as novice teachers. They wanted PSTs to see teaching and science from the learners’ perspective and, through a constructivist view of learning, be aware of why learners in school fail to grasp scientific ideas. In terms of developing the PSTs as teachers, their goal was for them to develop their own styles and strategies, and not just imitate other teachers.

This study raises some important issues relevant to my research. First, although it was conducted in different national and organisational contexts, Berry and Driel (2013) noted that the differences between them were not strongly evident in the findings. However, substantial differences were noted between the tutors themselves. It was the tutor’s personal background and previous experiences that impacted most on their pedagogy. The practice of those with research backgrounds was characterised by challenging PSTs and making them think critically about the curriculum and their own teaching. Those without such research experience, but substantial experience in school teaching, tended to be more pragmatic and focused on interactions with learners in school. This suggests that the tutors’ practice needs to be related to their individual backgrounds in order that the differences between them may be better understood.

Berry and Driel’s (2013) study did not examine the tutors’ practice when they visited PSTs in school. Although the sample was small, they argued that the tutors were not supposed
to be representative of the population. Rather, their aim was to contribute to what is known about this under researched group of practitioners. They conceded that ‘the data are limited to tutors’ self-reports of their practice’ (2013:126) and identified the need to examine how tutors’ approaches affect PSTs. Although the tutors’ self-reports were focused on a specific curriculum topic, these sessions were not observed by the researchers. Tutors’ intentions and view of themselves as practitioners may not always match what they actually do in practice, as has already been noted. This confirms that interviews should be located within a real, shared experience of practice in the setting in which it takes place.

Another recently published study by Ievers et al (2013) examined and compared the role of the HEI tutor during school placements in the context of Northern Ireland (NI) and the Republic of Ireland (RoI). The focus included the extent to which the tutor role was complemented by the role of the mentor and PST. A large-scale, mixed-method approach was taken, using a questionnaire survey and focus-group discussions. The participants were 100 PSTs studying for a primary Bachelor of Education degree (B.Ed.) at teacher education colleges, 60 teachers and 60 HEI tutors. Importantly, the PSTs were not directly supervised by either the HEI tutors sampled or the class teachers. The questionnaire used a mixture of closed ‘yes/no’ questions, scaled responses indicating importance of a role, and open, free response questions. Focus groups comprised of tutors, PSTs or teachers
who had completed the questionnaire. The quantitative data were statistically analysed, with a thematic analysis conducted on the qualitative data.

The analysis and findings focused on assessment of the PST and their involvement in evaluation. All participants supported the notion of listening to PSTs and including them in the process of assessment and evaluation, but rejected the idea that it should go as far as being a collaborative process. The findings also indicated a potential conflict between the roles of assessor and supporter and a lack of agreement as to whether the tutor or teachers were best placed to assess the PST. However, there was general agreement about the tutor role, which was to:

‘...observe, report, assess, advise, encourage and support the student and to engage in dialogue with the class teacher in relation to the student’s progress...’

(Ievers et al, 2013:192)

From the data, Ievers et al (2013) concluded that the work of the tutor during school-based work should be recognised as a specialist role with recent and relevant classroom experience as a part of the specialist training (2013:196). Another conclusion was that assessment of PSTs requires the involvement of both class teachers, with HE-based tutors
acting as moderators. Overall, collaborative partnership was seen as most appropriate, but with the ultimate responsibility residing with the HEI. However, this study did not examine the tutors’ role in practice; nor did it consider PSTs’ perspective on their roles. It was also set in a context which is very different to that in England, as school involvement through partnership in ITE is a relatively recent development in Ireland.

These studies were published once the field work phase of the research was underway and therefore did not affect the nature of the research and the methodology used. However, they did support the decisions already taken and demonstrate that this focus is worthy of academic research.

2.8 Conclusions

The aim of this chapter was to review what is known about the complex dimensions to tutors’ knowledge and practice. Whilst ITE is constrained by legislation and policy, and there is a predominance of theoretical writing and discussion about its nature and effectiveness, there is remarkably little substantial research focused on HE-based teacher educators. Recently there has been an increase in studies into these tutors, as noted by Marilyn Cochran-Smith, a former President of the American Educational Research Association:
‘What all of this evidence gathering has in common is the intentional and systematic effort to unlock the “black box” of teacher education, turn the lights on inside it, and shine spotlights into its corners, rafters, and floorboards.’

(Cochran-Smith, 2005:8)

Such research, she argued, has the potential to inform and improve the decisions made by practitioners and policy makers and ultimately improve teacher quality. No research found to date has examined the complexity of tutors’ practice during visits to PSTs on school placements and how this practice is affected by the school context and the PSTs characteristics and individual needs. Much of the previous research lacks explanatory rationales - they report what is done, but not why and most notably how it affects the PST. The examination of elements of tutors’ practice on visits does not provide a holistic understanding of their practice, goals and intentions, or the underpinning knowledge, although these studies provide some useful insights.

This review has highlighted that in order to understand practice, research must be conducted in the settings in which is situated. A qualitative approach allows for an in-depth examination. Participants from different HEIs may help to reduce institutional bias and tutors should be involved in the exploration and construction of their practice. Underlying practice are tutors’ values, goals and knowledge, which need to be
understood in order to make sense of their actions. Gaining PSTs’ views on what they gain from tutors’ visits is needed if an understanding of how practice influences them is to be gained.
Chapter 3  Methodology, research design and methods

This chapter begins by setting out the philosophical and epistemological position of the research and how this contributed to the framing of the research questions. It provides a brief outline of the initial study and how this informed the design and methods used in the main study. The data collection methods are examined in more detail, before issues pertaining to the quality of the research are discussed. This is followed by consideration of the ethical issues involved and the steps taken to ensure the research met the expectations of the University’s ethics committee. The final section focuses on the approach taken to the analysis of the data.

3.1 Methodology and design

Practice encompasses the actions and behaviours an individual uses to achieve particular goals. It is situated in the social settings in which it occurs and is influenced by context. It is underpinned by the values of the practitioner, as well as by formal, propositional knowledge and practical knowledge, some of which is tacit and often unconsciously held. This study positions learning as underpinned by social constructivist epistemologies. The constructivist view of knowledge is that it is not externally imposed, but constructed over time by the individual as they make sense of the social world in which they operate. Thus, experience and knowledge are integrated, each impacting on the other; knowledge is shaped by experience and practice (experience) is shaped by knowledge. Tutors’ practice is socially situated in the context of the schools they visit. They have to interpret and
make sense of these contexts and value systems; they have to make choices and learn from the outcomes. In this way they develop their practical professional knowledge.

The conception of knowledge as personally constructed through experience aligns with the view that ‘reality’ is not objective, but subjectively constructed. This research did not set out to test a theory, find an objective external ‘truth’ or to explain tutors’ practice as a series of cause-and-effect relationships, as a positivistic approach might do. Rather, the intention was to explore it as a complex phenomenon in its natural setting in order to develop a holistic understanding of practice and underpinning knowledge. In order to achieve this it was necessary to look at the tutors’ practices from their perspective, rather than the researcher’s. Consequently, this research was located in naturalistic, interpretivist paradigm in which researchers begin with individuals and seek to understand the subjective world of human experience and phenomena from the individual’s point of view (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

In order to address these questions, a design congruent with the naturalistic, interpretivist paradigms was chosen. A positivist, quantitative approach, such as survey, was rejected because it would have neither enabled the elicitation of practical knowledge, nor supported a detailed understanding of practice. Qualitative approaches that afford detailed and deep understandings to be developed were therefore most appropriate for the design.
Research design

There are many approaches to qualitative research. Ethnography was considered as it aims to provide rich, holistic insights into people’s views and actions and understand how they see the world. As an anthropological approach, ethnography is focused on producing detailed accounts of the lives of groups of people and emphasises the importance of understanding events and actions from the point of view of those involved (Denscombe, 2007). The key element of ethnographical research is extensive observation in the field and immersion with the group being researched. Although some of the characteristics of ethnography resonated with the aims of my study, it was discounted. This was due to the research questions identified being focused on a particular aspect of the tutors’ work, rather than on developing a holistic understanding of their professional lives.

Case study too offered a potentially useful approach. According to some researchers, a case study must have clearly identified boundaries, specifically who and what is included and excluded (Stake, 1995; Silverman, 2010). In this study, the tutor-PST dyads were potential cases, as all were located in the same national legislative and educational policy context. However, the practicum context would be different for each and change when the PST moved to the second school placement. In addition, the boundaries in this study were likely to be permeable, as the tutors’ practice may not be confined to school visits. Therefore, although the aim was to enable theoretical understandings to be developed beyond each particular dyad, as well as to analyse individual practice in order to
understand the impact of context and tutors’ professional knowledge and personal values, a purist case study approach as advocated by Yin (2009) was not adopted.

Although neither an ethnography nor case study approach were entirely suitable, both contributed to the development of a qualitative research design that would enable the research questions to be addressed. The final design drew on elements of an instrumental collective case study (Stake, 1995), in which several cases are used to explore a particular group of people or phenomenon over time. The collection of data over the duration of the PGCE courses (some nine months) was an important feature of this research. Practice may change through the course and therefore data that simply captured a single ‘snapshot’ of practice at one point would not result in a complete or representative view. Collecting data over time allowed exploration of how tutors responded to PSTs as they developed as teachers.

Preliminary plans for data collection were tentative in nature, following Appleton’s (2002) argument that the constructivist researcher should allow the study design to ‘emerge as the researcher interacts with the study participants in the natural context and begins to understand and get a feel for important issues’ (Appleton, 2002:91). An initial study involving two tutors was conducted in order to refine the research design. Its primary purpose was to explore the process of eliciting practical knowledge and constructing practice through the observation and interviews. It also provided an opportunity to
identify practical issues and determine whether data gathered in the main study would enable the research questions to be addressed. An important outcome of the initial study was that it confirmed the importance of observing practice during the visits, as it was essential to understanding the context. Without a shared experience of the visit, the interview that followed was difficult and the quality of the data gathered adversely affected.

An in-depth, conversational style interview, as suggested by Kvale (2007), was used following each visit, rather than a semi-structured interview. This unstructured approach was similar to that taken by Elbaz (1985) in her attempts to understand one teacher’s knowledge. It was important not to impose a theory or method, but rather support conversations in which the teacher could explore her actions and the thinking behind them. The first attempts at conducting this type of interview in the initial study were limited in success. They revealed the need to plan for and manage the conversation sufficiently to probe their practice successfully, and to support the tutor’s recall of the visit through use of field notes and recordings of events.

3.2 Sampling

As the research questions focused on tutor’s practice on school visits, the tutors were the primary participants. This research was not focused on the triad (tutor, mentor and PST),
as it was not seeking to explore how the triad operates or the content of the discussions. Rather the primary aim was to explore the tutors’ perspectives and practices and the knowledge that informs their decision making during the visits. As PSTs were the primary recipients of tutors’ practice, it was their views that were sought in order to explore how their practice was regarded. The potential benefits of recruiting two or more PSTs per tutor were identified. For example, it would allow for an understanding to be developed as to how tutors tailor their practice to particular PST characteristics and circumstances. However, as the data would be gathered through long, in-depth interviews it was deemed too onerous on tutors to recruit more than one PST with each tutor, which may have also deterred tutors from participating.

Mentors were peripheral participants and data on how the tutors worked with mentors (or not) was gathered through the observations and interviews. In addition, focusing on the triad may have imposed an expectation and created artificial situations, as through personal experience I know that many visits do not include tripartite meetings. My intention was to capture the natural events occurring on visits and understand them from the perspectives of the tutor and PST.

When deciding on the sample of tutors, consideration was given to the nature and quality of the data that would be gathered, as well as to strengthening the applicability of the findings. The participants were recruited from different HEIs in order to avoid the issues
associated with researching tutors in my own institution, such as participants being inhibited. This was also strengthened the study by reducing the likelihood that the data would be affected by the same institutional expectations. It was important that tutors were able to speak freely and not feel under pressure to portray what they thought they ought to be doing.

As tutors were the prime focus of this research, the first consideration was given to the number of tutors to recruit. The sample size was informed by the research questions and the research design, which was intensive rather than extensive in nature. Focusing on one or two tutors would have reduced the quality of data, locating it more specifically in the idiosyncrasies of individuals. In addition, the study would have been too particular in nature and at risk if the PSTs or tutors withdrew. However, a large number of tutors in the sample would have prevented the exploration and analysis of practice in sufficient depth. As the aim was to investigate tutors’ practice over the course of an academic year, a sample of six tutors, each matched with one PST, was deemed sufficient to collect data that would address the research questions and feasible given the timescale.

Following this, consideration was given to the characteristics of the tutors needed. Several options were considered. In terms of subject specialism, one option was to recruit tutors from different subject disciplines. It might be argued that this would have had the advantage of allowing consideration of the similarities and differences between tutors in
different specialisms and revealed common practices. However, data from a single tutor from a particular subject specialism could not be regarded as representative. Therefore, his option was rejected in favour of selecting tutors from one subject area, as this had the potential to maximise the homogeneity of the group. As my familiarity with the secondary science teacher education context would place me in a better position to relate to the tutors and discuss the teaching observed, I decided to recruit tutors working on secondary science courses. This was an important consideration given the nature of the data sought and methods used to obtain it.

Another aspect that was considered in determining the tutor participants was the background and position of the tutors. The group I was interested in was tutors working in higher education on PGCE courses. The population of HE-based teacher educators working in ITE is diverse. It includes those working on primary undergraduate and postgraduate programmes; secondary and primary specialists; part-time teachers and full-time tutors. Research on the transition from school teaching to the higher education tutor role suggests that it takes at least three years for a tutor’s identity to become established (Murray & Male, 2005), although the time spent in the role does not necessarily indicate the professional identity of the tutor, as suggested by Murray et al (2011). However, as practice also takes time to develop, and this was the focus of the study, it was important to recruit experienced tutors who would feel secure in the role and therefore more comfortable in sharing and examining their practice. The sampling was therefore
purposive in nature, taking account of the afore-mentioned factors. The tutors sought were full-time members of HEI education faculties working on secondary science PGCE courses.

3.3 Recruitment

Tutors

Tutors were invited to participate in the research through emails sent to HEIs offering PGCE science courses. Of the nine positive responses received, only six tutors met the criteria of working in the HEI full-time and having sufficient experience in the role. Therefore no further selection was possible. The group of tutors recruited consisted of three men (pseudonyms of Alex, Alan and Richard) and three women (pseudonyms of Diane, Clare and Jenny), working in Universities in southern England.

All of the tutors had moved into HE-based teacher education from school, having been Heads of science and mentors. For Alex, Alan and Jenny, the move out of teaching was deliberate. Alex, who had been in his current post for four years, went straight from school to a full-time post as a lecturer in education. Alan and Jenny had embarked on careers in educational research and it was through this research experience that they became involved in ITE. Diane too moved gradually into the role, having been a professional tutor in school before moving to the HE role. She was the head of the PGCE
science course at her HEI and in the third year of her post when this research commenced. Both Richard and Alan had been involved in ITE with another HEI as part-time tutors for a number of years before securing full-time HE roles on PGCE courses.

The tutors varied in their research backgrounds. The most experienced was Clare who had a substantial research history and had been in post for 20 years. Jenny and Richard were also experienced, published researchers and this was an important part of their tutor identity; they had been in their current posts five and seven years respectively. Alan was an experienced educational research fellow and embarking on his own doctoral research, as was Diane. The least experienced researcher was Alex, who found that his workload prevented him undertaking his own research. However, he participated in the research because of his positive view of educational research.

Pre-service teachers

Once the tutors had been recruited each university was visited at the start of the course in order to provide information to the PSTs about the research. As tutors had knowledge of the schools and mentors hosting the PSTs, they were asked to provide a list of schools to avoid when selecting the PST. This was compared to the PSTs who had expressed an interest in participating. Pre-service teachers were not selected if the school was new to the HEI partnership in order to allow the tutor to establish a relationship with staff. The
PST eventually identified was then sent the consent and information form (Appendix 2). Those not selected were thanked and informed by email.

Access to schools and mentors

Once possible PST participants had been identified, consideration was given to the schools and mentors involved. Permission was obtained from the PSTs’ partner schools in order to enter the premises for the purposes of collecting data. Teachers have high, stressful workloads and can be protective of each other and their PSTs. When seeking permission from organisations, Bailey (1996) cautioned against beginning by seeking permission from the top as this may ‘result in gates being closed at lower levels’ (1996:50). Therefore, initial contact was made with the mentor to ensure that s/he was aware of the nature and extent of their involvement. A concise, information and consent form was sent to each mentor (Appendix 3) and once the mentor agreed, the approval of the Head Teacher and senior teacher with overall responsibility for PSTs was secured.

3.4 Methods of data collection

The methods chosen were informed by the research questions and qualitative design. Observation was appropriate because of its suitability for researching behaviours in their normal contexts. In-depth interviews allow for collecting rich data on individuals’ perspectives and experiences and are most suitable when sensitive or complex issues are
being explored. Therefore, in order to obtain the data needed to examine the tutors’ practice and practical knowledge, data were collected using the following procedures and methods:

- Field notes recorded observations of tutors’ practice during visits
- Discussions between the PST and tutor were audio recorded
- Interviews with tutors and PSTs at the start of the course and after each visit.

Observation of visits

Tutors were accompanied on their visits to the PST on school placements through the duration of the course. All the schools involved were state funded secondary schools with an 11-18 non-selective pupil intake. All PSTs completed placements of varying duration in two schools (A and B). One of the PSTs went to another school for a short placement in the summer term, but as the visit was cursory in nature it was not included. I was unable to attend two of the seventeen visits. One tutor mistakenly conducted his first visit without me and two visits coincided. In this case, one tutor audio recorded the discussion with the PST. Unfortunately Rafid was unable to make progress and suspended the course, resulting in his views on the third visit not being obtained. A summary of the visits made is provided in Table 1.
Table 1: Summary of visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutor (PST)</th>
<th>First visit</th>
<th>Penultimate visit</th>
<th>Final visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane (Angela)</td>
<td>Dec 2011 School A</td>
<td>March 2012 School B</td>
<td>April 2012 School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan (Rafid)</td>
<td>Nov 2011 School A</td>
<td>Dec 2011 School A</td>
<td>March 2012 School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny (Karen)</td>
<td>Nov 2011 School A</td>
<td>January 2012 School A</td>
<td>March 2012* School A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare (Toby)</td>
<td>No visit made</td>
<td>January 2012 School A</td>
<td>May 2012 [missed] School B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation of the tutors during the visits informed the subsequent interviews in which the reasons behind their actions were probed. Gray (2004) described the need for the researcher to become ‘‘immersed’ in the research setting with the objective of sharing and experiencing people’s lives...’ (2004:241). Observing the PST’s lesson alongside the tutor allowed access to what the tutor focused on and aided understanding of the discussion and actions in context. Observations were recorded as field notes, which were a chronological record of what the tutor did, how they related to the PST and mentor and the focus and the nature of the discussions. Gray (2004) recommended building in time to
make reflective notes. These were made as the visit proceeded, along with questions and issues for the interview.

_Tutor interviews_

One of the purposes of the interviews was to reveal the tutors’ practical knowledge. Eliciting implicit practice is challenging. Accessing practitioners’ practical knowledge is problematic because much of it is tacit by nature and may only be inferred from observed practice. The narrative approach taken by Clandinin (1992) to eliciting this knowledge is therefore open to the criticism that it is too accepting of what teachers say and elevating this to the status of knowledge. In addition, a narrative approach may not capture all elements of a teacher’s practical knowledge. Other studies seeking to do this (e.g. Meijer et al, 2002; Zanting et al, 2003a, 2003b) suggested various elicitation strategies, including journal keeping, questioning, stimulated recall, interviews, practical arguments. Zanting et al (2003b) concluded that a ‘combination of instruments [...] is to be recommended because each has its own advantages in eliciting the various aspects of practical knowledge, such as knowledge of facts, beliefs, values, etc.’ (2003b:211). Meijer et al (2002) used semi-structured interviews and concept mapping to elicit teacher’s knowledge and beliefs, while stimulated recall interviews using video of practice examined tacit thinking. However, Connelly and Clandinin (1990) highlighted the importance of avoiding the excessive imposition of external theories and constructs on the practical knowledge of teachers. Their adoption of a narrative approach sought to encourage the teachers’ story-telling and develop trust between the teachers and those
wishing to understand their knowledge. The use of devices such as video and concept mapping may interfere with the story telling and so were discounted. Video in particular would have been much more intrusive and may have affected tutors’ willingness to participate.

The initial interview protocol (Appendix 4) aimed to establish the tutors’ backgrounds, experiences and aspects of their ‘formal knowledge’ (Fenstermacher, 1994). The idea of ‘espoused theory’ presented by Argyris (2004) composed of values, beliefs and action strategies and ‘theories-in-use’, which are used spontaneously to guide action. In this way practical knowledge ‘encompasses theoretical knowledge, though adapted to the relevant teaching situations’ (Black & Halliwell, 2000:276). Beginning to reveal this formal knowledge was therefore a logical first step. The interview also supported the development of a rapport with the tutor, which is essential for in-depth interviews (Gubrium & Holstein, 2002; Gray, 2004). It was for this reason that tutors were interviewed face-to-face rather than by telephone.

The time and place of the interviews with tutors following each visit to the PST, was negotiated. All were conducted either immediately after the visit in the school or a few days later in the university so that the events were still fresh in the tutor’s mind. It was important that the tutors could talk about their practices freely, but time constraints had to be considered. The initial study had confirmed the argument of Mills and Bonner
(2006) that the researcher must proactively plan for the time spent with participants (2006:10). However, as the intention was a co-construction of practice, the protocol design was less important (Silverman, 2010). Therefore a loose protocol was devised, structured around the chronological course of events and including key questions and issues that were identified before the interview (Appendix 5). Nevertheless, the interviews remained conversational in nature, relying on the spontaneous generation of additional probing questions as the interview progressed (Gray, 2004). This was important to accessing the implicit aspects of practice ‘where the knowledge sought is often taken for granted and not readily articulated...’ (Gubrium & Holstein, 2002:105).

Silverman (2010) claimed that identity is not fixed, but lies as a personal construction in the mind. Therefore, the ‘self’ and view of practice that the tutor brings to the interview may be different to that which emerges in the context of the school visit. In order to mitigate the effects of this phenomenon, recordings from the visit were used to focus the tutor on the events, rather than what they believed had happened. This is similar to stimulated recall, which can be used to prompt participants to recollect thoughts they had while performing a task or participating in an event (Gass & Mackey, 2000:17). The observation notes were used to stimulate tutors’ thinking and help them re-live the visit, whilst the recordings supported the tutor’s recall of the discussions with the PST. The recording was played and paused by the tutor when he or she recalled the thinking
behind actions. The recording was also paused if there was something I wanted to investigate in more depth.

Through this type of in-depth interview, the researcher aims to ‘learn the meanings of participants’ actions’, in which the participant becomes a teacher to the interviewer (Gubrium & Holstein, 2002:106). I therefore explicitly adopted the role of learner and naïve observer, asking ‘why’ questions’ to elicit the thinking behind actions, and probing why other alternative actions had not been used. This strategy was explained to the tutors prior at the start to prevent them feeling that the questions were in any way testing them.

Bridges (2001) warned against ‘ventriloquy’ – using the voice of the participant to give expression to the things which the researcher wants to say (2001:381). Viewing the tutors as participants in the construction of their practice, rather than ‘subjects’ from which data is simply harvested helps to avoid this (Bridges, 2001). Mills and Bonner (2006) contended that a constructivist approach to interviews should commit ‘the researcher to a relationship of reciprocity with the participants’ (2006:9) through which meaning may be co-constructed. They argued that interviews are not neutral context-free tools for data collection, and that the data that emerges are a result of the interaction participant and researcher. This requires establishing a reflexive and more equal relationship between research and participant and proactively planning for the time spent together (2006:10).
Most of the tutors were accomplished researchers, which aided the establishment of a more equal, collegial relationship.

**PST interviews**

The questions in the initial PST interview (Appendix 6) were designed to discover their motivations for teaching and choosing the PGCE route; their aims for teaching; and their expectations of their tutor. They were also interviewed after each visit at a time of their choosing and usually by phone, which was not ideal. Lyle (2003) argued that a comfortable environment must be created. Therefore, PSTs were asked to locate to a comfortable, private place where they would not be overheard.

The interviews probed how their expectations were realised and what they felt they had gained from the visit. Semi-structured interviews provided a degree of consistency across the interviews so that the same issues were explored with all PSTs, but allowed questions to be tailored to the particular context and probe responses when necessary. It also ensured that interviews were kept to a time-limit of 30 minutes so as to minimise the demand on the PSTs.

Following the guidance set out by Gray (2004), the interviews began by setting out the purpose and nature of the interview, as well as reaffirming confidentiality (Appendix 7).
Subsequent questions focused on what they felt they had gained from the visit by asking what had made the most significant impression and what they remembered from the discussion. The questions did not invite criticism or evaluation of the tutor, but focused on what they felt they had gained and their perceptions of how the tutor had influenced them.

3.5 Ensuring research quality

The indicators of quality in qualitative research are concerned with ‘dependability’ rather than reliability; ‘confirmability’ rather than objectivity; ‘transferability’ rather than generalizability; and ‘credibility’ rather than validity (Guba, 1981). These criteria, along with a framework for judging applied and practice-based research proposed by Furlong and Oancea (2005), provided the foundation for planning and evaluating the quality of this study. This section focuses on the aspects of quality that pertain to ‘trustworthiness’, which is concerned with ‘the relation between the research process and its representation of the world’ (Furlong & Oancea, 2005:12). In qualitative research attention must be paid to trustworthiness as described by its ‘dependability’ ‘confirmability’, ‘transferability’ and ‘credibility’ (Guba, 1981), authenticity and plausibility (Furlong & Oancea, 2005; Lincoln & Guba, 2007).
Credibility

In the interpretivist paradigm it is more appropriate to conceive validity as *credibility* or *fairness*, which is judged through considering whether the methods used provide the data needed to address the research questions, and the extent to which the participants recognise the view constructed of them as practitioners. In order to strengthen the credibility of this research, time was spent observing the tutors’ practice in the school context in which it occurred. The in-depth interviews allowed for the exploration and interrogation of practice in a genuine and reflective manner. This provided the ‘prolonged engagement - lengthy and intensive contact with the phenomena (or respondents)’ that Lincoln & Guba, (2007:18) advocated for strengthening credibility. In addition, data were collected throughout the year, rather than on just one occasion in order to gain a more holistic understanding of their practice with the particular PST. Credibility was also strengthened through measures such as minimising the time between the visit and the interviews, using recordings and field notes to aid recall of the experience so that the interviews were based on what happened, rather than what the tutor imagined or perceived.

The credibility of the findings was also checked by inviting the tutors to participate in meta-interviews once the data had been analysed and broad findings identified. The aim was not to ask tutors to confirm the findings, as in ‘respondent validation’, but rather to test whether the interpretation of the data revealed practices that the tutors recognised and discuss any issues of contention. It would be difficult for the tutors to validate the
totality of the findings or the security of the conclusions unless they were co-researchers and closely involved in the process of analysis and interpretation. Another problem is the issue of the time delay, as ‘people view the past through the lens of the present’ (Silverman, 2010:192) and may be unaware of what they were saying or doing at the time.

**Dependability**

Reliability is conceived as precision, accuracy and replicability, the underlying assumption being that consistency of results is integral to quality. Replicability is based on the notion that similar findings would be derived if the study was repeated by another researcher with similar groups of participants in similar contexts. It is also predicated on the idea that there is a truth to be discovered, making it incompatible with the epistemological stance that reality is personally constructed. Replicability is therefore not an appropriate concept for this type of research, because contexts are varied and cannot be controlled. Even replicating the same study with the same tutors may reveal different aspects of their practice, as they work in different schools with different PSTs and practice changes over time. The data are rooted in the specific time and ‘sharply influenced by the nature of the immediate context’ (Lincoln & Guba, 2007:17). Indeed, the uniqueness of the data is a strong point of this type of qualitative practice-based research, as it has the potential to contribute to the understanding of the complexity of practice in the context in which it occurs.
Dependability is a more appropriate way of conceptualising reliability in qualitative research study. It is concerned with the extent the data can be viewed as providing a truthful account of practice. For this reason, it was important that I developed a rapport with the tutors and PSTs and earned their trust so that they would feel able to respond honestly and not simply report what they thought was wanted or what they believed ought to be said. Developing rapport was also how I attempted to engender participants’ commitment to the aims of the study. It was also important to try to suppress my own views and interpretations so not as to influence the tutors and PSTs, which was the reason behind adopting the explicit position of naïve learner, as described in section 3.4.

Confirmability

Confirmability equates to objectivity and neutrality in quantitative research. It is concerned with bias and ensuring that findings ‘emerge from the data and not their own predispositions’ (Shenton, 2004). However, the argument that all aspects of a study can be free from bias is not sustainable, as any enterprise involving human beings will be affected by those involved. Interpretation, particularly in interpretivist studies, is entwined with the researcher and ‘the very act of generating evidence or identifying something as evidence is itself an interpretation’ (Schwandt, 2007:11). I recognised that my own experience and position within the study would have a bearing on the potential for bias. Not being connected to any of the participating HEIs or schools, I was an outsider. This brought the advantage of not being influenced by intuitional practices, values and expectations. However, my experience as ITE tutor brought me inside the
professional community, and meant I embarked on the research with my own knowledge, and understanding of the role. This gave rise to the possibility of that the observations, interviews and interpretations would be affected by my own expectations, through for example, selectivity or filtering. However, Gubrium and Holstein (2002) noted that ignorance and inexperience of the phenomenon being researched can have a negative impact on the quality of interviews, with the researcher failing to see the nuances or layered meanings (2002:108). As an informed outsider, I had insight into the issues and was in a position to ask pertinent questions and probe their practice and decisions. My background enabled me to develop the rapport needed with the participants. This point is supported by Bishop (2005) who argued that researchers need to be able ‘to participate in appropriate cultural processes and practices and to interact in a dialogic manner with the research participants’ (Bishop, 2005:120). Overall therefore, the advantages of having personal experience and knowledge of the role outweighed the potential disadvantages.

Measures taken to reduce the influence of my own experience and views included transcribing the interviews verbatim so as to present the words of the participants to evidence the interpretations. In addition, in order to not lose sight of the tutors’ and PSTs’ ‘stories’, what Brookes and King (2012) termed ‘case summaries’ were developed drawing on field notes and interview transcripts. These condensed summaries helped to capture the individuality of each participant’s account by highlighting the elements that seemed most important. These summaries were used to test the thematic analysis. In addition,
the recordings from the visits were revisited throughout to ensure that the analysis and interpretations reflected the work and views of the tutors and PSTs.

**Transferability**

Transferability refers to the extent to which the findings can be applied to similar situations elsewhere. Transferability has been strengthened in this study by supporting interpretations with authentic evidence from the tutors and presenting findings in ways that are plausible to an informed reader. The intention was to make it possible for others in the field to confirm, challenge or provide alternative explanations for the data.

Whilst this research did not set out to identify practices that are generalizable to the population of tutors, general theoretical understandings were sought. Importantly, by describing and analysing these tutors’ practices, I hoped to stimulate reflection on practice within the HE initial teacher education community. Others working in ITE can take the findings from this research and add them to their existing experience and knowledge in order to make their own ‘naturalistic generalizations’ (Stake, 1995:85).
3.6 Ethical considerations

Ethics clearance was granted by the University’s Human Participants and Materials Ethics Committee (HPMEC) prior to commencement of data collection. Ethical clearance was also sought from the tutors’ HEIs and documentation submitted as required. The tutors’ line managers also sanctioned their participation.

Various issues were examined in the development of the ethical framework for this research and different sources of information consulted, including the literature on ethics, the Open University’s guidance and Code of Practice (Open University, 2004a, 2004b, 2006) and the guidelines from the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2004).

Ethical framework

An ethics grid developed by Stutchbury and Fox (2009), based on the work of Seedhouse and Flinders, supported consideration of the participants’ perspectives and provided the basis for deliberation, resolution or compromise when dilemmas emerged as the research progressed. I placed myself in the position of the participants, by drawing on my personal professional experience as a tutor; what Sikes (2006) referred to as the ‘acid test’ in judging the methods used.
The cornerstone of the ethical guidelines is respect for people, knowledge, democratic values, the quality of educational research and academic freedom (BERA, 2004:5).

Consideration was given to the impact of the research on the ITE community. Shortly after embarking on the research, changes to ITE were announced that signified a significant change in the role of higher education in ITE, which has left many in the higher education ITE community feeling threatened and undervalued. This research therefore had a political dimension. I was aware of my responsibility to represent the ITE tutors fairly and authentically, but also felt under pressure to represent a positive view of the contribution of higher education to ITE. Nevertheless, I was conscious of the need to act as impartially as possible throughout the research and to consider the motives behind the research.

Interrogation of the motives of research is an important part of the ethical considerations (Sikes 2006). To be truly ethical, educational researchers must be prepared to its purpose (Howe & Moses 1999:56). This study had several purposes, including personal ones. As well as providing an opportunity to develop my research skills, I also had a personal interest in the research as a practitioner and wanted to develop my understanding of the practices of tutors. Another motive was to support the induction and professional development of the tutors with whom I work.
Consideration of risks, harms and benefits involves personal interpretation and value judgements; what is considered as harm by one individual may not be to another (Kennedy, 2005). Therefore, my obligation was to help participants to think through the risks and take steps to avoid them. The likelihood and potential seriousness of risks was determined by drawing on my values and personal practices, as well as my professional knowledge and experience (Kennedy, 2005). As practice is personal, helping tutors examine it closely was likely to promote reflection on their practice, which may be uncomfortable. This was not a major concern however, as reflection on practice is regarded as a mechanism for professional learning in ITE. Even though the likelihood of harm was low, reflection on practice was presented in the information and consent form (Appendix 8) as both a potential risk and benefit.

Learning to teach is emotionally challenging, and through personal experience I know that tutors can develop close, professional relationships with PSTs. There was a risk that my presence would interfere with these relationships. Another risk was that the tutors may feel threatened if the PST was critical of their practice. To avoid this, the PST interview schedule was shared with tutors and questions did not invite criticism or evaluation of the tutor.

Another risk for tutors was how colleagues may view their participation and the repercussions of revealing their practices (Sikes, 2006). This can change how someone is
perceived and consequently affect academic and social standing, as well as personal and professional relationships (Sikes 2006:114). Reporting issues had to be considered carefully, particularly when findings were potentially difficult. Whilst data has been anonymised as far as possible, tutors’ colleagues may be still able to identify them from contextual clues. Tutors therefore were presented with their data so that problematic contextual clues could be identified and removed.

The ethical issues surrounding PST participation, particularly the potential for subtle duress, had a significant impact on the process of recruiting the PST participants. To avoid PSTs feeling obliged to participate, tutors were distanced from PST recruitment. When they added their details to a contact form to indicate their interest in participating, neither I nor the tutor was present. In addition I, as the researcher rather than the tutor, approached the PSTs and mentors in school. The tutors did not know who had volunteered and who had not.

The risks for the PSTs included disruption of their relationship with their tutor and how they are assessed, and whether they would want to share their thoughts with me if they did not make the progress needed. The tutor is in a position of power in relation to the PSTs and they may have felt that they had to be positive in their responses. To avoid this, PSTs were assured that their data would not be shared with the tutor during the course and that their contributions would be anonymised. Guarding their anonymity and
confidentiality was an important part of developing trust so that they would share their genuine perspectives and views. Pre-service teachers also have huge demands on their time during school placements and may feel tired and stressed. To reduce the impact on them, only a modest time commitment was required for the interviews.

The risks and ethical issues for the mentors and other teachers involved were not as significant as those for the tutors and PSTs, although the issues surrounding visiting tutors in school contexts were considered. I was conscious of avoiding undermining the dynamics of the mentor-PST-tutor relationship, or making the mentor feel a less valued member of the partnership. Mentors and other teachers who took part in the triad discussion were reassured that the recording would be kept confidential, stored securely and not used to assess their contribution.

As well as potential harms and risks, possible benefits to the participants were identified. Whilst there were no obvious immediate, discernible benefits to PSTs, mentors and schools, the research may contribute to teacher education more broadly and support development of new teachers.
Consent and confidentiality

The tutors, PSTs and mentors needed to be fully informed of the research, its purpose, methods, potential risks, benefits and how data would be stored prior to agreeing to take part reported (BERA, 2004:6). I provided as much information as possible via the information and consent documents (Appendices 2, 3 and 8). This allowed participants to carry out their own analysis of the risks. Part of guaranteeing confidentiality was complying with data protection legislation and code of good practice (Open University, 2004b), which involved storing recordings and transcripts on a password protected area of a secure server.

Ethical decisions and research methods were intertwined and affected one another. A guiding principle put forward by Stutchbury and Fox (2009) is that decisions made need to have ‘a defensible moral basis and that process of making those decisions must also be made transparent’ (2009:489). This principle was at the heart of my approach to the research.

3.7 Data analysis

When determining the method of analysis, consideration was given to the research questions and the nature of the data gathered, as well as the underpinning epistemology and theoretical framework (see sections 2.4 and 2.5). Several different approaches were
considered. Content and discourse analysis were rejected because of their quantitative nature; neither would help to address the research questions and illuminate how tutors approached the visits and what informed their decisions. Narrative analysis was considered as there were narrative aspects to the interview data. However, the aim was to examine tutors’ practices and knowledge and there was a tension between presenting the tutors as individuals and developing an understanding of their knowledge and practice as a group of professionals. Therefore, a narrative approach to the analysis was rejected. However, the analysis of the data needed to preserve how the tutors talked about their practice and present it in a way that would be accessible and meaningful to others. As the primary focus was to reveal the tutors’ practices in context of the school visits, rich descriptions were needed of their actions. Analysing the data in terms of the dimensions to practical knowledge put forward by Elbaz (1981) and Clandinin (1986) would have focused on their knowledge, which may have not have adequately examined their practices. It would also have imposed an existing framework, instead of allowing an understanding of their practice and knowledge to be constructed from the data. The approach of thematic analysis would allow their practices to be analysed without imposing a theoretical framework. These practices could then be examined in terms of the underpinning practical knowledge.
Thematic analysis is a widely used qualitative analytic method used to identify and analyse patterns within data and is compatible with research in the interpretivist / constructivist paradigm as it ‘can be applied across a range of theoretical and epistemological approaches’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006:78). It does not carry the quantitative nature of techniques such as content analysis and so is more commensurate with a qualitative, constructivist approach. Thematic analysis involves searching for and identifying themes across a data set to find patterns that accord with the research questions. A theme describes an important construct in the data relevant to the research question. Therefore, in this research, thematic analysis would support the identification of the key dimensions to the tutors’ visit practice, which could then be examined in terms of the underpinning practical knowledge.

Themes can be identified inductively or be theoretically derived. Inductive themes are strongly linked to the data, arising from the data and not fitted into a preconceived theory or coding frame (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Theoretically driven analysis provides a less rich description of data and maps on to highly specific research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Whilst I have research questions, I am not approaching the data with a set theoretical position; as the practice has to be constructed an inductive approach is more suitable. However, a truly inductive approach is naive, because researchers cannot free themselves from what they already know (or think they know). Having already engaged with the literature and begun to identify significant dimensions to practice, I had to
acknowledge that this affected how I approached and interpreted the data. The researcher plays an active role in this process, deciding which are of interest and which to report. A critical approach to the data is needed to avoid ‘anecdotalism’ whereby a few well-chosen examples illustrate the reality the researcher wishes to construct (Silverman, 2010:276).

Data analysis methods and procedures

The data comprised of conversational interviews with six tutors following each of their three visits to their PSTs in school. Overall, I aimed to construct an authentic account of practice that tutors recognised. The interviews explored the events and exchanges that occurred during the visits, the rationale behind tutors’ actions and their decision-making at the time. It was not uncommon for tutors to draw on other experiences and relate stories and anecdotes linked to the events that had occurred during the visit. They explored their beliefs and working theories, as well as their personal reflections on their practice and the challenges of working in schools, resulting in a great deal of complex data.

The recordings were transcribed in order to ‘present the data in codifiable units of meaning’ (Bird, 2005:245). The degree of detail captured was appropriate to the method of analysis. It was important that the transcript retained the information needed from the verbal account ‘in a way which is ‘true’ to its original nature (Braun & Clarke, 2006:88). It
was important to use the tutor’s own words in the construction of their practice and this helped to reduce researcher bias at that stage. Parts of the conversations not directly related to the visit were omitted. This required a judgement about the relevance of the recorded talk, but if there was any doubt about its relevance the conversation was transcribed. This decision is supported by Bird’s (2005) contention that transcription is an interpretation of the interaction between interviewer and interviewee and researchers make decisions about the details to include; the researcher must ultimately make the decision as to what is useful in terms of answering the research questions.

Transcribing verbatim enabled me to become familiar with the interview data and how the tutors talked about their practice. In this way the transcription process helped me to listen to and understand what they were saying. The primary principle that has governed the transcription was that someone reading the transcript should be able to gain the essence of the conversation and what was being communicated.

**Thematic template analysis**

Template analysis (King, 2004; Brooks & King, 2012) is a form of thematic analysis and was chosen because it allows for the identification of themes early on in the analysis. Its flexible nature ‘encourages the analyst to develop themes more extensively where the richest data in relation to the research question are found’ (King, 2004:4).
An overview of the process that was taken to develop the thematic analysis template is summarised in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: Overview of data analysis process**

1. Interview recordings used to produce ‘case summaries’ (Brooks & King, 2012)
2. Interviews transcribed
3. Interview data imported into Excel spreadsheet
4. Subset of data coded to aid development of initial template
5. Statements coded (statements may be assigned different codes)
6. Statements with multiple codes duplicated (one statement has one code)
7. Codes grouped and numbered to enable sorting
8. Clustering continues and template developed
9. Examination of content, nature and use of knowledge within each theme

The analysis began by developing ‘case summaries’ (Brooks & King, 2012) for each tutor, as described in section 3.5. This step helps to avoid one of the pitfalls of template
analysis, which is losing sight of the context of the individual participants (Brooks & King, 2012). Following transcription, a subset of the data was coded. Codes were developed to describe the data items and captured the essence of what the tutor was saying. Some were literal codes that simply summarised what the tutor was saying, whilst others had an element of interpretation. An example of coding is provided in Appendix 9. To ensure the meaning was not misinterpreted, the tutors’ individual statements were considered in the context of the interview conversation. Coding by hand, rather than using a computer program, prevented me from becoming distanced from the data and ensured that I remained conscious of the tutors as individual practitioners.

From the initial coding an initial template was developed based on the themes arising. The data were not fitted to a set of predefined set codes, but ‘a priori’ themes related to the research questions and underlying concepts were identified early on. This meant that broad ideas and categories developed through the data collection were made explicit and acknowledged. The initial template was applied to the remaining data and evolved as the analysis proceeded.

Many statements by the tutors were related to several possible themes. In order to manage the complexity, the interview data were imported into an Excel spread sheet. This enabled multiple coding, ordering and the identification of similar codes or statements related to one another in some way. Statements were duplicated where there
were several possible codes, which allowed statements to be categorised in different themes where relevant; an example is provided in Appendix 9. Grouping statements with similar codes led to the identification of themes. The final hierarchically structured template showing the themes and subthemes is provided in Appendix 10. The statements within each theme were then analysed in terms of the content, nature and use of knowledge.
Chapter 4 Findings

This chapter presents the analysis of data collected during the visits and through the interviews. An important feature of the analysis and portrayal of the findings is the words of the participants themselves. These are included as quotes from the initial interviews conducted at the start of the course (denoted as Initial interview), from the interviews following each visit (denoted as Interview visit 1, Interview visit 2, etc.) and from the recordings made during the visits (denoted as Recording visit 1, Recording visit 2, etc.).

Table 1 in Chapter 3 summarises the fieldwork undertaken with the tutors and PSTs; all names used are fictitious. The tutors, with their corresponding PSTs in brackets, were: Alan (Rafid); Alex (Nyle); Clare (Toby); Diane (Angela); Jenny (Karen); Richard (Carl).

The broad themes identified as a result of the initial coding and grouping of the interview data were goals and intentions, support, assessment, development, management and quality assurance. The tutors’ goals and intentions were subsequently grouped within the other process themes identified. The themes of support and development were identified as a priori themes from the literature review and subsequently confirmed by the thematic analysis. The theme of assessment is dominated by statements that were originally identified as ‘evidence gathering’. These were subsequently subsumed under the theme of assessment due to the evidence gathered being used formatively to assess the PSTs’ development needs or identify the reasons behind difficulties. The third theme identified through the process of developing the template was management. Actions connected to
quality assurance were not formal in nature and tutors attempted to deal with quality assurance through management practices. The final template derived from the data sets out the final themes and subthemes (Appendix 10).

The themes are not mutually exclusive. For example, management practices were indirect ways in which the tutors supported the PSTs or managed their development. Overlap between themes is to be expected when trying to analyse such a complex activity (King, online, n.d). An overview map of the themes and main subthemes is provided in Figure 2 and these form the structure for reporting the findings.

The analysis of the findings that follows is presented within the three overarching themes of support, development and managing. For the purposes of reporting the analysis, the process of gathering and using evidence is presented alongside the theme of development, as this formative assessment was used to inform the development of the PSTs. As formal quality assurance was not a significant feature of tutors’ practice, this is reported briefly under the theme of management.
4.1 The theme of support

The support of the PSTs was a feature of all the tutors’ practice, although it was not generally a significant feature of their stated goals and aims for the visits. Tutors’ support practices varied in nature and extent. Some elements of support, as set out in the
thematic template (see appendix 10), were routine ‘rules of practice’ (Elbaz, 1981), whilst other actions were reactive responses to the particular circumstances and school context. The three primary subthemes identified within the theme of support are emotional, professional and personal support.

Personal support was concerned with issues not directly relevant to the placement or course, such as health and welfare. However, personal support was not a significant feature of the tutors’ visit practice and tended to be provided in the university due to limited time and priority being given to professional issues. Professional support included advice about dealing with situations in school, managing the workload, university requirements and helping with teaching. The dominant form of support provided by tutors however was ‘emotional’, aimed at maintaining PSTs’ self-esteem and confidence.

Emotional support was manifested in actions taken to deal with PSTs’ discernible anxiety, and the more subtle ways in which tutors maintained their confidence and self-esteem. Angela and Rafid (PSTs) were very anxious at the start of the course. Diane (Angela’s tutor) was concerned by Angela’s high anxiety, which led to her goals for the first visit included seeing ‘whether she’d moved on from that very out in the open panic’ (Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 1). Alan too was very aware of Rafid’s need for reassurance on the first visit, suspecting that he was not getting this from school staff:
‘...he just needs to know that he's doing okay and I'm not sure he's getting that, as much as he needs it...’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

Alan’s feeling about the lack of reassurance from school staff was subsequently confirmed by Rafid, who found his mentor’s business-like approach was not as supportive as his tutor’s, ‘more encouraging approach...’ (Rafid, PST: Interview visit 1). However, Alan was concerned about being too supportive fearing he may exacerbate Rafid’s anxiety, and so on some occasions he chose not to react:

‘...on reflection I said less with him than I would normally say, because he was kind of creating his own...sense of anxiety and anything I would say would just add to that really. So you just smile and nod...’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

In deciding on whether to reassure or not, Alan drew on his knowledge of PSTs gained from experience and revealed one of his ‘theories-in-use’ (Argyris, 2004).
The dominant and most frequently occurring aspect of emotional support was the proactive maintenance of PSTs’ self-esteem and confidence. All of the tutors believed this to be important in securing PSTs’ progress. The nature and extent of this support was affected by their goals. Tutors with the most PST-centred goals offered the greatest levels of emotional support. They emphasised the need to listen to PSTs, citing this as an important rule of practice (Elbaz, 1981). For Jenny, this stemmed from her principle of empowerment of PSTs:

‘...you've got to empower them to think that they can do it and lots of criticism can disempower [...] it can completely paralyse them and they can't move on. We've seen that so often. So for me it is about empowering them [...] because then they can start to make more progress.’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

All tutors were aware of the anxiety that their visits might cause and used strategies to maintain the PSTs’ confidence. Jenny’s well-defined PST-centred ‘principles of practice’ (Elbaz, 1981) and ‘theories-of-action’ (Argyris, 2004) formed the basis for how she conducted the visits. These were evident from the start of the visit and how she greeted the PSTs. Jenny talked of intentionally acting in a very friendly, positive way towards PSTs, because ‘it just allays their fears a little bit and stops them getting too worked up’ (Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1).
Tutors’ non-verbal reassurance was accompanied by attempts to ‘normalise’ their anxiety, primarily through sharing their professional knowledge of the experience of learning to teach and the stages that PSTs typically go through. This ‘normalisation’ strategy was used by Alan who wanted Rafid to recognise that:

‘...it's normal to feel like you're on the edge of a nervous breakdown at this stage in a teacher training course [...] you’re just realising it’s difficult, which I think is almost universal as a stage for them to go through.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

Tutors drew on their theoretical knowledge of teacher development to reassure PSTs. For example, Jenny used understandings gained from research about PSTs’ subject knowledge to reassure Karen, a recent physics graduate, who was worried about her understanding of biology. Her approach was to emphasise the dynamic nature of subject knowledge and that ‘you have to ask others; you have to get some help; you have to collaborate...’ (Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1). Diane drew on a model of teacher development that Angela found useful. However, it was their experiential knowledge that was most often drawn on. This was brought together with the knowledge they had gained supporting different PSTs. For example, Toby’s tutor, Clare, used her knowledge of PST
development to reassure him during her first visit, but like Alan and Diane, Clare’s approach was influenced by what she had learned about Toby:

‘(Toby) has high expectations of himself; he has some frustrations with himself, because he knows what he wants to do but he can’t always do it. And I wanted to [...] reassure him that he’s making progress and that [...] there is a theory and trajectory behind this.’

(Clare, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

This was not something Clare usually did, but she felt it would benefit Toby given his academic background. Through experience, she believed that his background in university teaching would lead to him finding school teaching challenging, both professionally and emotionally. In this way she tailored her approach to the needs she predicted.

Tutors not only shared knowledge of the experience of learning to teach, which was an integration of formal knowledge and experience, but also personal information, experiences and their own limitations. Clare for example felt disclosure to be important in reassuring and empathising with Toby, which was also intended to help him have realistic expectations:
'I think disclosure’s important [...] I wanted him to know that I would expect [...] somebody who he respected as a teacher [...] would struggle with this group.'

(Clare, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

A universally used ‘rule of practice’ (Elbaz, 1981) aimed at supporting PSTs’ confidence was focusing on the positives in their teaching. The tutors had different rationales for this rule however. Richard wanted to ‘find positives to counterbalance (the negatives), so they don’t go away [...] depressed’ (Richard, Tutor: Interview visit 2). Jenny’s view was that examining the positive aspects of their teaching empowers PSTs, which aligned with Diane’s belief that this helped them to see the progress made:

‘You need to make them aware of that journey they've made and it's part of celebrating the achievements and making it explicit…’

(Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

In this way, rules of practice were embedded in the tutors’ principles of practice. For Alan, the rule of highlighting the positive aspects of the lesson was important in his principle of building trust and rapport and the ‘right to be critical’:
‘When you talk about somebody’s lesson, it isn't just a skill or an artefact external to them. They are wrapped up in it as a person [...] So if you start to criticise that, to a certain extent you can't help but feel that’s a criticism of yourself because of the investment you’ve put into that.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

This principle stemmed from Alan’s personal experiences as a teacher. His personal orientation can be seen through how he begins to talk about ‘somebody’s lesson’, but then completes his point as if he were talking about his own experience. This characterised how Alan stood in the emotional shoes of PSTs and how it shaped his actions.

The tutors’ theories concerning support of PSTs influenced how they conducted the feedback on an observed lesson, in particular how the critical points were approached. All tutors were alert to the potential threats to PSTs’ confidence from what they perceived as over-critical feedback from the mentor and the PSTs themselves. Consequently, discussions began by asking the PST a question to start the discussion on a positive note. Diane’s theory was that it was not sufficient to tell the PST what was successful, but that ‘helping them say it out loud themselves is actually going to make them feel better about themselves’ (Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 1). However, all of the tutors talked about the difficulty PSTs have in identifying successes in their teaching and having to ‘tease out
strengths not recognised’ (Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1). Jenny’s view, that PSTs tend to focus on the negative aspects of a lesson and not see the positives, was typical:

‘I desperately want them to talk about [how] they think they’ve really moved on; to recognise how much they can do […] and they’re not good at that […] But often they can be too negative. I’m always having to say, “Now hold on; if we talk about the negatives, let's look at the things you are doing well.”’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

As Jenny suggested, tutors often struggled to get the PSTs to identify the positive aspects themselves. Consequently, when PSTs did recognise successful aspects, tutors provided positive reinforcement. Clare signalled her agreement by ‘nodding away’ when Toby started listing some good things about the lesson. Alan too regarded affirmation as an important part of building PSTs’ confidence:

‘I want them to know I agree with it and I want them to know why because, […] partly it's about building their confidence and about them recognising the successes…’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)
Affirmation was also reinforced by highlighting the strengths they had observed and that the PST had not identified. In this way, tutors were not simply concerned with evaluating the lesson, but with promoting a balanced view of it. Underpinning this aim was the tutors’ views of PSTs as learners, and that deficits in the lesson were opportunities for development. Several tutors cited this as an important principle of practice, reflecting a strong learner-centred approach:

‘...everybody's got things to learn and given where they are, they're not weaknesses - it's not saying you’re weak or insufficient; they're just things you're working on and things you're thinking about.’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

Whilst reassurance was a feature of all visits, it decreased as the PST developed confidence and the tutor focused more on challenge and development. The extent to which this ‘emotional scaffolding’ was withdrawn was informed by the tutor’s knowledge of the PST and the school context. Rafid was particularly stressed and had sought reassurance from his tutor (Alan) between visits. However, Alan balanced reassurance with challenge and realism, as his theory was that being over-protective does not prepare PSTs for the reality of teaching:
‘...if you [...] look after them, you keep them protected and then they get the job and the pressure comes on [...] that does them no favours...’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

Tutors varied in how successful they were in judging the balance between support and challenge. Diane was one of the most successful tutors in this respect. Although she was reassuring during her first visit, on the second she was more critical and challenging. Diane’s motivation was to promote Angela’s development as a teacher and she was concerned that the mentor was being too reassuring and not sufficiently challenging. Indeed, this was a source of considerable frustration for her and she was exasperated by the mentor’s attempts to protect Angela form the critical points she wanted her to think about.

‘She doesn't need this constant reassurance. [...] he was trying to protect her, which just [...] emphasised again that he didn't know [her] and he's misjudged where she's at [in her development].’

(Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 2)
Despite seeing Angela infrequently, Diane felt she knew her better than the mentor and what was needed to help her make progress. This change in approach was common to all tutors to a greater or lesser extent. Judging the level of criticality required the tutors to make rapid judgements about the PST’s position and what was needed to secure progression. Knowing the PST was fundamental to knowing when and how to challenge.

**Pre-service teachers’ perceptions of support**

The initial interviews revealed that PSTs had a broad view of the tutor role, believing they would help with teaching, resources, evaluating lessons and difficult situations. Most cited pastoral support and reassurance from the tutor as important. Rafid in particular found Alan’s reassurance helpful and this dominated what he recalled from the visits:

‘[What I remember] most clearly was the reassurance [Alan] was giving me more than anything else...him saying, you’ve managed to get through this...you’ve passed, so you can do this.’

*(Rafid, PST: Interview visit 2)*

However, Rafid’s highly anxious state appeared to block him from benefiting in other ways from Alan’s visits. He found it difficult to recall any of the positive things that been discussed, thereby supporting Diane’s theory that simply telling PSTs what they are doing
well does not induce self-belief and confidence. Several PSTs talked about the
reassurance they gained from the normalising practices referred to earlier. Angela used a
model of teacher development introduced in the university to reflect on her need for
reassurance that she was ‘on the right track’ (Angela, PST: Initial interview). Toby too
wanted to know how he was progressing in relation to typical expectations:

‘What I’d be very interested to hear is some kind of normalised version
of how I’m doing […] it’s picking out what you’re doing well, what
you’re doing badly, but I’ve no idea whether that’s on course for being a
dreadful teacher, a good teacher or an excellent teacher.’

(Toby, PST: Initial interview)

Most of the PSTs wanted to know whether they were typical in terms of their progress
and experience. Rafid expressed the reassurance he derived from this benchmarking form
Alan:

‘[Alan] reassured me that I am at the stage of my development where I
should be really […] and the fact that I am not as bad as I thought I was.
[...] I certainly felt a lot better for it.’

(Rafid, PST: Interview visit 1)
Nyle and Toby also talked of being reassured by knowing that they were ‘on track’.

‘It’s just helpful to hear that you’re on track […] she’s the experienced one; she’s seen hundreds of student teachers [It confirms] that you’re at the right kind of stage for where you’re at…having an external person coming in and going ‘Yep, that’s all going fine’, is reassuring.’

(Toby, PST: Interview visit 1)

Toby’s reference to his tutor being the ‘experienced one’ featured in the responses of other PSTs. The normalisation and benchmarking provided by the tutors was particularly valued because of their external position and perceived expertise:

‘…getting confirmation or affirmation […] from someone externally is always important […] and I think it gives a level of self-belief.’

(Rafid, PST: Interview visit 2)

Tutors’ feedback and reassurance was also trusted more because they were perceived to be more impartial and not distracted by the detail of the school
context. Angela needed reassurance from Diane because she didn’t believe the positive feedback from teachers in school:

‘...someone from the University who is the examiner [...] telling me ‘yes or no - you are a proper teacher’... even though a teacher can tell you whether you can teach or not, it always feels a bit unreal.’

(Angela, PST: Interview visit 3)

This need for external validation of them as teachers by their tutors, who they perceived as being better positioned to judge them, suggests a lack of trust in the judgement of the teachers they were working with. Carl was particularly critical of the teachers and even the PSTs who were not critical believed that their mentors were not challenging them sufficiently, which undermined the confidence they had in their judgements of them.

Tutors’ external position was also a link to the university community. This was particularly important to Karen and Angela, who talked about feeling isolated. Angela reflected that despite having a good relationship with her mentor and reassurance from the department, she gained comfort from her tutor’s opinion:
‘...you just need someone like (Diane) to say, no - actually it is all right; it's fine. Get on with it. Get on with a few things; have a bit of fun’.

(Angela, PST: Interview visit 2)

This suggests that the university community is important to some PSTs and that their sense of belonging and community is with the HEI rather than the school. Angela’s reference to ‘have a bit of fun’ was something that she was not hearing from teachers; Diane was effectively giving her permission to relax and take some risks. Several other PSTs reported that the tutors’ support had given them confidence in other areas of practice, such as planning and evaluation. Karen found Jenny’s visits as constructive opportunities for growth and wanted her to observe her teaching classes she found challenging:

‘I benefited more from this visit [...] because I actually had a class I wasn’t so comfortable with and a subject I wasn’t so comfortable with. So I think it allowed her to see where I need support.’

(Karen, PST: Interview visit 2)
As well as helping her to identify what she needed to improve, Karen indicated a counselling element to her discussion with Jenny. The opportunity to discuss the lesson at length had helped her to ‘let go of it a bit’ (Karen, PST: Interview visit 2).

Carl, a post-doctoral research scientist, was the only PST who appeared not to want or benefit from emotional support. He talked about ‘looking for critical feedback’ and hoping that his tutor would be ‘a lot more critical than the teachers are’ (Carl, PST: Initial interview). His reaction to Richard’s attempts to protect his confidence and self-esteem not appreciated and indicated that his expectation of critical feedback was not met:

‘I don’t really care about what went well [...] I want to know what was bad so I can improve. [...] I’d have liked more [critical feedback].’

(Carl, PST: Interview visit 1)

Although Carl did not appreciate Richard’s attempts to reassure him by focusing on the positive aspects, he understood the reason behind it and hoped for a more critical, challenging approach in subsequent visits. When this did not materialise, Carl became disillusioned and less receptive to what Richard had to say.
Summary: support

Elbaz (1981) identified three dimensions to practical knowledge: content, orientation and structure. In terms of ‘content’, the knowledge central to tutors’ support practice was their generalised knowledge of PSTs as learners and their development, and the nature of the experience of learning to teach. This knowledge was used in conjunction with their knowledge of the PSTs as individuals to provide reassurance through ‘normalising’ the experience for the PSTs and ‘benchmarking’ their progress. This knowledge was also an important part of their affirmation of the PSTs. It was their knowledge of teaching and learning to teach that enabled them to identify and affirm the positive elements in their practice, particularly in the early stages. This knowledge together with their personal values, views and experiences, formed the basis for the tutors’ ‘images’ (Elbaz, 1981, 1983; Clandinin, 1985, 1986).

The second dimension to practical knowledge identified by Elbaz (1981) was ‘orientation’. Tutors drew on all orientations of knowledge as suggested by Elbaz (1981). The social orientation was seen through Jenny’s overtly friendly behaviour towards the PSTs and Clare’s empathising through sharing her own experience. Theoretical knowledge contributed to how their knowledge was orientated, but personal, social and experiential were most used in their instinctive practices - the practices that were reactive rather than planned. All the tutors had theoretical knowledge of the stages that PSTs go through, but it was their experiential knowledge that was most often cited as being the basis for their decisions and actions. Alan, Diane and Jenny in particular placed great emphasis on the
emotional aspects of teaching and learning to teach, drawing on their own personal experience. It is interesting that their PSTs (Rafid, Angela and Karen) highlighted the emotional support provided by their tutors as important to them. Alex and Richard were noticeably less emotionally orientated and more intellectually orientated. Neither Nyle nor Carl (PSTs) cited emotional support as important or wanted.

Alan’s images of teaching and learning were the most significant in his approach to support. Alan was orientated to teaching from a very personal experiential perspective; some of his own experiences in teaching had been in a challenging school. His description of teaching as ‘a tough job’ and a ‘rough ride’ (Interview visit 2) led him to put great importance on the satisfaction gained through the successes. This underpinned his principle of helping Rafid see the successful aspects of his teaching. The significance of the emotional dimension to teaching was also seen by his comment that ‘in teaching, you invest so much of yourself’ (Interview visit 3). Alan’s conception of teaching as a highly personal activity in which ‘they are wrapped up in as a person’ led to measured rules of practice around giving criticism and layering it between the positive aspects. This also lay behind the importance he placed on earning the trust of the PST and the right criticise. Alan’s images of the process of learning to teach were ones of difficulty and ‘a steep hill to climb’ (Interview visit 1). Again there was a strong emotional component to his image. His reference to ‘you do all that looking after because it’s quite an emotional experience for them’ (Interview visit 3) was based on his experience of working with PSTs over a
number of years. However, Alan’s principles of practice also included realism, as he saw himself as preparing them for the tough world of teaching. This lay behind his rule ‘to keep them focused on getting in and getting on with it...not be too indulgent...’ (Interview visit 3). Alan summed up his stance towards PSTs as a critical friend; caring and encouraging, but within limits.

Jenny had many years of experience of working with PSTs and it was her images of PSTs as learners that were the most significant in guiding her support practice. Like Alan, her images had strong emotionally orientated knowledge. Her image of PSTs was one of them being vulnerable, having fears and being too negative. Importantly, Jenny did not have a deficit view of PSTs, but regarded them as developing professionals. Crucially, she viewed the experience from the PST’s perspective and used her knowledge of the PST as individual to gauge the support needed. This underpinned her principles of practice, which centred on empowering PSTs and helping them to ‘recognise how much they can do’ (Interview visit 1). Jenny’s desire for the PST to do most of the talking reflected her counselling approach to the discussions, as her theory was that sharing and talking is helpful as it ‘gets fears out into the open’ (Interview visit 1). To achieve this, Jenny sought a warm relationship with the PSTs and was protective of Karen, fearing that some mentors had unrealistic expectations.
Like Alan and Jenny, Diane’s knowledge of Angela as an individual informed her support and it was her images of PSTs that were significant in her practice. She too saw PSTs as vulnerable and talked of being worried, concerned and anxious about Angela, particularly in relation to the potential effects of critical feedback from teachers. However, Diane’s images were strongly rooted in her experience as a head of science and deputy head in school. This experience contributed to her image of teaching as a collaborative and collegial enterprise and her view of PSTs as similar to junior members of her department that needed guidance and supervision. Diane also saw PSTs as too negative, which underpinned her practice of highlighting the achievements and helping Angela to see what she was ‘unconsciously competent of’ (Interview visit 1). Diane’s image of learning to teach was of a journey, and that PSTs need to be made aware of ‘that journey they’ve made and it’s part of celebrating the achievements and making it explicit’ (Interview visit 1). Diane used her knowledge of the nature of that journey to reassure by normalising the experience. Like Jenny, Diane’s practice was governed by strong PST-centred principles, for example, the PST owning their successes by vocalising these for themselves, rather than by others. Her support was rooted in a warm rapport with the PST and concern for them as learners. In this way, like Jenny, her practice was pastoral in nature.

Clare’s support practice was underpinned by similar images of PSTs, mentors and learning to teach to those of Diane, Jenny and Alan. She too had used her knowledge of Toby’s background to gauge the support he needed and normalise the experience for him by...
drawing on her knowledge of the experience of learning to teach. The emotional
dimension to her knowledge was expressed through how she picked up on how he was
feeling. She was worried about the effects of the placement on him emotionally and was
concerned that he was dejected after the first visit. It was Clare’s sensitivity to Toby’s
emotional state that led to her disclosing her own experience and limitations and
highlight was he had achieved. Clare’s image of teaching as ‘tough’ was reinforced by
going in ‘as a commando to sort things out’ (Interview visit 1) revealed her protective
stance towards the PSTs.

Alex and Richard were very similar in their support practice, and had very different
images, principles and rules of practice to the other tutors. Whilst they shared the
principle that PSTs should be supported and their confidence maintained, their support
practices were not as significant in how they talked about PSTs and their images were less
rich. They were also both very much less emotionally orientated to the PSTs. Whilst some
of the their rules of practice relating to support were similar to those of the other tutors,
they spoke about them in terms of theoretical knowledge rather in terms of PST-centred
principles. They did not draw on their personal experiences as much or stand in the
emotional shoes of the PST. The rationales behind their rules of practice were different to
the others. For example, Alex and Richard started discussions with the positive aspects of
the lesson to support the PST’s confidence, as opposed to wanting to empower or
celebrate success. A key rule of practice for Alex was that the discussions should be tightly
focused and short, to prevent the key points getting lost. This affected how much he would listen to the PST and the extent Toby’s issues could be discussed. Richard’s references to reflection were the basis of his principles of practice, which shaped how he conducted the discussion through careful questioning. In this way, the tutors’ support practice was shaped by their goals as well by as their practical professional knowledge.

4.2 The theme of development

The second *a priori* theme of *development* comprised of guiding principles, specific aims or intentions for the feedback discussion and the strategies employed, as shown by the section from thematic template shown in Table 2.

Although tutors’ assessment practices were identified as a separate theme (see the final thematic template in appendix 10), the gathering and using of evidence that all engaged in during the visits was closely tied to the support and development of PSTs and is therefore included in this section on ‘development’.
### Table 2: Section of thematic analysis template showing subthemes within the theme of ‘development’ and ‘assessment’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Assessment</th>
<th>3.2 Gathering evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Development</td>
<td>4.1 Aims &amp; intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 General principles and approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Strategies used to achieve aims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2.1 School staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2 Paper work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3 Lesson observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.4 Talking to PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 Develop practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2 Develop reflection on practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 Build on strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Trainee focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3 Prioritising and focusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4 Practices to avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.5 Nature of approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 Start the feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2 Support PST’s self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aims for development**

The tutors’ goals for PSTs’ professional development were strongly linked to pupils’ learning. Richard also aimed to promote critical reflection on teaching from the outset, although Clare, Alex and Alan thought this too demanding early in the course; initially
they were more concerned with ensuring the PST was secure with basic teaching elements, such as explanations and management:

‘I don’t want to talk to him about the more reflective things - that will come later on. I just want to get him secure at this stage.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

Nevertheless, promoting thinking about teaching, learning and the outcomes of lessons was an important aim cited by all tutors throughout. Most set out to achieve this by helping the PST to examine their teaching from a different perspective:

‘...it's very much about another perspective on their teaching and it might be quite a different perspective [...] to what school teachers think about. So that's all about getting them to think about their teaching...’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

For Diane and Richard the aims of the second and third visits included stretching the PST to avoid a plateau in development (Maynard & Furlong, 1995). Richard talked of PSTs still being in ‘survival mode’ in the second school and believed that ‘part of our job, even at
this relatively early stage, is to get them out of that’ (Richard, Tutor: Interview visit 2).

Diane echoed this by wanting to get Angela ‘out of her comfort zone’:

‘...she's capable of doing much more and I wanted to give her the space to explore that [...]. What I want [Angela] to start to do is to take more risks and move into that zone of less control and actually trust the kids... ’

(Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

Developing PSTs’ ability to evaluate their teaching and identify ways forward was also an aim of later visits. Alex expressed this as PSTs ‘being able to analyse what they’re doing in lessons and to be able to reflect and act upon that’ (Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 3). Jenny believed the skills of reflection and analysis to be a pre-requisite for learning; ‘it's those skills that I'm trying to develop in them’ (Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 2).

How tutors talked about their aims for PSTs’ development revealed some commonalties and key differences in how they viewed the development of PSTs. Most of the tutors were orientated towards improving teaching through such aims as identifying long-term key targets, supporting progress through challenge and focusing the PST on the pupils’ learning. There were also common aims in relation to PST development, such as helping them to see the strengths in their teaching and teaching the skills of reflection and
analysis to support autonomous development. Jenny’s aims were different to those of the other tutors in that they were expressed in terms of the development of PSTs rather than their performance in the classroom. Jenny was more concerned with the perspective of the PST, helping them make sense of what they were seeing and doing and empowering them to own their professional and personal development. Whilst the other tutors had some elements of this, their aims were more focused on developing the ‘best teacher’, or the ‘teacher I want’ (Alex, Interview visit 2).

*Principles behind development practice*

The principles guiding the tutors’ approach to the PSTs’ professional development were connected with developing a different and secure ‘space’ for discussion, building on the strengths, ensuring PST-centred development, and prioritising and focusing. Establishing a secure space, aimed at encouraging and supporting a genuine dialogue, was largely dependent on developing a good relationship with the PST; something regarded by all as important.

The tutors’ principles were supported by expressed theories-of-action. For example, Alan theorised that building trust in the relationship with the PST was important in order to developing a relationship as a critical friend:
‘...if I don't talk for long enough about the strengths of the lessons I don't earn the trust from them to put themselves in my hands to ... for the dissembling of it. [...] if I can tell them what was good, they'll then let me tell them what was bad...’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

Diane had a similar theory, seeing highlighting the successes as preparing the PST for the potentially emotionally difficult discussion of the negative points of the lesson:

‘I'm trying to model that thing that you do with kids as well; that you want them to focus on good things and then you're going to be ready for the bits for improvement.’

(Diane, Tutor: Interview 1)

Diane’s reference to modelling good practice points to her knowledge of teaching and underlying view of ITE pedagogy. These ideas were also reflected by the practices tutors avoided, such as not demeaning what the PST had done or criticising too early:
‘...if you criticise too early in the wrong way, they will put up a barrier and they won't hear a word you say.’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

These excerpts reveal how tutors had reflected on their experiences as teachers and teacher educators and developed theories to guide their practice on the visits. These theories, rules orientated practice as PST-centred or teaching-centred. All tutors demonstrated elements of both in their practices, although to differing degrees. Tutors with highly PST-centred goals had subtly different principles and rules to those focused on teaching. For example, whilst all had the rule that the start of the discussion should be positive, the most highly PST-centred tutors started by asking how they felt about their performance, (e.g. ‘What were you pleased with?’ Or ‘What were you happy with?’). Alex and Richard were more focused on developing teaching. They paid less attention to how the PST felt, choosing to focus on what had been achieved instead. For example, Alex began by asking ‘What did you set out to achieve and did you get that?’ (Alex, Tutor: visit 1). Richard’s typical opening questions were ‘Give me two good things’ and ‘What do you think?’. Although both approaches invited the first response from the PST, the first approach was rooted in the PST’s emotional experience. The latter approach was more intellectual and objective, being focused on analysing the event rather than the PST’s emotional reaction.
Jenny was highly PST-centred in her principles of practice, theorising development as located within the individual. She conceptualised her role as helping PSTs to think about and take ownership of their development, believing that if PSTs ‘can’t highlight where (they’ve) come from, then (they’re) not going to be able to go further’ (Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1). For Jenny, verbalising for themselves how they had developed and what needed improving was an integral part of this:

‘...it's so much more powerful if they have identified it rather than me telling them ...much more powerful. [...] They've got to do themselves; they've got to build it from their own experience and make sense of it themselves by drawing on multiple perspectives.’

*(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 2)*

Listening to the PSTs and responding to the issues they raised was pivotal to PST-centred practice. For example, Alan detected Rafid’s anxiety about subject knowledge and so ‘stopped the conversation for a moment to think about the strategies that he's using’ (Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1). For Diane listening was an important part of determining what PSTs would be receptive to:
‘[It’s] about giving them something that they will hear that will help move on. I'm trying to hear where she's at...because she will be telling me her priorities... ’

(Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

In this way, the very PST-centred tutors were highly sensitive to the PST’s concerns and saw these as potential blocks to development if they were ignored.

The fourth key principle for development was prioritising and focusing. In any one lesson there were many issues that could have been focused on and discussed, but all tutors selected the one or two aspects that would help the PST make most progress. Alex summed this up as identifying ‘the key things that are going to make the biggest difference to this trainee at this particular point in time’ (Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 2). Focusing was also concerned with helping the PST identify the most important elements of the lesson, rather than being diverted by many minor issues. For example, Richard talked about focusing on ‘the important bits for learning, without the clutter’ (Richard, Tutor: Interview visit 2). This was also the reason behind Alex’s rule of practice that the discussions were kept short so that the important messages didn’t get lost. The focus usually led to an associated target and all tutors left the PST with a few priorities. Diane felt this to be an important part of her role, speaking of her ‘responsibility to leave
[Angela] with some quite simple, but big targets’ (Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 1). Alan also selected a few key elements to talk about in depth, which then formed ‘the targets [...], the things I want him to do above all’ (Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1).

This focusing and prioritising was a crucial part of the tutors’ skill and was one of the ways in which they felt they differed to the teachers’ in approach, most of whom provided feedback on many details of a lesson and didn’t identify the most significant issues.

Through the process of prioritising and target setting tutors drew on their knowledge of teaching, PST development and the PST as an individual. Alan noted the importance of getting this judgement right:

‘Where is the bit I can push them into? What’s next? And if you get that wrong, it doesn’t work [...] if you try to leap them over something and give them something way down the track, they’re just not ready for it.[But] if you don’t push them far enough, then they’re just going to carry on doing what they’re already doing...’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 3)

Alex expressed focusing and prioritising as keeping the next steps manageable so that the PST would be motivated to improve. Jenny also held the principle of identifying
achievable goals, choosing to ignore issues that she knew Karen would develop through experience, such as her subject knowledge, believing it was:

‘not something that she's going to cure overnight, so there's no point in beating her up over that, because she feels vulnerable about that as it is.’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

Richard noted that he differentiated according to the PST’s needs, limiting the number of issues he focused on when the PST was struggling to make progress because ‘that’s what they need to concentrate on rather than have too many things to deal with at once’ (Richard, Tutor: Interview visit 1).

Other common principles of practice included promoting thinking, analysis and reflection. The main differences in practice were connected with how the tutors were orientated towards the development of PSTs. Both Alex and Alan’s principles aligned with a training view of development and rooted in their view of PSTs as learners acquiring the practical skills of teaching. For example, Alan’s focusing on the basic teaching skills in the early stages, and Alex keeping the steps manageable and the discussion focused so the main points weren’t lost. Both also focused on the events in the lesson and how effectively the objectives had been achieved. Their principles were supported by a strong view of science
teaching and effective science teachers. The principles of Richard, Diane, Jenny and Clare were associated more strongly with examining the PST’s thinking in terms of the rationale behind their action and planning decisions. The two tutors who were most PST-centred in their principles were Jenny and Diane. They talked of empowering the PSTs, wanting them to talk about their own development and try different approaches, rather than simply do what they were told to do by the mentor. In this way they were more focused on helping the PST to develop higher order thinking skills and their own identity as teachers.

Evidence gathering

The process of gathering and using evidence was an important aspect of tutors’ practice on the visits. The subthemes, as shown in the final thematic template (appendix 10), were connected to the nature of the evidence gathered and how the evidence was used. Tutors sought evidence in order to identify issues, threats to the PST’s development and the underlying causes of any problems. They also used the evidence to theorise about the PST’s stage of development and identify the priorities for development.

Evidence was gathered from various sources, using direct and indirect approaches. Diane found that teachers and non-teaching staff in the department provided a useful, wider perspective on PSTs’ work in school, including their emotional state:
‘...if I haven't seen the mentor I will always ask the technicians as I arrive [...] they always give you quite a clue. You know, things like, “it would be useful if we got the orders in more”, or they'll say, “no, they've been lovely; it's been really fun having them here”. As technicians, they’re quite a good barometer I think.’

(Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

Other sources of evidence valued included teachers, the PST’s files and school records, the lesson observed and the PST. In some instances the tutor targeted a particular class to observe. For example, Clare knew that Toby was struggling with using language that pupils would understand and having issues with his management of younger, lower attaining pupils. She therefore chose a class that had pupils with special needs and one ‘he’d talked about with fear’ (Clare, Tutor: Interview visit 1).

Tutors took a critical approach to evidence, making judgements about its reliability and significance. For example, on his first visit, Alan did not attach great significance to the concerns expressed by Rafid’s mentor, describing them as ‘fairly low key’ based on his knowledge of PSTs and their development. Tutors also took steps to understand the evidence in context. For example, talking to the co-observing teacher during the lesson to gauge typicality and understand the lesson in context was common practice. Jenny wanted to see whether the pupils ‘were behaving with [Karen] was typical to what they
were like’ (Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1). Clare expressed this as finding out how the ‘lesson compared to other ones that were going on’ (Clare, Tutor: Interview visit 1).

Gaining a broader view of their progress and typicality of the lesson was also supported by examining evidence from documentation, such as plans, evaluations and observations. Another important source of evidence was the pupils. Tutors talked to them during the lesson and looked at written work to gauge their motivation, as well as their understanding of the science and purpose of the task:

‘Do they know what they're doing and why? The number of times you ask children in classrooms ‘what are you doing and why?’ And they haven't got a clue what they're doing.’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

The PSTs themselves were perhaps the most important source of evidence. Tutors sought to understand the context of the lesson, and probed their work with other classes and knowledge of the pupils in order to identify any issues or problems. The most significant aim was to evaluate the PST’s thinking and decision-making, which was accomplished through questioning and listening to their evaluation of the lesson. This gave Diane an insight into where ‘the [PST’s] thinking is and where they are’ (Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 1). The PST’s self-evaluation of the lesson was seen as an indicator of their potential:
‘I'm reassured by [Rafid’s] own self-evaluation...that he wasn't [...] happy with how things went. [...] The one that worries me is where you see a lesson and you think ‘oh that's okay, it wasn't a brilliant’ and they say, ‘oh that was fantastic!’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview1)

Jenny too was interested in Karen’s intentions for the lesson for the same reason:

‘I'm interested in the thinking, because often at this stage the lesson might be completely awful, but the quality of their thinking suggests that things will be fine in the end.’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview1)

For Clare, PSTs’ evaluations provided an indication of their development; she was particularly interested in their focus as they progressed from evaluating teacher activity and classroom management to examining pupils’ learning:
‘I’m always really interested to see have they picked up on learning?

Particularly of groups that are relatively well-behaved groups, but that I can see are not learning. And have they actually picked that up?’

(Clare, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

How and what evidence was gathered suggested the tutors’ views of the visits, their conception of their role and the priorities for development. Some tutors were more focused on evidence of teaching and the lesson was the prime source of evidence. Other tutors were more interested with the evidence they gathered from the PST.

The tutors’ use of evidence to establish the PST’s stage of development revealed that they held complex models and knowledge of how PSTs develop through the course. None of the tutors could articulate how they decided the priorities for development based on the evidence collected however. Jenny and Alex simply attributed it to experience, suggesting that this knowledge is tacit. However, it seems likely that their knowledge of PST development and teaching are key elements.

Approaches and strategies for development

Once the priorities and issues were identified, tutors decided how to engage PSTs with these and help them progress. Frequently used approaches included supporting the PST’s
self-evaluation, challenging their thinking, examining alternatives and awareness-raising.

Discussions about the observed lesson began with the PST’s reaction. All the tutors were concerned with the purpose of the lesson and the pupils’ learning:

‘What did you set out to do? Do you think you achieved it? And then it’s going to be, what things do you think were good? Would you change anything?’

(Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

Jenny’s rationale was centred on developing PSTs’ skills of analysis:

‘I usually start with ‘what was it that you want the children to learn?’ [...] What were you happy with in terms of their learning, and what were you less happy with? [...] You've got to teach them the skills of self-analysis and evaluation, and part of that is asking the right sort of questions I think, to get them to think about it.’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 2)
The tutors supported the PSTs’ evaluations by helping them to think through the lesson. Alex expressed this as wanting Nyle to ‘visualise what went on’ (Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 3). However, PSTs often found this difficult and tutors used a variety of strategies to help them. Alex focused on key incidents:

‘I sometimes go back to the point in the lesson to [...] project back at them what I mean by it, you know, ‘remember when that happened?’ You try and pick up those incidents in lessons.’

(Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 3)

Nevertheless, Alex struggled to focus Nyle at times, finding that he was continually ‘drawing him back trying to get him to refocus and think about what he did this lesson’ (Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 2). Alan used a similar strategy to help Rafid identify the point in the lesson where he felt things had started to go wrong, believing that:

‘...if he can recognise when it starts to go wrong, we might be able to then to connect that to what he’s doing at that point [...] and where the cause for that comes from.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 3)
This unpacking of events and processes was not confined to the aspects of the lesson that needed to be improved; tutors also helped the PSTs to understand what underpinned success. For example, Alan spent some time unpacking what he meant by ‘the pupils working well’, providing examples from the lesson to illustrate his points. Richard helped Carl examine why the pupils had enjoyed the lesson in particular ‘what is it that he did that was positive to make it work’ (Richard, Tutor: Interview visit 3). Although tutors helped the PST understand the reasons behind the successful aspects, discussions gravitated towards the less successful aspects and what to improve.

Helping PSTs understand the outcomes was closely aligned to focusing them on the reasons behind their actions and probing their thinking and decision-making. This was a particularly strong focus for Jenny:

‘I ask more ‘whys’. Why did you do that? What was behind that? And perhaps next I might actually ask, “Where did you get that from? Where did you read about that?”’  

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

The rationale was then linked to evaluation of the outcomes. When PSTs had difficulty evaluating the lesson, or had not detected problems, tutors took steps to change their
perceptions. Richard used what he called ‘loaded’ questions and a ‘devil’s advocate’ position to confront Carl:

‘I would lead them up the garden path until they get to the stage where they realise that what they’re saying is illogical or doesn’t make sense. So it’s confronting really some of their [ideas]…’

(Richard, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

Alan helped Rafid to understand why he was having problems by modelling how he had presented himself in the lesson, theorising that this would make more of an impact than verbal feedback alone:

‘...if they are a wallflower and hiding behind the podium, I'll go to show them what that looks like. [...] You exaggerate it. You look a bit scared and pretend to disappear into the wall and they see the difference between that and the confident use of the space.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 2)
Strategies that were used to challenge the PST’s views included viewing the lesson from either a pupil’s or observer’s perspective. Alan presented pupils’ responses to the questions he had asked during the lesson to find out how Rafid would have expected them to respond. This was intended to help him consider what pupils had understood, as well focus him on the pupils in his subsequent planning:

‘I’ll talk to him and say ‘this is the sort of answers they gave me. What would you have expected them to have said? What would you have liked them to have said when the observer comes and asks them?’ [...] I think that helps them focus on getting the pupils clear about what they’re doing.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

When such strategies did not work, or time was limited, tutors used a more direct approach to giving critical feedback. This generally occurred when the PST was more confident. On the second visit, Carl’s lesson was very teacher-centred. Richard decided ‘I’ve got to be frank about this’ and recognised that he had been ‘quite blunt’ (Richard, Tutor: Interview visit 2). Alex too became increasingly frustrated with Nyle, who did not appear to be focusing on the issues that Alex wanted to discuss. Even though he wanted to avoid simply telling Nyle what the problems were, like Richard, Alex felt the point so important that he eventually felt compelled to take a direct approach:
'I try [to] be nice [...] but if that's not working, then I'll tell you how it is [...] Well you have to, don't you? You can't keep on trying to draw it out because the whole point gets lost....'

(Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

By the third visit, Rafid was still not making sufficient progress and Alan also began adopting a much more direct approach to the evaluation of the lesson. Jenny took a different approach as she wanted to reduce the potentially negative impact of critical feedback. She did this by avoiding ‘dwelling’ on the criticisms and moving quickly to focusing on ‘But what could you do better?’ [Jenny, Tutor: visit 2].

A rule of practice held by all tutors was to avoid saying what they would have done as the teacher, which they regarded as unhelpful and limiting:

'I've sat in and watched too many people say to [PSTs] ‘well if I was you, this is what I would have done’. That's not helpful actually - you've been teaching 20 years.'

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 2)
Instead, tutors preferred to ‘give them alternatives [...] so they engage with it’ (Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 2) and focus them on thinking critically through questioning and challenging their assumptions about pupils:

‘I wanted to pick him up about [...] his statement ‘They look like they’re getting it’ [...]. My whole point is how do you know? [...] How can you actually find out how they know rather than just by expression?’

(Richard, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

Jenny too was concerned by the use of terms frequently used in school to describe pupils, such as ‘running riot’ and ‘low ability’. She challenged Karen to explain what she meant by them, because of her concern that people ‘never question (them), unless you say, ‘Well, what do you mean by that?’ (Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 3). In this way she tried to help Karen to reflect critically on the messages she was getting from the school. Although challenging PSTs to think critically about school practices was a feature of all tutors’ practice, it was particularly prominent in Jenny’s practice. For her it was important that Karen questioned what she was learning from the experience:

‘I always ask those questions. Did it work? Well actually, did it work? [...] I just want them to question the rubbish that goes on in school and
to say, ‘but why are we doing this? [...] it’s my attempt to get her to think may be actually this perceived wisdom is not that wise after all.’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 3)

A particular strategy used to develop the PSTs’ understanding of science lessons and planning was talking about the ‘narrative’ of the lesson. Identifying a strong story for lessons was important to Alan and Jenny:

‘...talking to them about the narrative of the lesson is really common... that sense they have that they're telling a story in the lesson.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

Jenny believed personal stories helped to make her points ‘more memorable ...meaningful...less abstract.’ (Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1) and were strongly linked to her experience as a teacher and learner.

The PSTs’ progress and response to the strategies used by tutors affected what they did subsequently. More direct, instructional approaches, such as coaching and modelling, were used when the PST did not grasp ideas or make progress. For example, when Rafid
continued to struggle Alan decided to ‘fall back on teaching by numbers just to see if we can get some progress’ (Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1). Alex too became frustrated by Nyle’s response to his questions and resorted to a more direct approach:

‘...with the PST like this sometimes you’ve got to turn it around and go, ‘Right this is how it is; this is what you've got to do’, I'm now actually giving him feedback [on] what science teaching is about; what he should be doing in general, not just from this lesson.’

(Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

Coupled with being more directive and authoritative, Alex also used the grading criteria as an analytic tool to help Nyle reflect on his teaching and think about specific aspects of the lesson in more detail.

Examining the planning process and decisions made by the PST was an aspect of practice that all tutors focused on to support development. Both Alan and Alex started by focusing on the end of the lesson and the outcomes that the PST had intended. For example, Alex focused Nyle on what he wanted from the pupils and then asked him to think about ‘How
am I going to get there?’ and ‘What could you do differently to improve what you've seen in the plenary?’ (Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 2). Alan also used this strategy:

‘…the assessment box they see as the endpoint [...] Everything I do leads up to that, so if that's the case let's start by identifying what it is, because then you know where you're trying to go and everything else stacks up behind that.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 3)

Alan took this one step further with Rafid by planning the next lesson with him in order to provide concrete advice and ideas; something he did with ‘struggling students’. In this way he modelled the ‘backwards’ planning process, using questions to support Rafid’s thinking and ‘coach him through it’ (Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 3). In this way, tutors had a range of strategies to achieve their underlying aims and deployed them in response to the context and particular needs of the PST. However, the tutors were not aware of how successful they were in achieving their aims.

**PSTs’ perceptions of development practices**

Four key aspects related to professional development were identified from the PST data:
1. benefits - what they found useful;

2. the influence on them as developing teachers;

3. deficit - confusing aspects and those that were expected but not provided;

4. the distinctive aspects of the tutors’ practice.

The most significant feature of the visit for all PSTs was the lesson observation and subsequent discussion, which dominated their responses. The PSTs’ attitudes to the visit reflected their level of anxiety and view of its purpose. Rafid’s views were coloured by his perception of assessment, which led to him finding the visits stressful. Whilst Angela and Karen were nervous prior to the visits, they regarded them as supportive and developmental in nature and spoke about them positively. Nyle, Toby and Carl appeared more relaxed, also regarding the visits as opportunities rather than threats.

1. Benefits

The PSTs’ perceptions of how they benefited from the visits did not necessarily reflect the tutors’ practice or what had taken place. The beneficial aspects identified included linking teaching to what had been learned in university (Angela, PST: Interview visit 1), focusing on pupils’ learning (Toby, PST: Interview visit 1) and prompting the mentor to observe (Karen, PST: Interview visit 1). However, it was not uncommon for the PSTs to find it difficult to recall anything substantial and often their responses were non-specific or vague, such as ‘good advice’ and ‘valuable feedback’.
When they were able to identify what was useful, it was usually advice linked to practical teaching, often directly connected to the particular lesson observed. For example, Karen valued Jenny’s ideas about how to use a particular activity more effectively (Karen, PST: Interview visit 3). Nyle too found practical advice most useful:

‘...he made some very helpful comments about how when you move between groups, make sure you’re shouting out across the room; simple things to make sure everybody is staying on task.’

(Nyle, PST: Interview visit 2)

The PSTs were most likely to cite something as useful when it addressed their immediate needs or concerns. Toby for example was focused on objectives and outcomes:

‘...trying to make the objectives match up to the outcomes; that’s stuff that’s useful to me. [...] I’ve been wrestling with it from day one....’

(Nyle, PST: Interview visit 2)

As discussed previously, tutors purposefully focused on key areas for development in their discussions with the PSTs. This was valued by Nyle, Toby and Karen in particular:
‘…she reinforced that I only need to focus on one or two things and
forget other things. I don’t have to focus on everything…’

(Karen, PST: Interview visit 1)

One of the aims tutors had for the visits was developing PSTs’ skills in relation to critical
thinking, analysis, reflection and evaluation. This emerged as one of the most important
and frequently cited contributions made by the tutors. Toby, Angela and Karen thought
that they had been helped to analyse the lesson and understand the outcomes. For Toby
this was in relation to how his actions had contributed to behaviour issues. Diane had
helped Angela to understand the pupils’ thinking and analyse the purpose of the practical
activity:

‘It made me really think [about] not just what we are doing, but [...] the
purpose of the practical... [Diane] helped me unpick the lesson a bit
more – unravel it a bit more. Why did they do this?’

(Angela, PST: Interview visit 1)
Karen was particularly thoughtful about Jenny’s approach and felt that Jenny’s visit had given her the opportunity to talk about a lesson in depth. She also appreciated being helped to think more about the rationale and purpose behind what she was doing:

‘…she’s more interested in the ‘why’ with everything […] if I said to her it had gone brilliantly, she would have wanted to know why I thought that, rather than saying ‘yes, it was brilliant, or no, it was awful’. Yes, she’s really good at helping you reflect […] she led me through thinking through the lesson. […] she led me through that process (of evaluating the lesson) quite nicely. It was like she was helping me remember how to evaluate a lesson properly…’

(Karen, PST: Interview visit 2)

Carl was the least positive about what he had found useful. Being supported in his thinking and evaluation was not something he cited, despite his tutor’s endeavours. Like Rafid and Nyle, Carl was affected by his own agenda, which was dominated by his desire for critical feedback. Initially he identified Richard’s feedback as useful because ‘it was critical’ and told him what he needed to improve (Carl, PST: Interview visit 1). However, he found Richard’s feedback increasingly less useful because it did not meet his expectations of criticality.
Rafid also cited very little as useful in terms of professional development, because he was so focused on Alan’s support and reassurance. His stress seemed to prevent him from engaging with thinking about his teaching, resulting in his fixation on coping strategies. Consequently, Alan seemed to have little obvious impact on Rafid’s development as a teacher.

2. Influence

The PSTs’ perceptions of the tutors’ influence was gauged by their immediate intentions and later, by asking them what they had done. Nyle and Toby were particularly vague:

‘...no sort of burning goal [...] However, I’m certain that when I sit and plan next week’s lessons that what she said will be very much in my mind; [...] I am certain that next week’s lessons will be planned differently with the intention of going differently.’

(Toby, PST: Interview visit 1)

‘I didn’t make any great resolutions. [...] The main one is really just to carry on as I am but to try and refine certain aspects of it.’

(Nyle, PST: Interview visit 1)
Nyle believed Alex’s visits had affected his practice, but added that ‘it would be hard to say exactly what’, but I think it would be more attention to the objectives and the outcomes’ (Nyle, PST: Interview visit 3). When influence was indicated, it took the form of intending to implement advice or suggestions. Karen was motivated to plan for flexibility, whilst Angela intended to be clear about the purpose of the lesson and activities. Carl was keen to act on his tutor’s advice, viewing the points raised as things to be ‘fixed’:

‘I got my talking down a lot less; I got them to do a lot more activities I thought. [...] So yeah, I think I tried to fix everything he said to do.’

(Carl, PST: Interview visit 3)

This suggested that Carl’s thinking about teaching was limited; he did not see it as problematic or contested. For him it was simply a case of getting it right. When Richard did not provide him with a list of corrections, he became increasingly frustrated. Nyle on the other hand regarded Alex’s feedback as suggestions:

‘I’m going to give it a try [...]. At the moment every technique, every hint and tip I always try now to see what fits for me.’

(Nyle, PST: Interview visit 1)
Nyle attributed less importance to his tutor’s feedback than Carl, regarding learning to teach as a process of trial and error.

One of the influences of the tutors most frequently cited by the PSTs was their understanding of the role of teachers in supporting pupils’ learning. This made a significant impression on Nyle who thought that Alex’s advice about ‘getting in and challenging the kids during the main task’ was revelatory and was something he claimed that he ‘started using it a lot’ (Nyle, PST: Interview visit 3). Angela was the most definite about the impact of her tutor visits, believing they had had a significant impact on her progress. The second visit had been particularly challenging, but she thought it had given her:

‘...a kick up the backside [...] If I am getting too much positive feedback from the department, then that brought it home that this is not playing teaching; they’ve [pupils] actually got to learn something...’

(Angela, PST: Interview visit 2)

These two examples are significantly different however. Whilst Nyle’s thinking about the role of the teacher had been progressed, Diane had succeeded in challenging Angela to
move off the plateau she had reached in her progress. For Angela this had been a far more uncomfortable event.

3. Deficits

Whilst most of the PSTs thought they had benefited in some way from their tutor’s visits, most identified issues that they felt had been missing or not addressed. Toby was surprised that Clare had not made more links between practice and theory; something he had wanted from the outset:

‘[Clare] knows everything that I have been taught about teaching in a formal way, and there wasn’t really much link back to that. [...] It wasn’t quite the distinction between the academic content of teaching and how it is on the ground [that] you might expect…’

(Toby, PST: Interview visit 1)

Carl wanted more challenging, critical feedback. He also felt that he was not making sufficient progress and was ‘picking up all these bad habits’ because of a lack of challenge from the school. His frustration was confirmed through the interview and this had a significant impact on his view of the second visit.
The two most frequently mentioned deficit issues related to confusion and not understanding how to make changes. Several PSTs talked about the confusion they felt when teachers’ feedback conflicted with that from the tutor. The problem arose when the PST was established in the school and viewed by school staff as a teacher. This meant that the tutor was challenging the PST at the point when teachers were not. In Toby’s case, it left him with ‘no idea about how I am doing’ and wondering ‘where am I at with my teaching?’ (Toby, PST: Interview visit 2). Angela was also felt ‘stuck in the middle’ because ‘Diane was saying both in the meeting and afterwards that the feedback [from the school] is not good enough’ (Angela, PST: Interview visit 2). Richard had left Carl with some very specific advice about the structure of lessons, which Carl had tried to implement. However, he was frustrated by the contradictory feedback he subsequently received from the teacher:

‘I really took on board what [Richard] said and I kept it quite minimal and not too many things at once [...] but after a while the teacher told me ‘no, you just have to teach all of it...’

(Carl, PST: Interview visit 1)
Nyle also found that feedback conflicted after he implemented the changes suggested by his tutor, only to receive contradictory feedback from the teacher. Nyle’s reaction was to regard feedback as idiosyncratic and something he could pay attention to if it suited him:

‘[I know] in future what [Alex] says is what he wants, but what the mentor said when she assessed me on the other lesson is what they want. And then in-between times […] I’m going to do what I want.’

(Nyle, PST: Interview visit 1)

Most interesting was Nyle’s resolve to simply provide the observer with what he thought they wanted, but then carry on with his own way of doing things.

Although the majority of PSTs valued the discussions with their tutors, they were frustrated by not being helped to understand how apply ideas more widely. For example:

‘…translating that to other lessons I’m still struggling with, because they are obviously very different classes and different teachers […] I know what I have to do, but I don’t know how to do it.’

(Angela, PST: Interview visit 2)
This lack of understanding in how to apply feedback more widely was also cited by Carl. Whilst he believed the discussion had been helpful in corroborating his own evaluation, he was unsure as to how he could have approached the lesson in a less teacher-centred way:

‘I don’t remember getting any feedback about how I should have done that (been less teacher centred). I guess what I would have done [...] is just stay round and not really talked, but just watch pupils work and monitor it quietly and not say anything.’

(Carl, PST: Interview visit 2)

So whilst Carl accepted that the lesson had been too teacher-led, he did not have a secure conception of pupils-centred teaching and how to plan for it. Even when PSTs did not explicitly state that they did not understand how to achieve a target, their vague responses to probing questions suggested a lack of clarity:

‘He said to me what did I think about it and I said I just need to tighten everything up. And he said yeah, pretty much...’

(Nyle, PST: Interview visit 2)
It would appear that even though the tutors had the best of intentions, they were undermined by their assumptions that PSTs understood what they were advocating.

4. Distinctiveness of the tutor contribution

When PSTs were asked to compare the discussions they had with their tutor with those they had with their mentor, their responses indicated variation in the expertise of both. Several commented on the variable nature of teacher feedback. Angela and Karen noted the discussions with their tutors had examined issues in greater depth and probed their thinking more. Karen and Toby thought their tutors’ feedback had been more focused, supporting the tutors’ belief that this was a key difference between their feedback and that of mentors. The focus of teachers’ and tutors’ feedback was also picked up by Nyle and Toby who both thought their tutors had focused more on pupils’ learning than behaviour management.

Another difference identified by the PSTs, touched upon previously, was that tutors provided more constructively critical feedback than teachers, who they thought tended to be overly positive:

‘...I don’t feel that I get particularly helpful feedback from teachers that observe me. [...] I am getting observations saying that was a good lesson
when I don’t believe it was. I don’t find that information particularly helpful.’

(Toby, PST: Interview visit 2)

This supports tutors’ concerns that PSTs are not being challenged by mentors to progress from the plateau in their development when they are working comfortably in the school and looking and acting like teachers (Maynard & Furlong, 1995).

As well as challenging PSTs, tutors believed that they had a longer term, broader view of their development and that mentors are focused on the immediate, pragmatic details of teaching. Nyle, Carl and Angela all noted their tutor’s wider perspective and that they were not distracted by the details of the context, thereby supporting this view:

‘….teachers are more concerned about the individuals [...] in their own class [...]. [Diane] is better at that impartial outsider view of teaching, because you can get caught up in the ‘yes, he's a nice boy he's just a pain in the neck in the classroom’...whereas [Diane] can see it's because of [something] in your teaching.’

(Angela, PST: Interview visit 3)
Whilst Nyle valued Alex’s view as an outsider, his later expression of this decontextualized view as ‘best practice’ suggested his rejection of these ideas:

‘[Alex’s] discussions are much more practice-based – clinical almost [...] whereas in school with the mentor...we’re dealing with the day-to-day situation. [...] We only really talk about what we are going to do – not in the best practice, text book kind of way [...] like [Alex] does.’

(Nyle, PST: Interview visit 2)

Overall, although PSTs identified some differences between tutors’ and mentors’ practice, they did not perceive that their tutors contributed anything significantly distinctive to that of an experienced, expert mentor. Toby summed this up:

‘...what (Clare) gave was what any very experienced mentor would give, not something that was hugely distinct from that.’

(Toby, PST: Interview visit 1)

It was notable that Carl cited only very specific practical advice as helpful; the visits had not helped him to think more critically about teaching or change his approach. Carl was
not alone in wanting critical feedback however. Although the others valued the
reassurance provided by the tutor, all the PSTs except Rafid wanted critical feedback,
recognising its importance to their development. However, few thought they were
getting enough of this from teachers in school.

**Summary: development**

In the development of the PSTs, tutors drew on their professional knowledge of teaching,
pupils’ learning and PST development. The latter was central to their decision-making and
deployment of strategies to differentiate their practice, such as the level of challenge and
when to encourage autonomy in their own decisions. The tutors generalised conceptions
of PSTs as learners and clear ideas about the nature of the progression expected,
informed the evidence they sought to gauge the PST’s progress. However, knowledge of
the PST as individual was also important to the success of the differentiation to their
practice. Diane and Jenny were particularly successful and had concern for knowing what
the PSTs concerns were and what they were thinking. Richard however was not aware of
Carl’s concerns and needs and was not as successful in influencing Carl.

The tutors’ principles of practice revealed their orientation to PSTs as learners and
conception of their role as HE-based teacher educators. Jenny and Diane had principles
for development that revolved around capacity building of PSTs in terms of ownership of
learning and empowerment through development of thinking skills. Alan and Alex were
more focused on developing teaching skills. These principles led to practices that were PST-centred or teaching-centred. The PST-centred strategies, such as getting them to talk, focusing on the reasons behind their actions and helping them identify the strengths and areas for development themselves were characterised by getting something from the PST. Strategies that stemmed from a focus on teaching were characterised by giving something to the PST. These included such things as modelling actions, providing a different perspective on the lesson, giving direction if needed, unpacking of events and giving feedback. All tutors used a mixture of strategies, but even those with PST-centred goals who focused on the development of higher skills such as analysis and critical evaluation, provided the PSTs with concrete, practical advice. This suggests tutors’ knowledge of teaching and previous teacher identities were powerful influences.

A summary of characteristics, behaviours practices and motivations associated with each position is provided in Table 3.
**Table 3: Summary of PST-centred and teaching-centred characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Teaching-centred</th>
<th>PST-centred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals / aims / intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for ITE</td>
<td>Develop effective science teachers</td>
<td>Develop teachers with skills for life-long learning (capacity building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- in relation to visit</td>
<td>For PST to know how to improve teaching</td>
<td>For PST to recognise own personal and professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- in relation to PST</td>
<td>To help PST evaluate teaching</td>
<td>For PST to articulate thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of PSTs</td>
<td>As potential science teachers</td>
<td>As learners, developing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of practice</td>
<td>Tutor ownership of professional development</td>
<td>PST ownership of professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behind PST learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to PST</td>
<td>Professional, expert advisor, teacher</td>
<td>Rapport, critical friend, supporter of developing professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of transactions</td>
<td>Gives information to PST</td>
<td>Seeks information from PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with PST</td>
<td>Meets PST on tutor terms</td>
<td>Meets PST on PST’s terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not interested in listening to PST; closes PST talking down</td>
<td>Listens to PST, uses strategies to promote PST talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ignores PST agenda</td>
<td>Responds to PST’s agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor does most talking</td>
<td>PST does most talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PST receiver of information</td>
<td>PST as active participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutor assesses evidence</td>
<td>Joint consideration of evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How tutors talked about their practice revealed different images of PSTs as learners. These included images of PSTs as inexpert teachers deficient in skills, as developing teachers making progress with their professional development, as potential teachers of a specific kind, as like junior colleagues, as autonomous learners or as needing direction and to listen to advice. The tutors’ backgrounds and views of science teaching influenced their images. Diane’s image of PSTs as junior member of her department stemmed from her relatively recent experience in school. Jenny’s images of PSTs, as developing teachers, learning and working on improving their practice, were rooted in her research and ethos of the HEI. Clare’s image of PSTs was also influenced by her research background, as she viewed them as developing creators of knowledge through becoming active researchers of practice, as well as novice teachers. The ways in which Richard, Alan and Alex talked about the PSTs indicated all images of PSTs as inexpert teachers. Alex’s images of science
teaching were particularly strong. He had a strong vision for science teaching based on enthusing pupils and active, participatory learning. He was particularly critical of the sort of science teaching he was finding in schools. It was this that was at the heart of focusing the visits on developing Nyle’s teaching.

An important principle of practice, and one valued by the PSTs, was focusing discussions on the priorities for development. Tutors’ external position appeared to be important in this, as PSTs recognised that the tutor was not too close to the school context. They also valued the tutor’s generalised knowledge of teaching, which had been developed through their experience as teachers as well as the theory gained through their work in the HEI. This appeared to one in which tutors were more expert than most mentors. However, although the tutors had different aims, principles and images, they were all drawn into discussion of practical teaching and gave the PSTs ideas on teaching strategies based on their own experience. This, along with the PSTs feedback, suggests that their role was not significantly different to that of the mentor, even though they constructed a subtly different view through assertions such as having a broader, longer-term view. Although several voiced one purpose of the visits was to help the PSTs make links between the work in the HEI and practice in school, only Diane and Jenny referred to ideas from the university sessions explicitly. Although theory was implicitly embedded in their advice to PSTs, such as through focusing on pupil-centred teaching, they did not advocate ambitious teaching approaches. Instead, they tended to focus on manageable ways that
the lesson could have been improved. When tutors were critical of the worth of a lesson set by the school or the approach taken by the PST, the outcomes were not always congruent with their aims. For example, Richard’s critique Carl’s very teacher-centred lesson did not help him to understand how to develop a more pupil-centred approach. In this way, some practices undermined tutors’ overall goals and aims.

4.3 The theme of management

The tutor visits followed a traditional model focused on the PST. Typically, visits lasted two to three hours. All visits involved an observation of a lesson, which was followed by a discussion. All the tutors wanted to talk to the mentor, but there were several occasions when this was not possible. Contact with mentor was very varied, ranging from very cursory to substantial tripartite discussions. The tutors used subtle management practices to ensure their goals for the visit were not undermined and to influence the mentor’s practice and expectations.

All tutors found managing the visits challenging due to their unpredictable nature and had to be flexible and opportunistic. There were some common patterns in tutors’ management practices, but some significant differences that were linked to their principles and rules of practice (Elbaz, 1981, 1983). All but one of the tutors talked to the PST prior to observing the lesson to find out about the background context, such as the
nature of the class and the topic. Alex was the exception, preferring to have minimum contact with the PST at the beginning because he wanted Nyle ‘to be at ease’ and choosing not ‘to be questioning them, talking to them or deflecting them from what they need to be thinking about or organising’ (Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 2). Although the other tutors talked to the PSTs prior to the lesson, they were all conscious of allowing PSTs sufficient time and space to prepare for the lesson and avoiding unnerving them by focusing on the detail of the lesson planned.

The lesson observation was a major event in the visit and tutors managed it in similar ways, such as making themselves as inconspicuous as possible and making notes. However, limited use of the notes was made during the visit, as all preferred to leave them with the PST to read afterwards. Alan noted how his practice had changed:

‘When I first started [...] I would go through my notes and explain what I meant by each bit I'd written. [Now I pay] very little attention to what I've written, other than usually at the end of the conversation to say ‘so these are the strengths that I've picked out; these are the targets I'd like to set and this is the grade I'm giving it. Now take the comments and go and read them and make sense of them’.

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)
Richard and Jenny too reflected on how their practice had changed with regard to how they used their notes, paying relatively little attention to them now. Richard used them as an *aide memoir* and to ‘drive a conversation’ (Richard, Tutor: Interview visit 2). Jenny had reduced her written feedback, because she believed that PSTs did not read it. Instead, she preferred to ‘write three bullet points and a couple of things to think about’, considering this to be more effective (Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 2). The fact that tutors spent time writing the notes and sometimes word processed them afterwards suggests that some importance is attributed to these, which in conflict with how they talked about them. Neither did they find out on subsequent visits what sense PSTs had made of them or how helpful they had found them.

The discussion following the observation was usually conducted immediately afterwards and typically lasted between 12 and 50 minutes, partly because tutors wanted to keep the discussion focused and partly due to other tasks that needed to be done. Keeping the discussion brief was particularly important to Alex who limited feedback to about 15 minutes in order to ‘keep it really short and sharp and really focused in on what is the key thing that is going to make the biggest difference’ (Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 2). Tutors were also conscious of how pressured time was for teachers and mentors and didn’t want to take more time from them than was necessary. Not all of the tutors conducted tripartite discussions with the mentors however. Whilst this was aimed from by all the tutors, it was not always possible. For example, Alex did not hold tripartite discussions
with Nyle’s mentor on any of the visits. Clare only had the class teacher, rather than Toby’s mentor to join the discussion and Richard held two of the three discussions with Carl alone. Jenny and Diane were the exceptions in that all their visits had tripartite discussions involving the PST’s mentor, which reflected the strength of the course partnership model.

The lack of time was challenging because tutors wanted to accomplish several aims through the discussion, such as identifying the strengths, supporting the PST’s own evaluation and examining the less successful aspects. This meant that the management of the discussion was important to its success. For example, tutors wanted to avoid alienating the PST or undermine confidence during the discussion of the lesson. One way this was managed was though structuring the discussion so that the negative points were ‘sandwiched’ between the positives. Another tactic used was to quickly move on to future teaching and discuss alternative approaches.

The presence of the mentor in the discussion was also perceived as affecting its success and something that they had to manage. Whilst the tutors welcomed the presence of the mentor, they recognised that that their presence could have a significant and unpredictable impact. Occasionally, the mentor’s presence caused the tutor to reconsider what issues to discuss. For example, Jenny avoided talking about the pupils’ behaviour because of the difference between the PST’s and mentor’s expectations:
‘[PST] would like them quieter [...] she said that [mentor] puts up with much more low-level [noise]. So I never mentioned that [...] because I know [PST] can't honestly talk about it and I wouldn't want to undermine the mentor either.’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

Diane was also frustrated by the mentor’s expectations of pupils’ behaviour and felt it was not worth pursuing in the discussion because the mentor had already indicated that this aspect had been satisfactory (Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 2). Alan too avoided an issue he wanted to explore with Rafid because of a difference of opinion with the mentor:

‘I'd made the comment that it would be nice if they [pupils] just moved around a bit, and she [mentor] said ‘Oh, I’d never do that. Not with this class’. So I thought ‘oh, okay’. So clearly I'm going to fight the tide here....’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 3)

These instances revealed that avoidance was sometimes used in preference to confronting or discussing differences in opinion, particularly when they felt it would undermine the mentor or result in an argument that they could not win.
All tutors believed they led discussions and used various strategies to steer it. Alan for example, frustrated with one mentor’s contributions, chose not react to a point he made. Jenny let the mentor dictate the issues, but picked up on those that concurred with her own agenda. Likewise, Alan drew the mentor into the discussion when he felt they were in agreement:

‘...if it isn't [...] what we're talking about...I think maybe what I tend to do is draw on them less. Whereas if I get a sense that they [understand] the point I'm trying to make, I will bring them in.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

When the mentor acted in a way that was approved of, the tutor stepped back and supervised rather than led the discussion. An example of this was Jenny, who had two PSTs in the school, each having a different mentor. One mentor was experienced, but Karen’s mentor was not, resulting in Jenny actively leading the discussion in order to support her:

‘...(with) the first one (mentor), I can just sit back and listen [...] and I don't have to say very much [...] but the other one was much harder work [...] they don't talk as much. [...] it was just a few bullet points and
really exploring things was much more difficult. […] It was hard work. Otherwise it would have been all over in five minutes.’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 3)

In this instance, Jenny intervened to develop a more in-depth, reflective discussion in order to help Karen learn from the experience. On other occasions, the tutor closed the mentor or teacher down, believing their contributions were not helpful. Alan found the discussion with Rafid on his third visit particularly challenging due to the interventions of the Professional Tutor who had joined the discussion. He found he had to work hard to steer the discussion so it was helpful to Rafid:

‘This is my student! Give me back my student! […] I think I tend to try and pull back some control over the dialogue and agenda if the contribution from the mentor or [professional tutor] in this case [is not] actually helping the student.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 3)

Alan’s reference to ‘my student’ reflects his belief that PSTs ‘belong’ to the HEI and that he has prime responsibility for them; a belief shared by all the tutors. In part, this is driven by tutors’ lack of confidence in school staff to provide the support, challenge and
guidance needed. For example, tutors were aware that mentors sometimes had unrealistically high expectations of PSTs’ teaching, which might undermine confidence and progress. PSTs’ expectations also had to be managed to make them more realistic. Jenny used feigned surprise to manage the expectations of what Karen should be doing in school after she had heard that Karen was taking responsibility for teaching a number of lessons early in the placement:

‘...that was feigned surprise...to say, ‘What?! You've done that much already? [...] Because they all think they should be teaching masses and masses more and I'm always trying to rein them back...’

(Jenny, Tutor: Interview visit 1)

When the mentor was perceived as being over-critical, tutors were more active in managing the discussion. For example, Alan reflected that:

‘I'm conscious, from experience, of mentors who are overcritical in the early stages, [...] they sort of trip up that progress. [...] mentors often jump past all the good bits and want to [...] dissect the problems...’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1)
Alan’s concern that Rafid’s mentor was focusing on the more challenging aspects of teaching too early, and that this was having a negative impact on Rafid’s confidence, led him to take charge and ‘be quite disciplined in saying we’re not going do that yet - we’re going to start with the positive bits’ (Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 1). However, this had to be managed carefully in order to avoid alienating or demeaning the mentor. Diane’s achieved this by prompting the mentor to conduct the feedback as she would do normally. This, she explained later, ‘was saying in a nice way don’t forget that you ought to start without telling her off’ (Diane, Tutor: Interview visit 1). Other protective behaviours included ‘cajoling’ the mentor into using language that would help the PST (Clare, Tutor: Interview visit 1) and managing the completion of the report with the mentor by taking overly critical points made by the mentor and re-phrasing them more constructively, as Alan did:

‘...it would be things like turning a sort of deficit comment like, ‘you haven't’, ‘you didn't’, into ‘you need to’ and ‘this needs development next placement’. But also it just needed some positive points in there. It needed to recognise some of the successes that were evident.’

(A Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

Alan’s amelioration of the mentor’s contribution and the other management techniques deployed reveals the ways that tutors navigated the context of the school visits and
through this, indicated their underlying conceptions of their role. They had to assess situations rapidly and react to manage encounters in order to achieve their goals. There were instances when different goals were in conflict. For example, Clare explained that she did not want to pressurise the teacher or make her feel that she was taking over, which led to her deliberately holding herself back (Clare, Tutor: Interview visit 3). On this occasion maintaining the relationship with the school won over her development and support principles. In exceptional circumstances, when tutors were not prepared to sacrifice their principles, avoidance tactics were used. For example, on the second visit Jenny moved Karen (PST) to a different room to avoid the teacher attending the discussion because he had intervened in the lesson observed and undermined Karen’s authority. She was also concerned about the advice he had given the PST, which made his attendance at the discussion problematic. Alan too wanted time with Rafid by himself and managed the teachers by sending strong signals to ensure this happened:

‘...the mentor's with them five days a week, you know, they've got their turn; they can grab them at lunchtime and give them their feedback and I'll often say, you know, 'you're welcome to join us, but I'm happy for you to give your feedback at another time’, because I get just half an hour to do what I can to put things in a better place.’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 2)
Alan wanted time alone with Rafid to enable him to have a focused discussion without interruption. Although his motivation was primarily linked to support and development, it was reinforced by his sense of ownership of the PST and his lack of confidence ‘in the mentor to put these things right’ (Alan, Tutor: Interview 3). He thought he was ‘carrying that [discussion] more than I ought to be’. This shows how tutors’ practice is influenced by the context and can lead them into actions that they feel are not part of their role.

The tutors’ management practice sometimes had unintended consequences in terms of meeting the PST’s needs. Nyle wanted to talk at length about the lesson, which conflicted with Alex’s (tutor) practice of keeping the feedback focused and short. The result was that Alex became frustrated by Nyle’s need to talk, although he allowed him to do this initially:

‘...if I let him talk then he's got that out of his system and he's not going to go back to it and at least I can then pull him back and focus him on [...] what I want him to focus in on...’

(Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

This proved to be ineffective however, as Nyle’s need to talk did not diminish. On the third visit, Alex adopted stalling tactics to try to slow Nyle down so that he would ‘think things through that little bit more, without overthinking it’ (Alex, Tutor: Interview visit 3).
Another example occurred on Alan’s last visit to Rafid. By this time Rafid was struggling and all involved were concerned with his lack of progress. Alan wanted to time to confer with the mentor before holding the discussion and so managed the situation to give him the time he wanted:

‘[When] there could be problems, I normally invite the student to go and get a cup of coffee and take a break. [...] sometimes I think the mentors need an opportunity to talk with candour and say what they mean, rather than couch it in terms that protects the student. So it’s useful just to have [...] 15 minutes or so and then for the student to come back once you’ve got to the point where you’re in agreement…’

(Alan, Tutor: Interview visit 2)

Alan viewed this practice as allowing Rafid to collect his thoughts. However, Rafid was very stressed because he knew his mentor and tutor were discussing and assessing his lesson. Alan’s management of the situation in order to agree the assessment before sharing this with Rafid unintentionally excluded him and made the situation worse.
The PSTs' perceptions of management

The PSTs made few comments concerning the management of the visits, although Angela noted Diane’s disagreement with her mentor during the discussion of the lesson, and Karen had wondered why Jenny had avoided inviting the class teacher to the meeting. The only significant comments made by the PSTs about the management of the visits were those from Carl. He had particular expectations about the visits that stemmed from his hierarchical view of the partnership and the university tutor’s senior position. He became increasingly frustrated with the support he was getting from the school and had wanted to talk about his concerns to Richard on the second visit. However, he did not get the opportunity to talk alone with his tutor, leading to his wish for a more formal structure for the visits. The lack of opportunity to talk to his tutor on his own left him very frustrated and disillusioned.

Summary: management

The findings showed how tutors navigated the visit through their management practices. Their social knowledge and knowledge of the ‘the milieu of schools’ (Elbaz, 1981) was important to the success of their interactions with the school staff. The context affected which practices they deployed. For example, Jenny’s leading of the triad discussion with an inexperienced mentor, but being an observer in a discussion led by a more experienced, expert mentor.
The tutors’ goals and images of effective support and development of PSTs and principles of practice guided their decision-making (Elbaz, 1981). All had principles aimed at maintaining good relationships with mentors and PSTs. In addition, how tutors described the rationale behind some management actions revealed their ‘theories-of-action’ (Argyris, 2004). For example, Alan’s theory was that letting Nyle talk would ‘get it out of his system’.

The tutors voiced their management practices using terms and phrases such as ‘control’, ‘steer’, ‘ignore’, ‘avoid’, ‘transform’, ‘ameliorate’, ‘select’, ‘intervene’, ‘close down’, ‘cajole’, ‘feigning surprise’ ‘hold back’, and sending signals (e.g. You must be busy…). Much of their management practice was aimed at mentors. For example, Alex used a form he had designed to ensure the mentor focused assessment and feedback as he wanted, whilst Alan took control of the completion of a report. Mentors who were over-critical and threatened the confidence of the PST were closed down or avoided. Their practices also included avoiding potentially difficult conversations and opting out of battles that they felt they could not win. However, on some occasions this left the PST confused or frustrated, as they were unaware of the reasons behind their tutors’ actions.

These practices reflected tutors’ images of mentors as variable in terms of expertise, lacking confidence, having high or unreasonable expectations, as unconsciously competent or incompetent, over critical, too focused on lots of detail, limited by context situations.
and having the need to talk and dissect problems. Generally it was the tutors who led the discussions and believed themselves they had this role. The mentors tended to defer to the tutor, possibly due to the sense of ownership tutors had of PSTs. When mentors did not defer to tutors’ judgements (for example, Diane’s second visit to Angela) the tripartite discussion was tense and frustrating for all concerned.

A quality assurance role was not an obvious or strong feature of the tutors’ practice, even though several cited it was a goal of the visits. Although tutors were concerned with ensuring quality of provision by the schools, and had knowledge of the schools and the limitations of the placement, their main focus was the PST. There was no concerted focus on improving the quality of provision, although issues were noted when they became apparent.

4.4 Overview of findings

The key dimension to practice was development, as that was the underlying goal of the visits, even though there were differences between the tutors in terms of the nature of the goals and strategies used. The support practice was regarded as an important to achieving development goals. Both support and development required management practices. The management practices tutors employed also suggested their conception of the roles they fulfil and the nature of the partnership with schools. Perhaps most
significant is that the PSTs’ views support consideration of the tutors’ visits from the learners’ perspective, thus allowing for the tentative identification of knowledge and practices that could optimise the benefits of the visits to PSTs.

The PST data indicates that they valued the tutor visits and believe they benefited from the support and external perspective their tutors provided. In terms of support with teaching, the tutor’s contribution was most useful when it addressed their immediate needs or concerns. There is little evidence that tutors had a significant influence on PSTs’ subsequent practice, although success varied. These differences along with the PSTs’ views have pointed towards some issues that deserve further consideration.

Tutors used most of the time on their visits gathering evidence through observation, talking to teachers and examining the PST’s files and paperwork. Consequently, the PST’s spent relatively little of the time interacting with the tutor and their experience of the visit was largely as a passive participant. The analysis has shown how tutors supported PSTs, how they collected and used evidence to inform their decisions and identify priorities for improvement, and the strategies they used to develop them as teachers. Tutors’ practice was underpinned by clear aims and intentions, which were realised of through skilful deployment of a variety of management strategies. In the context of the visit, support, development and management practices were seen to be interconnected and woven together. Although similarities and commonalities were apparent across the
tutors, there were some important differences. These may in part be due to how the tutors responded to individual PST and school contexts. However, the data showed that tutors were governed by strongly held theories and principles of practice that are likely to extend beyond the individual case.
Chapter 5  Discussion

This study explored the practices and underpinning knowledge that tutors use during their visits to PSTs during school placements. It also sought to gain an insight into the nature and extent of the influence of these practices on the PSTs by examining their perceptions of how they benefited from the visits.

5.1 The theoretical framework

Through the process of template analysis, three key dimensions to the tutors’ school visit practice were identified: support, development and management. The concepts of practical knowledge (Elbaz, 1981; 1983, Clandinin, 1985; Fenstermacher, 1994) and theories-of-action (Argyris, 2004) provided a useful lens through which to view the knowledge that underpinned these three dimensions of practice. Elbaz (1981, 1983) identified three aspects to practical knowledge; content, orientation and structure. The ‘content’ of tutors’ knowledge (what is known) relates to what others have termed ‘professional knowledge’ (e.g. John, 2002; Lunenberg, 2002; Smith, 2005). The way in which tutors talked about their practice revealed the orientations of their practical knowledge. How knowledge was structured and used in practice was through what Elbaz (1981) termed ‘images’, rules of practice and practical principles. These principles were broad, encompassed their beliefs and guided their actions. The tutors’ ‘theories-of-action’ (Argyris, 2004) were more specific and deployed to help them achieve their goals and make sense of their actions. Figure 3 represents these different facets.
FIGURE 3: REPRESENTATION OF TUTORS’ PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE
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The tutors’ practical knowledge was seen to be multi-faceted and multi-dimensional, and it provided them with the basis for operating in schools. However, the tutors’ work in different and changing school contexts of which they have limited knowledge. They have to make rapid judgements and decisions based on the evidence they gather in what are often short periods of time. To accommodate this they use different facets of their practical knowledge to orientate their practice and make decisions in order to achieve their aims and over-arching goals.

Although practical knowledge, as conceived by Elbaz (1981, 1983) and Clandinin (1985) incorporates the practitioner’s personal values, ethics and moral codes, it does not set their actions in the wider context of their secondary order of practice (the HEI), their teacher educator identity, and their ‘intentionality’, which incorporates their explicit and tacit goals, aims and motivations. How these different elements combine in the context of the school visit to produce the observed practices is complex. Figure 4 attempts to represent the web of relationship between these elements and their practice on the school visits.
Figure 4: The professional self: a representation of the elements contributing to tutors’ practice
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As members of the HEI, tutors are influenced by the expectations, values, rules and procedures of that community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). It is therefore reasonable to expect that what tutors do on their visits will incorporate these institutional expectations. In addition, their practice is potentially influenced by how they conceive their role and their professional identity, for example as a teacher, teacher of teachers, academic or researcher (Swennen et al, 2010; Murray, 2014). This professional identity is constructed through their work in higher education and this is likely to have an impact on their goals and aims for teacher education (their intentionality). However, the literature suggests that development of their second order identity as an HE-based teacher educator is complex and can take time to develop from the first order identity as a teacher (Murray & Male, 2005). As consideration of identity is important in understanding their relationships with PSTs (Murray, 2014:7), identity must have an impact on their practice. Thus, operating in the school context, tutors’ practice embodies their identity, their conception of the role, their professional knowledge and their ‘intentionality’, which incorporate their personal governance (values, ethics, morals and motivations). The representations provided in Figures 3 and 4 inevitably oversimplifies what is a complex set of inter-relating knowledge, emotions, values and self-conceptions. However, this framework has the potential to support a better understanding of the practical knowledge underpinning tutors’ support, development and management practice.
5.2 Tutors’ practical professional knowledge

The three dimensions to tutors’ practice examined in Chapter 4 revealed the actions tutors took to support PSTs, promote their professional development and manage the visits. Their practice was underpinned by the professional practical knowledge and influenced by their goals and perceptions of their role. The findings supported Tzur’s (2001) notion of layered knowledge, which tutors gained through their experiences as learners, subject experts, mentors and tutors.

As what Murray et al. (2011) described as ‘second order practitioners’ (2011:263), the tutors’ experiences as teachers were in the past. Nevertheless, the knowledge gained through this ‘first order field’ experience (2011:263) was an important part of their practical knowledge as teacher educators. The tutors drew extensively on their knowledge of teaching, learners, practical matters and the ‘milieu of schools’ (Elbaz, 1981:49) in supporting PSTs’ analysis and evaluation of their teaching, as well as identifying the priorities for the development of their teaching. The tutors’ knowledge of what Elbaz (1981) described as the ‘milieu of schools’, along with their social knowledge, informed their management practices. Their second order knowledge as teacher educators consisted of understanding the nature of the experience of learning to teach and of PST development. This knowledge was central to their development and support practice, forming the basis for such actions as normalising the experience for PSTs and benchmarking their progress.
Although this study did not directly compare tutors’ practical knowledge with that of mentors, there are indications of distinctive differences in their professional knowledge, supporting the conclusions of others (Furlong, 2000; Tzur, 2001; John, 2002; Murray and Male 2005; Smith 2005). Their first order teacher knowledge has been transformed through their experience in the HE-based teacher educator role. Some of the tutors recognised that they had lost aspects of the practical knowledge they had as practising school teachers, such as the practical rules and routines. Most striking was the way in which tutors combined their practical knowledge of teaching with what they learned through their second order field activities, such as research, scholarship and supporting PSTs. In addition, being embedded in an institution that values criticality and research has provided the opportunity to reflect on their work as teachers from a different perspective. Through this, their teacher knowledge has been examined and made sense of, resulting in a particular perspective on teaching and the experience of PSTs. The distance from the first order field of practice results in de-contextualised understandings, whereas teachers’ knowledge is situated in the school context.

Tutors have developed their second order knowledge as teacher educators through their work in higher education and their experience of supporting PSTs working in different school contexts. Unlike school-based teacher educators (mentors), tutors have had the opportunity to develop complex, rich understandings of PSTs as learners from their point of view (Furlong, 2000). In particular, tutors’ knowledge of PST learning and development
may lead tutors to develop different ‘images’ of PSTs to those of mentors. This was apparent in their expectations of them as they progressed through the course. The fact that the tutors have supported many PSTs through their ITE year has given them experience on which to base generalisations. It was this categorisation that enabled them to predict issues, such as unrealistic expectations due to their previous background, and take action to prevent these becoming problematic. This aspect of tutors’ knowledge and their ability to use this in the support and development of PSTs, was missing from both Lunenberg’s (2002) list of competences and Smith’s (2005) features of the HE teacher educator’s professional expertise. This is potentially a significant difference between school-based and HE-based teacher educators.

It was tutors’ knowledge of schools and mentors that was used to navigate the school context, as revealed by the findings related to the theme of management. These management practices were well developed and deployed to maintain good relationships and support their goals. How this knowledge informs tutors’ practice on school visits has not been recognised by previous research (e.g. Haigh & Ward, 2004; Nguyen, 2009; Chambers and Armour, 2011). Neither do they feature in existing frameworks for teacher educator expertise (Lunenberg, 2002; Smith, 2005). The ways in which tutors managed the visits suggest that their relationships with teachers and mentors are more complex and nuanced than partnership agreements would suggest, something which is examined later in this chapter.
Elbaz (1981, 1983) conceptualised the ‘orientation’ of knowledge as how it is held; situational, personal, theoretical, social and experiential knowledge. These were nuanced and challenging to identify through the data. Therefore, in developing the framework in Figure 4, the orientation of knowledge was conceptualised as the nature and origin of the knowledge. An important component of the orientation of knowledge was its emotionality, which was closely aligned to ‘experiential’ knowledge (Elbaz, 1981). Whilst all had experiences as teachers, the tutors had experienced this differently. Alan for example had experienced some challenges, which made his images of teaching more negative than some of the other tutors; this affected his practice with the PST. Diane’s images of teaching on the other hand were more collegial, supportive and emotionally positive, leading her to look for this on her visits.

Through the interviews, which focused on specific events during the visit, tutors drew on their general principles to explain their actions. These revealed how they theorised teaching, PSTS and initial teacher education. They used this decontextualized knowledge to relate the particular events to the general knowledge in order to make sense of situations and diagnose issues. Formally acquired theoretical knowledge obtained through training did not appear to be significant in how tutors talked about their practice. When this was referred to, it was not always well connected to their practice, sometimes appearing to be overlaid rather than integrated. For example, tutors either cited training
as a source for starting the discussion of lesson positively or related it to their underlying principles of practice.

The tutors’ principles of practice were strongly linked to their theories of teaching and learning. Elbaz (1981) termed these ‘practical principles’ and described them as broad, ‘more inclusive’, and embodying ‘purpose in a deliberate and reflective way’ (Elbaz, 1981:61). Whilst these principles guided their actions and decisions, their ‘theories-of-action’ (Argyris, 2004) were what they used to achieve specific goals. These theories-of-action were deployed to solve achieve particular aims. For example, Alan’s theory of action was that letting Nyle talk would ‘get it out of his system’. Whilst there were similarities in their principles of practice, there were also fundamental differences that impacted on how they operated in school. A significant difference was the extent to which these were PST-centred. Some tutors expressed very strong PST-centred principles of practice, whilst others were more centred on teaching, as examined in detail in section 5.3.

The use of tutors’ practical knowledge was strongly evident through their ‘rules of practice’ (Elbaz, 1981:61). Rules governed how they managed the visits from the start, how they approached feedback and criticisms of the lesson and the nature of their written feedback and what use they made of it. Whilst there were similarities between the tutors, there were differences that stemmed from their conceptions of teaching and
learning to teach; their goals and intentions; and how they positioned themselves in relation to the PST and teachers. In this way they reflected their view of their role.

Although Elbaz presents the idea of ‘images of practice’ as how practical knowledge is used, these also seemed to be how tutors held knowledge. This relates to the idea of what Zanting et al (2003a) described as ‘patterns, scenes and procedures (2003a:198). The ‘images’ that tutors held about PSTs, ITE, mentors, schools, their subject and themselves as teacher educators were revealed by how they explained their practice through the metaphors they used and the experiences, values and beliefs that were embedded in how they talked (Elbaz, 1981; Clandinin, 1985). These images embodied tutors’ knowledge, values, how they saw their role and their identity. The knowledge they had gained through working with different PSTs enabled them to differentiate their images. These were used to tailor their practice to the particular PST, pre-empt issues and identify ways to support PSTs’ progress. In this way they helped the tutor make sense of what faced them.

5.3 Practice on visits

The different frameworks developed to capture teacher educators’ professional knowledge and skills (e.g. Lunenberg, 2002; Smith, 2005) suggest its elements, but not how they are used in practice. The competences for teacher educators derived by
Lunenberg (2002) included four extra facets needed by teacher educators in addition to teaching competence, all of which were found in this research. First, the tutors had knowledge and understanding of adult learners, reflected mainly by their approach to discussions and the personal relationships they developed. Another facet identified was being highly reflective in relation to their practice was also evident from the data. All tutors demonstrated a well-developed sense of themselves as practitioners and were aware of the rationale behind their decision making.

The second facet of being able to support reflective practice and critical thinking was also seen in the tutors’ practice. They believed these to be important, as found by Burton (1998) and Furlong (2000), and used strategies such as provocative questioning, presenting evidence and providing different perspectives to develop these skills in the PSTs. However, the reflection they promoted was predominantly low-level, framed within the practicality of managing teaching in the classroom. What was often absent was reflection on the ‘ethicality’ of practice, consisting of the ethics of pluralism, professionalism and caring (John, 2002). Tutors focused on implementation and practical issues, rather than critical reflection that questioned moral and ethical perspectives and which considered the problematic nature of context and values. This is perhaps not surprising. Tutors have to judge whether a PST would be receptive to such higher level reflection. A PST struggling to secure the basic skills of teaching is likely to reject attempts to engage them with such matters. Neither did the tutors want to risk undermining the
school or damaging their relationships with teachers. This supports the conclusions of Ellis et al (2011) and Hutchinson’s (2011) who found tutors’ spent time on relationship maintenance and focused on maintaining positive relationships with the PST and mentor. In addition, the PST has to continue to work in the particular school context. Critical reflection on practices in school could lead PSTs to be dismissive of other teachers or demoralised about their teaching. These issues present tutors with barriers to engaging PSTs in critical discussion about science education and school practices during the visits. Little wonder that they may choose to leave this to the safety of the university. In this way tutors appeared constrained by the school context, even though taking such critical conversations into school settings is where perhaps they are potentially most powerful (Hopper, 2001).

Avoidance of conflict may also be the reason why the tutors tended not to advocate more ambitious teaching approaches, but generally confined their advice to improving traditional approaches. Hallett (2010) suggested that ‘teacher educators are modelling how to ‘succeed’ in an externally regulated profession (2010:443). His argument was that external regulations lead tutors to validate methods of teaching that will be seen to be successful in that context, rather than methods that may give personal satisfaction but be viewed as ‘dissonant’ (Hallett, 2010: 443). Some of the tutors were very frustrated by the expectations teachers had of pupils and were critical of the teaching approaches into which the PSTs were being inducted. The advocacy of ambitious teaching approaches
however, was either not evident or tempered by what the tutors thought the teachers would tolerate. This was another way that they appeared constrained by the school context.

The fourth facet in Lunenberg’s (2001) framework relates to bridging the gap between theory and practice. Previous research concluded that tutors are focused on practical issues and do not help PSTs understand theory in relation to practice in school (e.g. Smith, 2000; Hutchinson, 2011). How the tutors in this study used their theoretical knowledge of teaching and learning during the visits was not always obvious, despite claiming they valued it and wanting to help PSTs make links between theory and practice in school. The tutors drew on knowledge derived from both theory and practice, similar to that reported by Burn (2006) who concluded that tutors’ suggestions were supported by literature and research. It was difficult to identify the sources of their ideas however, and their lack of explicit reference to theory and research may support the conclusion that tutors focus more on practical matters and are not significantly different from mentors in this way; a finding similar to that of Hutchinson (2011). However, use of theory may not be as straightforward as simply referring to it explicitly, as suggested by Burn’s (2006) findings.

Universities are associated with theory, whereas schools are associated with practice. The tutor is an outsider coming into the practical domain of the school, which raises a credibility issue for tutors. Explicit, repeated reference to theory in discussions in the
school context could lead to the tutor being regarded as someone who does not understand the reality of teaching. Tutors have to convince both PSTs and mentors of their teaching credibility, a phenomenon ‘commonly associated with teacher education’s perceived closeness to professional practice’ (Ellis et al, 2011:277). It is little wonder then that tutors offer practical advice as part of their contribution. They are in effect giving PSTs what they want, need and expect; to do otherwise may marginalise their influence further. This does not mean that theory was absent from the tutors’ discussions however. In most cases, the theory provided the lens through which they viewed lessons, how they chose the focus of conversations and framed questions and suggestions, supporting the conclusion by Burn (2006).

One facet of competence not identified by Lunenberg (2002) as needed by teacher educators is that of being able to differentiate their practice in order to meet the individual needs of the PST. The tutors’ practice was affected by the PST and the school context, so cannot therefore be assumed to be typical or representative. As only one PST for each tutor was recruited for this study, the full extent of tutors’ differentiation of practice is unknown. Developing a more detailed understanding of how tutors tailor their practice to the situation would require investigating how they supported different PSTs. However, indications of differentiation in their practice were observed, a finding supported by Fayne (2007). Tutors responded to the needs and characteristics of the PSTs. For example, emotional support was provided by all tutors, as found by Fayne
(2007) and Ellis (2011). However, their knowledge of the individual PST and their perceived needs informed the extent and nature of the support provided, as well as when to withdraw the emotional scaffolding and be more challenging. It was also experiential knowledge gained through tutoring many PSTs that they used to judge the approach needed. Differentiation in practice was also evidenced through their responses to the needs of the PSTs as they gained more confidence and developed as a teacher through the course. Most were concerned with securing basic teaching competence and confidence in the early stages and challenge and critical reflection were features of the later stages.

**Approaches to practice**

The tutors in this study were all science specialists and had a strong vision for the sort of science teaching they wanted to promote. A constructivist approach to teaching science was evident in the tutors’ content knowledge as teachers and all believed it important to effective science teaching. Like the science tutors in the study by Berry and Driel (2013) they focused PSTs on the pupils’ understandings of science concepts and promoted teaching for conceptual change. The constructivist approach to teaching and learning science was also an important part of the work carried out in the university. Berry and Driel (2013) argued that science teacher educators seeking to develop PSTs’ teaching in line with a constructivist approach should model the approaches advocated and purposefully highlight learning from experience. Whether the tutors’ espoused commitment to constructivist learning theory was supported by such strategies in the
university is not known, but little or no explicit reference was made to this during the visits. Although tutors alerted PSTs to pupils’ misconceptions and highlighted when this was a particular issue, generally there was very little discussion aimed at supporting PSTs’ understanding of how to respond to pupils’ misconceptions or consideration of approaches to teaching that may help pupils’ develop scientific understandings in the context of the lesson observed.

Although tutors promoted a constructivist approach to science teaching, the extent to which this approach was taken to PSTs’ learning varied according the context and their own goals and principles of practice. Practices that supported developing PSTs’ ideas about teaching through a constructivist approach included modelling the approaches advocated and acknowledging, developing and challenging PSTs’ perspectives (Loughran & Russell, 1997). The importance of understanding the PST’s views about teaching and learning was highlighted by Lunenberg (2002) and Loughran and Russell (1997) who argued that they hold significant views about the nature of teaching and learning and that ‘it is essential to meet them on their own terms’ (1997:164). Tzur (2001) too noted that his attempts to simply give one PST his ideas were unsuccessful, because he had not considered the understandings the PST held about teaching and learning and how this impacted on his ability to make sense of the new ideas. Evidence from this study supports this contention, as in two cases, attempting to ignore the PST’s agenda resulted in a barrier to learning. There were also instances where the PSTs agreed with criticisms, but
did not understand what it meant in practice or how to implement the suggested changes. This resulted in what might be described as a ‘learning dead-end’, and an opportunity for growth was lost due to the tutor’s assumptions.

Most of the tutor’s had clear overarching goals for PST development and aims for the visit. All tutors shared a similar vision for the science teachers they wanted to develop, and expressed similar concerns about the quality of science teaching in school to those given by the science tutors in the study by Berry and Driel (2013). A strong, underlying motivation for the tutors was to improve the quality of science teaching and therefore the pupils’ experience of science in school. For some tutors, their goal to develop science teachers they regarded as most effective was their primary motivation and underpinned how they approached the visits and what they focused upon. These tutors were more teaching orientated and tended make teaching the object for improvement. The goals of other tutors were focused on improvement of the PST as a professional, such as promoting their skills of evaluation and critical thinking and empowering them as autonomous learners. It would be unjust and over-simplistic to imply that the tutors were either PST-centred or teaching-centred in their position however, as the tutors used practices from both in response to the situation and context. However, there were trends in tutors’ practices that placed them along a continuum ranging from highly PST-centred to highly teaching-centred. The tutors with very strong PST-centred goals focused on developing their skills, empowering them to be active participants in their own learning
and helping them to recognise their own growth and development. They aimed to support PSTs to articulate their thinking and think critically about science education. This was identified by John (2002) as ‘Intentionality’, which described tutors’ goals to improve PSTs’ decision-making and professional judgement. The tutors in this study sought to develop PSTs’ ability to interrogate the decisions made in planning and focused them on the evidence behind their assertions to a lesser or greater extent.

Written feedback

All tutors left the PSTs with written feedback on their lessons as part of their routine practice, but none used it extensively in the subsequent discussions, leaving it for PSTs to make sense of it after the visit. However, the PSTs did not appear to value it, as most did not read it, or if they did could not remember the key points. This might suggest that tutor feedback is not important to PSTs, as found by Caires and Almeida (2007). The findings from this study though revealed a mixed picture, as PSTs repeatedly cited tutors’ feedback as useful. How written feedback was regarded however may be an indication that PSTs valued the opportunity to talk about their teaching, rather than the tutor’s judgements. This suggests that feedback has a counselling element that helps the PST make sense of the experience, which was even more valued when the experience had been unsatisfactory. Written feedback however does not appear to provide what PSTs need or want. This leads to questions about its purpose and how tutors can use it effectively to achieve their goals, as the evidence from this study suggests that it is under-utilised and opportunities are being lost.
Continuity

Another missing element to tutors’ practice was a sense of continuity between the visits. Although tutors had a strong sense of progression in terms of their expectations of PSTs, how they built on previous visits was unclear. Preparation was often minimal in terms of reviewing previous feedback and targets. Therefore, each visit appeared to be a separate event, even though tutors knew the PST and the issues with which they were dealing. As tutors are visiting infrequently, there is an opportunity for them to gauge the impact of the previous visit, For example, they might examine how the PST made sense of and acted on the advice and feedback, assess their progress in achieving targets set, and discuss any issues they had experienced, as implementation was often problematic for PSTs. When a rationale was given for not doing this, it was linked to approaching the visit without prejudice and recognising that the PST would have learned a great deal. Even though the most PST-centred tutors were interested in the PST’s view of their progress, the absence of such conversations left them unaware of the difficulties the PST had faced following the visit and their feelings of confusion when advice conflicted with teachers’ direction. This meant that an opportunity to explore the tensions was lost. They also missed finding out what the PST had gained from the previous visit and therefore a potential source of information on which to inform reflection on their own practice.
5.4 Tutors’ contribution and influence

The tutor visit is both significant and insignificant. Viewed as a part of PSTs’ experience on the PGCE course as a whole, their visits constitute a small fraction of the total time. When contrasted with the time PSTs spend with the mentor and other teachers in the placement school, the time the tutor spends with them appears even more insignificant. In addition, the PSTs perceive that it is the teachers that they have to convince of their ability to teach effectively, potentially reducing the significance of the tutor visit still further. Any expectations that tutors have regarding their contribution to PSTs’ development seem hopeful at best. However, despite the doubts and uncertainties surrounding tutors’ influence (John, 2001; Capel, 2003), the findings suggest that the tutor visit has the potential to be significant for PSTs, supporting John’s (2001) assertion that the ‘supervisory’ process is potentially an important learning event (2001:154). Certainly the PSTs in this study attached importance to the visits, as revealed by the anxiety most experienced and the increased time spent preparing. This was not simply due to the tutor’s assessment role, as their desire for feedback suggests that they were comfortable with the potentially incompatible assessment and support roles of the tutor (Copland, 2010; Buhagiar, 2012). Most of the PSTs felt they benefited from their tutor’s visits and looked forward to them.

There was significant variation in the PSTs’ perceptions of the benefits and influence of the visits, as found by Graber, (1995). The different perspectives are likely to be due to a
complex interaction of different factors and caution has to be taken to attributing
influence. Pre-service teachers are subject to many sources of influence and PSTs’
awareness of how these have been influential will vary (McNamara, 1995; Capel, 2003). In
addition, what is meant by ‘influence’ requires careful consideration. Previous studies
such as John’s (2001) concluding that tutors have little or no influence were focused on
the impact on PSTs’ practice. However, influence also encompasses changes in thinking,
beliefs, knowledge, attitudes and self-concept, which may not be realised in practice until
the PST has developed basic skills and confidence. Such influence must also be
distinguished from other contributions made by the tutor, which may be transitory but
nevertheless important to the PST’s long-term development as a teacher.

Benefits of the visits
The PSTs reported that they had benefited from the visits in terms of the emotional
support provided, gaining an external perspective on their progress, validation and
affirmation of their teaching skills, and having a different space in which to think critically,
which reflects the findings of others (Fayne 2007; Caires & Almeida, 2007; Hobson et al,
2009). Learning to teach is challenging and emotionally demanding (Hobson et al, 2009).
The demand is exacerbated by the position of the PST as a peripheral member of the
school community (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which may explain why the PSTs valued the
emotional support tutors provided, particularly early in the placements. The counselling
elements of practice were important to those with high levels of anxiety or low
confidence, but the value that PSTs placed on the tutors’ normalising of their progress
and experience confirms the findings of others (e.g. McNamara, 1995; Buhagiar, 2012). The external position of the tutor is an important factor, as evidence from the PSTs showed that they valued their tutor’s external, context independent perspective on their teaching, as concluded by others (McNamara, 1995; Furlong, 2000). The PSTs’ perceptions of their tutors as experts in the teaching of science as well as in ITE, contributed to the value they placed on their tutors’ assessments of them as teachers. It also suggests that the tutor is perceived by PSTs as having a higher status than the mentor.

**Influences on thinking and practice**

Although it was beyond the scope of this study to explore the impact of the tutors’ visits on PSTs’ practice, the PSTs’ interpretations of their tutors’ advice and feedback provided a proximate indicator of the contribution made to their practical teaching. McNamara (1995) concluded from his study that what PSTs taught (content) was determined by the school, but that tutors had some influence over how PSTs taught. The PST’s teaching was not directly observed in this study with the exception of the lessons observed by the tutor, which may have not been representative of their teaching. Neither was their planning examined in terms of the sources of ideas. It is therefore not possible to draw definite conclusions about the extent to which the tutors influenced the PSTs’ teaching skills or how they taught. However, the PSTs’ intentions following the visits tended to be vague and there were several instances where the PST did not understand how to implement their tutors’ advice in the wider context of their teaching. This suggests support for the conclusions of others that tutors have little influence on their practice.
(John, 2001; Capel, 2003). The PSTs’ responses do though support the findings of Fayne (2007) and Hobson et al (2009) that they value what they perceive as having clear practical utility in school such as specific strategies, approaches or activities that they can use immediately, as these were the aspects of the feedback they could recall and were most positively received.

Even though tutors may have little direct impact on the PSTs’ teaching, the data suggests that they can influence their development and thinking as teachers, supporting McNamara’s (1995) tentative conclusion that the tutor is potentially an important source of knowledge and influence during the school placement. Angela, for example, believed that her tutor had played an important role in her understanding of the outcomes of lessons and challenged her when this was needed. Other PST responses also suggested that tutors supported development of PSTs’ skills of analysis and evaluation, as well as providing a more useful critical perspective on their teaching. In addition, although this study did not aim to compare tutors’ practice with that of mentors, the findings from the PST data suggest that tutors focused the PSTs on pupils’ learning rather than behaviour management, a similar finding to that of Burn (2006). Perhaps most significantly, they paid attention to PSTs’ decision-making and planning, not just the observed outcomes, contrary to Hutchinson’s (2011) finding that tutors focused on the context of the lesson. This may point to a difference between the tutors in this study who were based in the HEI and the tutors in Hutchinson’s study that were part-time ‘itinerant’ tutors (Childs, 2013).
The tutors in this study were interested in the PST’s thinking and used their theoretical knowledge of how children learn when focusing PSTs on the purposes of their actions (Furlong, 2000).

The changes in PSTs’ perceptions of what their tutors offered through the visits over time reflected Caires and Almeida’s (2007) idea that their ‘evaluation grids’ were refined as they developed as teachers. As their confidence grew and their teacher identity developed, they were more likely to resist advice or argue against it; a successful outcome if the goal is to develop autonomous, critical thinkers. How tutors respond to PSTs however, appears to be important in the success of exchanges and the extent of their influence. Tutors who ignored the PST’s arguments were more likely to have their feedback dismissed.

Accounting for variation

The question arises as to what lies behind the variation in tutors’ success, as defined by the readiness of PSTs to engage with ideas and see the visits as beneficial. It was not the aim of this study to identify effective practices, and generalising links between practice and PST outcomes based on such a small highly individual sample is unreliable. However, examining these differences may provide an indication of how the potential of the experience in school may be optimised (Caires & Almeida, 2007). Evidence from Graber’s (1995) study suggested that the personal qualities and idiosyncrasies of the individual
tutors were significant, including their personal skills and dispositions. Another factor identified by Caires and Almeida (2007) was knowledge of which approach to use in different situations, which was seen in this study as the tutors tailored their approach to the PST. However, this may not be sufficient to explain the marked differences in success as revealed by this study. The PSTs’ characteristics, view of learning and the school context are all likely to have a bearing on the extent to which the tutor influences a PST. In some cases, the PST may be beyond the reach of even the most expert and dedicated tutor. For example, Rafid’s deep-seated insecurity and anxiety seemed to leave him impervious to his tutor’s attempts to support him. In this way, the PST’s emotional state, their expectations and views of teaching and learning act as filters to the tutors’ efforts. Therefore tutors need to be alert to these factors and differentiate their practice in order to respond to individual differences, as noted by others (e.g. Hopper, 2001).

Whilst all tutors contributed to the PST’s experience in school to some extent, two were notably more successful, supporting Graber’s (1995) assertion that the tutor has the potential to be an important factor in ‘shaping pre-service student beliefs’ (1995:157). By considering the tutors’ qualities and ways of working with the PSTs in conjunction with the views of the PSTs, it is possible to begin to identify, albeit tentatively, dimensions to practice that are needed for this potential to be realised. The evidence suggests that these centre on the tutor’s goals and intentions, the nature of tutor-PST relationship,
their approach to learning and general principles of practice, as well as their knowledge of PSTs as adult learners.

PST-centred vs teaching-centred approach

One apparently significant factor in the outcomes was the nature of the tutor’s overarching goals and aims for the visit. The tutors who were more teaching-centred in their goals appeared to be less successful at influencing PSTs than those whose goals were aligned with a constructivist, PST-centred approach, focused on the personal development of the PST (see section 5.3). No matter what goals tutors had, all used a constructivist approach to developing the PST’s thinking and practice to some extent, but this alone did not determine their success in terms of how PSTs responded. Simply challenging their ideas with evidence from the lesson, providing different perspectives or suggesting alternative approaches was not sufficient. The most successful tutors put greater emphasis on eliciting knowledge (e.g. ideas, evaluations, current thinking) from the PST rather than conferring knowledge (e.g. advice, instructions, direction) on them. A feature of these PST-centred exchanges was listening to their ideas, rather than on persuading them to take a particular course of action. In these instances, the focus of the discussions was jointly determined by the PST and tutor, with the tutor detecting concerns and reassuring and supporting the PST’s development where necessary.
A significant aspect of a PST-centred approach that appeared to have the most influence was knowledge of the PST as an individual, including knowledge of their personal circumstances, concerns about their teaching, as well as their needs and expectations in connection with the course and learning to teach. This knowledge was behind the differentiation in tutors’ practice and how they decided on the approach to take during the visits. When the filters of PST’s views, needs and expectations are not known or taken into account early on, it may become increasingly difficult for the tutor to have an influence or successful exchange with the PST. This was seen clearly in one case in which the PST’s personal agenda dominated his thinking to the exclusion of all else, reducing his openness to his tutor’s ideas. The benefits derived by two other PSTs were also possibly compromised because their tutors did not adopt the approach they had expected and wanted, which in one case led to frustration and disillusionment.

Tutors who focused on developing the PST’s teaching skills were more likely to focus on teaching actions and practicalities than on the PST’s needs or current thinking. Advocating a particular view of teaching, even one recognised as good practice and supported by research evidence, may mean that PSTs are not supported to construct themselves as teachers and reconcile the different views of teaching they encounter. When the tutor’s views conflict with those of the teachers, it is not surprising that the PST may reject both in favour of what he or she believes, as was found in this research. The findings from the PST interviews therefore support the conclusions of other studies that teacher educators
need to listen to PSTs and assist them in examining and challenging the beliefs and assumptions behind educational practice (Zeichner, 1992; Fayne, 2007; Hobson et al, 2009).

**Relationships**

Knowing the PST and taking account of their existing beliefs and ideas is not sufficient to optimise the potential for influence however. Also required is a relationship based on mutual respect and trust, something also found to be important by Caires and Almeida (2007). The relationship needs to be one that provides a safe space for PSTs; one that allows them to be vulnerable; admit difficulties, ask questions, explore and express ideas and share their failings as they see them (Fayne, 2007; Caires & Almeida, 2007; Hobson et al, 2009). Without such a relationship, PSTs are liable to be defensive and view their tutor as someone to impress, rather than as someone who can support their learning, thereby reducing opportunities for growth and influence. Developing such a relationship is challenging for tutors due to the infrequency of visits, the number of PSTs they tutor and the pressure on their time. Considerable effort is needed to establish and maintain such relationships and tutors in this study varied in the degree to which they paid attention to ‘relationship maintenance’ (Ellis et al, 2011). The tutors paying most attention this also provided the highest levels of emotional support, emphasising the need to listen to PSTs. This supports Fayne’s (2007) contention that emotional support entails being a good listener and showing empathy and is an important part of building good relationships with PSTs.
Another important part of building a successful relationship is the stance adopted by the tutor. It was beyond the scope of this study to carry out a full transactional analysis of the interactions between the tutors and PSTs, but the most successful tutors in this study viewed and interacted with the PST as a capable adult learner who had expertise to bring to the teaching role, for example through knowledge of their subject or previous work experience. They adopted the position of supporter, interested observer and critical friend who challenged as their confidence grew. Less successful it seemed were those tutors who adopted the role of an expert with knowledge to impart to a novice.

The importance of challenge

The PSTs in this study all valued the critical feedback and challenge provided by the tutors, confirming the findings of Buhagiar (2012). Challenge was a crucial aspect of influential practice, but had to be carefully judged in terms of timing and nature. Without challenge the tutor’s influence was low. If it was too demanding or seen as irrelevant by the PST, the challenge was either not met or rejected. Therefore the challenge has to be regarded as both important and within reach by the PST.

The manner in which the tutors challenged the PSTs in this study affected how it was received and whether the PST learned from it. Hobson et al (2009) noted that an overly critical approach was not helpful. Such an approach may be perceived as an attack, resulting in the PST adopting a defensive position, rather than learning from the
exchange; what John (2001) termed as a ‘learning bind’ (2001:163). This was something that all of the tutors were conscious of and took steps to avoid. In order to avoid this situation tutors need to prevent setting up the encounter as what John calls a ‘win or lose game’ (2001:163). The tutors in this study did this by trying to avoid being judgemental about the PST as a person or as a teacher; an approach advocated by Loughran and Russell (1997). The most successful strategies were those that led the PST to form their own conclusions, for example by presenting evidence from the lesson and using questions to help them think more critically, adding yet more weight to the argument for PST-centred practice.

Whilst the ‘learning bind’ was not a feature of the majority of the tutor-PST exchanges in this study, there were elements in one case. This resulted in the PST deciding to do what he wanted to when his tutor was not observing him; in other words, he ‘played the game’. However, avoiding the learning bind was not simply avoiding criticism of the PST’s teaching. Indeed, the evidence supports other findings that show PSTs need and want feedback that will help them to improve (Buhagiar, 2012). There is also variation in what PSTs want and expect in terms of critical feedback, as was the case in this study. If this is an expectation and a need, taking an over-supportive approach may also be detrimental, despite the good intentions of the tutor. It cannot be known whether a learning bind would have resulted if the tutor of the PST wanting a critical approach had provided this,
but it adds weight to the argument that tutors need to know the PST and tailor their approach accordingly.

There were occasions when the tutors provided direct criticism. When this was given, it was done in a way that invited the PST to respond in terms of how they felt about the criticism. It was also embedded in the positive aspects of the lesson and quickly followed by examining possible ways forward. Advice presented as possibilities and the deliberation of the plausibility of alternatives was accepted more readily by the PSTs than ideas presented as uncontested knowledge or wisdom from an expert. Through consideration of the choices of future action with the tutor and mutual goal setting as advocated by John (2001), the PST is able to have some ownership of his or her next steps, resulting in the likelihood of greater commitment to them. If the next steps are simply imposed on the PST they are more likely to be ignored or result in superficial acceptance with little or no commitment to implement in practice, as was found in this study.

**Overview of influence**

There is little doubt that tutors’ knowledge and experience is of potential value to both PSTs and mentors. There is some evidence that their goals and intentions, in conjunction with how they use their knowledge, affect the influence they have and how PSTs benefit from the visits. However, the extent and nature of tutors’ influence remains unclear. The
evidence from this study must be treated with caution, as what PSTs reported as significant were only their impressions. The school context is likely to affect what and how PSTs teach and the tutor’s influence might be subtle (McNamara, 1995; Caires & Almeida, 2007). In addition, the extent to which PSTs are fully aware of the tutor’s influence is questionable. Their influence on PSTs’ thinking, cognitive skills, confidence and risk taking may not be recognised. Likewise, precisely what contributes to one tutor being more influential than another is not easy to determine. The long-term influence of tutors is even more difficult to ascertain, as their contribution becomes incorporated with other sources of influence. However, the ideas and ways of thinking about teaching and learning provided by the tutor during this formative period may contribute to the foundation for their future development, only to emerge in practice once their identity as a teacher is more firmly established.

5.5 Roles, responsibilities and partnership

Previous research identified several potential roles and responsibilities for the HE tutor in ITE. The roles fulfilled by tutors on school visits in this study were revealed by their images of and practice with the PSTs and the mentor.
Emotional support role

The findings confirm previous research that the tutor roles of advocate and supporter are regarded as important by PSTs (William & Soares, 2001; Caires & Almeida, 2007). Tutors’ knowledge of the development of PSTs and the potentially difficult transitions they experience, as described by Furlong (2000), means that they are well placed to provide targeted support. This is particularly in regard to experimenting and trying approaches they may see as risky. Furlong (2000) argued that supporting PSTs through these difficult transitions requires different strategies from those of the mentor. The tutors in this study did this through normalising the experience, by reassuring them of their typicality through benchmarking, and sharing their knowledge of PST development. This benchmarking role, which helps PSTs to understand what is typical and how the particular circumstances of the class or school are impacting on their development, was also found to be important by McNamara (1995). Tutors knowledge and external position gives them greater credibility with PSTs than the mentors. Mentors are not as well-placed to fulfil this role because they are embedded in the context and less likely to have such a well-developed and rich understanding of PST development, particularly from an experiential perspective. Even with this knowledge, mentors may find that their day-to-day contact with the PST reduces their ability to detect the stages and transitions the PST goes through and gauge its typicality. They are more likely to be concerned with day-to-practical matters and monitoring the progress of pupils taught by the PST.
Other strategies used by the tutors were not overtly aimed at supporting difficult transitions, but tutors were conscious of the stages that PSTs go through and tailored their expectations and practices accordingly. There was evidence through the findings on managing that mentors may have unrealistic expectations of PSTs. Tutors’ awareness of this led to them managing discussions in order to reduce what they perceived as potential damage to the PST’s confidence. They also focused the PSTs on their progress, rather than simply giving feedback on lessons and setting new targets. In this way they provided support through developing PSTs’ metacognition, helping them to stand back from the pressures of the experience and take a longer view. In some cases, tutors helped the PST deal with the stresses of the placement, supporting the conclusion of Caires and Almeida (2007) that tutors play a key role in the PSTs’ ‘emotional balance’ and ‘survival’ at some of the critical moments in their beginning in the teaching profession (2007:25). Such support was not only provided during the visits, but also through counselling-type meetings in the university. The tutor is able to provide PSTs with a safe, neutral space when problems arise that they feel unable to share with their mentor, which is an important role from the PST’s perspective. Pre-service teachers are not members of the school community, but work on the periphery of the school community (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This ‘guest status’ along with their subordinate position can leave PSTs feeling isolated and vulnerable, particularly if they have problems with the mentor or issues with progress that teachers cannot deal with.
A distinctive role

The finding by Caires and Almeida (2007) that PSTs valued their tutor’s contribution to their teaching experience is supported by this research. Despite this, and the fact that PSTs valued the external position of the tutors and their knowledge as teacher educators, they did not identify the tutor’s role as distinctive to that of the mentor. This adds weight to the conclusion that they operate as expert mentors and that there is little difference between the roles in practice (Hutchinson, 2011).

The prime role for HE in ITE identified in the literature is that of facilitator of the PSTs’ understanding of theory in relation to practice, as discussed earlier. Although tutors cited this as a potential role through bringing different ideas, perspectives and theoretical knowledge, and providing a space in which PSTs could question the sources of different ideas, this was not a strong feature of tutors’ practice in most cases. This contradicts Burn’s (2006) finding that tutors encouraged PSTs to be critical of sources of knowledge. Although the tutors in this study supported the PSTs’ critical evaluation of their teaching and practices in school, theoretical ideas were not examined critically in light of the school context. However, even though explicit references to theoretical knowledge were rare, tutors may have internalised such knowledge. The way in which the different types of knowledge were used in practice was not as discrete entities, but integrated with other forms of knowledge that make theoretical knowledge hard to identify.
Although tutors made few explicit references to theory, their knowledge of it guided their practice and informed their focus on pupils’ learning rather than management issues. An explicit understanding of pupils’ learning was noted by Furlong (2000) as being an important element of tutors’ knowledge, as teachers’ understanding are often tacitly held and not easily accessible. Nevertheless, even though theory may have been embedded in discussions, it was so implicit that PSTs did not recognise it and therefore they were not helped to understand it in relation to practice. Furlong (2000) identified helping PSTs understand the professional knowledge of teachers as an important roles for HE-based tutors. Even though tutors focused on learning, their focus tended to be on what pupils had learned and the evidence for this. Explicit understandings of how children learn were not made in the context of the visits to help PSTs link the theory to their practice, despite this being considered an important part of the university curriculum.

There was also some evidence from the PST data that tutors’ perspectives on teaching and learning to teach are different to those of mentors however. By stepping back from the primary field of practice, they have developed a broader perspective and recognise the complexity of teaching. Teachers may lose sight of this complexity, having routinized their practice as experienced practitioners. Tutors however, with their more distanced perspective and focus on the role, are better placed to analyse and articulate teachers’ practical knowledge, which is difficult for PSTs to access (Black & Halliwell, 2000; Zanting et al, 2003a). Accessing teachers’ practical knowledge has the potential to support PSTs’
learning (Haggar & McIntyre, 1992) and has an important part to play if they are not to be left to learn by simply replicating the practice they observe. Despite this however, such practice was not a strong feature of the tutors’ practice during the visits.

Another role frequently cited in the literature is that of quality assurance (for example, Davies & Ferguson, 1997; Field & Philpott, 1998; Hopper, 2001; Williams & Soares, 2002), but again this was not an obvious or strong feature of the tutors’ practice. Tutors were reluctant to bring issues and problems to the attention of the teachers, preferring to use a variety of management practices to ameliorate the worst effects, including providing additional support in the university. Chambers et al (2011) pointed out the importance of recognising the impact of conflict on learning, arguing that it may have a stifling effect on learning as PSTs are not fully integrated into the school. This may in part explain why tutors used more subtle and subversive practices, rather than confront issues directly. In addition, their time was limited and they wanted to avoid damaging relationships and placing the PST in a difficult situation.

Partnership in practice

Previous research on the nature of HEI-school partnership concluded that tutors can and should play a key role in ensuring PSTs derive the maximum benefit from their school placements by minimising the limitations and building on the opportunities they offer (Hopper, 2001; Ellis, 2011). To some extent the actions tutors took to improve the quality
of the PST’s experience, such as modelling the practices they wanted mentors to adopt and providing a space for PSTs’ critical reflection, are what Hopper (2001) identified as ‘minimising the limitations of school placements’ (2001:221). However, it is difficult to see how fulfilling this role to any great extent is possible given the tutors’ workloads, the infrequency of visits (three visits in 24 weeks of school-based experience) and pressures on their time, as found in this research. In addition, in most cases, the tutors did not have clear understanding of the nature of the partnership with schools and issues relating to partnership were not evident in their goals. Whilst they were interested in checking the support being provided, and offered PSTs support outside the school setting, the findings revealed that specific practices aimed at developing the partnership were not evident. Indeed, tutors avoided addressing issues with the school’s provision and support.

The PSTs’ perspectives on partnership were not explicitly probed, but indications of how they saw themselves within the partnership were revealed. Their choice of the HEI PGCE route and the time spent at the start of the course with their peers may result in a stronger affiliation to the HEI community than the school community, particularly at the start of placements. This sense of belonging may in part explain why PSTs rated the tutors’ approval more highly than that of their mentors. The PSTs’ feeling of belonging was reinforced by the tutors’ view that PSTs are their responsibility and reflected by their various management practices. It was therefore the tutor who had ultimate responsibility for the PST, despite the fact that mentors had the primary role in assessment. The
‘ownership’ of the PST by the tutor may also explain a finding by Hobson et al (2009) that PSTs on HEI courses are less likely to report good relationships with mentors than those on school-based routes. This suggests that PST remains the ‘piggy in the middle’ of uneasy partnerships between HEIs and schools.

The tutors’ images of mentors and their interactions with them also indicated their views and conceptions of partnership with schools. These images painted various views of mentors, including as variable, unreliable, unchallenging, over-critical and lacking expertise in developing PSTs into effective science teachers. Key to partnership is the ways in which tutors work with mentors. In most cases, the contact tutors had with mentors was mainly focused on gaining information about the PST. On some occasions the mentor was not able to spend any time with the tutor, or contact between them was very cursory. When mentors were part of the post-lesson discussions, the focus was on discussing the lesson and reviewing the PST’s progress. The pressure on teachers’ and tutors’ time, as well as the focus on the PST, understandably results in partnership issues not being a prime concern for either party. Therefore, collaboration was not a feature of most tutors’ practice; separatist and HEI-led practices dominated, in which tutors support and guide PSTs reflecting elements of the ‘old supervisory system’ (Burton, 1998:136).

Although the practices of the tutor revealed more positive relationships with the PSTs and mentors than this suggests, the relationship between mentors and tutors appears to remain an uneasy one. On the surface it is one of cooperation and mutual respect, but
Underlying this is, at best, indifference. At worst there is concern on the part of tutors that PSTs are observing mediocre or poor practitioners. In addition, in most cases the mentor and tutor operated separately. For example, mentors were often not part of discussions about the university work, such as assignments, even when these were based on practice in school. In the majority of cases, there was no dialogue that was genuinely exploratory in which all members of the triad shared perspectives and discussed different sources of knowledge. Rather, unspoken disagreements between mentors and tutors were carefully and skillfully avoided by the tutor, sometimes to conceal disagreement with the mentor in front of the PST. Indeed, the absence of the mentor from discussions, particularly one who might not be in full agreement with the tutor, was likely to be regarded as making the visits more straightforward. This leads to the conclusion that collaborative partnership may be too difficult to carry out in practice, due to the various constraints on those involved. The resulting impact of the tutor visit on partnership is difficult to measure, but any impact is likely to be serendipitous and dependent on the tutor rather than achieved by design.

5.6 Summary

Tutors occupy conflicting roles; they are both supportive counsellors, as well as assessors, monitors and overseers. They straddle the worlds of practical teachers and educational theorists. The findings reveal that their practical experience as teachers dominates their practice and that the constraints of time and context limit their contribution. Tutors do
however have the potential to have a significant role. Unlike mentors in school, who are often inexperienced and working with PSTs in the margins of their time, the PSTs are the tutors’ main focus. The tutors feel responsibility for them and work to secure good outcomes for them. Their external position affords PSTs with a different space to that provided by the mentor, who may be too close to the context to help PSTs deliberate its impact and challenge the status quo. Tutors’ knowledge and perspectives place them in a good position to be a conduit for theoretical perspectives on teaching, and help PSTs use different sources of knowledge to examine practice. However, PSTs do not perceive these links are being made, which leaves the theoretical knowledge located in the HEI. The question asked by Caires and Almeida (2007) was whether the ‘supervising figure’ is ‘really a key-element in the growth and learning of the prospective teachers, or is it "expendable"?’ (2007:525). Although the findings from this research present no definitive answers, they support Furlong’s (2000) contention that tutors do contribute something distinctive and have a role to play. They also indicate some successes, but also some points for growth.
Chapter 6  Conclusions

In this final chapter conclusions are drawn in relation to key aspects of the research. It begins by considering what has been learned, the new understandings that have emerged, and a discussion of the implications of these for policy and practice in Initial Teacher Education. It continues with a reflective critique of the research methodology, before key recommendations are made and further research suggested that will develop the understanding of the work of the HE teacher educator.

6.1 What has been learned?

This research has the potential to contribute to the wider debate about the place of higher education in ITE. It has done this by exploring the practical, professional knowledge of higher education teacher educators and how this is used in practice on their visits to PSTs. The qualitative approach taken resulted in rich data from which different perspectives and ideas emerged. The data and the approach to the analysis gave voice not only to the tutors, but also the PSTs. The tutors were confident and knowledgeable, but above all they were passionate about the teaching of science, pupils’ learning and working with PSTs. They revealed themselves to be reflective practitioners who had developed a profound respect for and understanding of educational theory, and its relationship to practice. The PSTs were enthusiastic about learning to teach and appreciative of their tutors, but their vulnerability, fears and frustration were evident through their words.
There were three research questions. The first asked:

*What practices do experienced science PGCE tutors use to achieve their goals when visiting PSTs on school placements and what does this suggest about their role?*

The analysis of the data from the in-depth interviews revealed key elements of their knowledge and the complex, multifaceted nature of their work and practice during school visits. Three key dimensions to the tutors’ practice on school visits were identified: support, development and management.

Emotional support was a key dimension of their practice, particularly in the early stages of the course. Support practices included reassuring through normalising the experience for PSTs and benchmarking their progress. Elaborate practices were used to protect PSTs self-esteem and confidence in the face of overly critical feedback on their teaching from teachers and mentors. Tutors also protected PSTs from mentors’ unrealistic expectations and those they perceived as being inappropriately critical. As the PST developed confidence and resilience, tutors’ emotional support was accompanied by a more challenging and critical approach.
Development practice included supporting PSTs’ critical thinking and evaluation through strategies such as provocative questioning, presenting evidence and providing different perspectives. However, the reflection they promoted was predominantly low-level, largely framed within the practicality of managing teaching in the classroom. Tutors focused on implementation and practical issues, rather than critical reflection that questioned moral and ethical perspectives and which considered the problematic nature of context and values. They tended not to advocate more ambitious teaching approaches, but generally confined their advice to improving traditional approaches. There was little explicit reference to theory and research in their discussions with PSTs, although the theory provided the lens through which they viewed lessons, how they chose the focus of conversations and framed questions and suggestions.

Tutors differentiated their practice in order to meet the individual needs of the PST and secure progress of the PST as they gained more confidence and developed as a teacher through the course. This was predominantly through becoming more challenging, interrogating the decisions made in planning and focusing the PST on the evidence behind their assertions. There were trends in their practices in terms of how PST-centred or teaching-centred they were. The tutors with very strong PST-centred goals focused on developing their skills, empowering them to be active participants in their own learning and helping them to recognise their own growth and development. The more teaching-
centred practices were focused on improving teaching and the associated practical matters.

All tutors left the PSTs with written feedback on their lessons as part of their routine practice, but none used it extensively in the subsequent discussions, leaving it for PSTs to make sense of it after the visit. This leads to questions about its purpose and how tutors can use it effectively to achieve their goals, as the evidence from this study suggests that it is under-utilised and opportunities are being lost.

The tutors’ management practices were used to achieve their aims for support and development, as well operate successfully in the school. Tutors managed the PSTs and mentors to ensure the outcomes they wanted from the discussions. They spent time on relationship maintenance and their practice was affected by maintaining a positive relationship with the mentor. Critical discussions were avoided with school staff and in this way they appeared constrained by the school context.

Tutors’ practices indicated the nature of the HEI-school partnership. The nature of the contact with mentors and discussions, along with the management practices used, suggest that separatist and HEI-led models of partnership dominate tutor visits. From the
tutors’ perspective, ownership of the PST resides firmly with the HEI, indicating that the HEI stills leads the process of ITE.

The second research question asked:

*What knowledge underpins tutors’ practice during the school placement visits to PSTs?*

Tutors’ practice stemmed from their practical knowledge, identity, conception of the role, intentionality (aims and goals) personal governance (values, ethics and motivations), which were filtered through the school context. The interconnectedness of the different aspects of their professional practical knowledge was apparent. The tutors’ knowledge was used as images and principles of practice, which were the basis of their decision-making.

The tutors’ knowledge of school communities along with social knowledge, informed the management practices they used to navigate the visit in the school context. They drew extensively on their personal knowledge and experience of teaching and learning in their support of PSTs. Their teacher knowledge has been transformed through their experience
in the HE-based teacher educator role. It has been combined with what they have learned through their second order field activities and reflected upon from a different perspective. Through this, their teacher knowledge had been examined, theorised and made sense of, resulting in a transformed perspective on teaching and the experience of PSTs. The distance from the first order field of practice had led to de-contextualised understandings.

Their second order knowledge as teacher educators consisted of understanding the nature of the experience of learning to teach and of PST development. Tutors had developed complex, rich understandings of PSTs as learners from their point of view. This knowledge was central to their support and development practices. Their experiential knowledge of PSTs has led to the theorisation and generalisation of PSTs as learners, which they used to meet individual needs and predict potential issues. Their understanding the nature of the experience of learning to teach and of PST development was central to their development and support practice. An important dimension to their knowledge was of the individual PST’s circumstances, needs and belief, which underpinned a PST-centred approach to support and development.

The tutors’ knowledge was used in practice through images, principles and rules (Elbaz, 1981). Tutors had clear principles of practice that were strongly linked to their theories of
teaching and learning. These principles guided their actions and decisions, while their ‘theories-of-action’ (Argyris, 2004) were what they used to achieve specific goals.

The third and final research questions asked:

What are PSTs’ perceptions of how the tutor contributes to their school placement experiences and what does this suggest about their influence?

An important dimension to this research was the perspectives of the PSTs. The findings from the interviews highlighted the practices that were beneficial to them as learners and how the tutor had influenced them. The PSTs perceived they benefitted from the visits in several ways; most regarded them as important and that tutors made a positive contribution to their school placement experience. The benefits cited included the emotional support provided, gaining an external perspective on their progress, validation and affirmation of their teaching skills, and having a different safe space in which to think critically. All the PSTs valued the tutors’ external position, knowledge and expertise and how they normalised their experiences and validated their progress. In this way tutors supported their confidence, helping them to cope with the emotional dimension of teaching and develop resilience.
The influence of the tutors was not easily determined, but the indications were that tutors have limited impact on their practice. There was some evidence that tutors have the potential to influence their thinking as teachers, through supporting development of the PSTs’ skills of analysis and evaluation, as well helping them interrogate the reasons behind their decisions. The most significant opportunities for influence were when the PST had become comfortable in the school and regarded as teacher by the staff. At this time, appropriate and skilful challenge by the tutors can prevent a plateau on PST development.

Tutors supported the PSTs understanding of planning and the outcomes of their teaching, as well as the development of their skills in relation to critical analysis and evaluation. Although the tutors did not overtly help the PSTs to make links between educational theory and their practice, they did provide a safe space in which they could think critically about practice in school and consider other perspectives. To optimize this opportunity, the relationship between tutor and PST needs to be one built on trust and mutual respect, so that PSTs feel able to share and explore their views.

The variation in practice and PSTs’ perceptions revealed that the tutor visit has the potential to be a significant learning event. The evidence suggests that the most successful tutors have highly PST-centred practices characterised by listening to PSTs, with the aim of empowering and helping them to construct their own meanings.
The contribution to research

Building on previous research, this study has contributed to an understanding of an under-researched activity in initial teacher education. In this way it has contributed to the overarching theoretical framework within which sense might be made of tutors’ knowledge and practice. The insights gained are important because they have the potential to inform the theory, policy and practice in Initial Teacher Education. The grounding of the findings in the lives of experienced practitioners, in conjunction with the PSTs’ perspectives, may also promote closer examination of this often over-looked and routine part of tutors’ work. Importantly, it may serve to stimulate reflection and discussion within the ITE community and promote a dialogue between HEI and school partners.

The identification of the knowledge and practices tutors used on their visits to PSTs in school has added to the existing but limited research on the work of experienced higher education science teacher educators. Most of this previous research has focused on the work conducted in the HEI. This research however has followed tutors as they work with PSTs in the school context through one year, contributing to a more holistic understanding of their work, knowledge and motivations.
It has supported the findings of others that tutors’ knowledge is layered and multi-dimensional; and that their second order knowledge, gained from their experience as HE-based teacher educators, is an important to their practice.

This research has not only contributed to an understanding of how tutors approach the support and development of PSTs during school placements, but also how they navigate their way through different school contexts. Management practice was an unexpectedly significant dimension to practice that showed how they skillfully managed and protected PSTs ensured that their goals were achieved and relationships maintained. Whilst valued by PSTs, the findings support those of others that there is little evidence that they occupy a different role to that of the mentor. However, varies between individuals and they have to potential to make a significant contribution to PSTs through their visits.

The findings from this study have also contributed to an understanding of how roles, responsibilities and partnership with schools are realised in practice during the visits. The roles identified by previous research, such as supporter, advocate and assessor have been confirmed, but this study has illuminated how these tutors fulfil these roles through the visits.
6.2 Implications for policy and practice

This research has pointed to some questions to be considered and some implications for policy, partnership, roles and practice that are particularly relevant to Initial Teacher Education in England as it undergoes yet more reform. With increasing de-regulation and emphasis on school-led training, the question about how to train and educate future teachers is being debated once again, fuelling further argument about the role and value of higher education.

Although other countries recognise the importance of experience of teaching in schools as part of ITE, the majority, including the most successful nations, retain a strong commitment to the contribution of higher education in teacher education. However, in England, policy is being influenced by ideological positions and ill-informed beliefs about teaching, learning to teach and the role of higher education. At the heart of the debates surrounding ITE and the role of higher education are different conceptions of teaching as an occupation. The current policy in England positions teaching as craft rather a profession. This is in contrast to other countries in the UK and in Europe that position teaching as a research-based profession. This is embodied in the published expectations of teachers, which include references to having knowledge of research and scholarship and the capacity to engage in practice-based research and professional enquiry. Here in England, there is the danger higher education will be lost from ITE and training confined to the development of teaching skills.
Higher education’s association with the theory of education places it in a precarious position given the present government’s view of teaching as best learned through experience and working with teachers. Despite reassurances from government that there will still be a role for higher education in ITE, the underlying messages in recent policy in England suggest that its involvement in the preparation of new teachers is of little value. There are those who believe that the Post Graduate Certificate of Education route into teaching will not exist for much longer, either by design or as an unintended consequence. The increasing devolution of responsibility for ITE to schools and the diversity of routes into teaching in England reflect a market-driven approach to ITE. This is leading to more uncertainty for the HEIs involved. As increasing numbers of teachers are trained through school-led routes such as School Direct, HEIs are finding planning their provision and meeting the costs involved increasingly difficult. There is a risk that HEIs will have to reduce their contribution to ITE or withdraw altogether, as is the case for my own institution.

The European Commission report *Improving the Quality of Teacher Education* (2007) has pointed to the importance of teacher quality in securing student attainment and the need to improve the quality of teacher education. The current policy of relocating initial teacher education to school has implications. There is no reason why school-based teacher educators should not acquire knowledge and pedagogy required to become skilled teacher educators. However, as yet no agreed set of skills and knowledge has been
identified for teacher educators in England as there has in other countries, such as the Netherlands and the United States. Consequently, little attention has been paid to their formal induction and professional development. Perhaps even more concerning is that there appears to be no perceived need for the training and education of teacher educators in England, either by government or schools. Instead, faith is being placed in the unsubstantiated belief that good teachers simply need a good class of degree in their subject and will develop into effective teachers given sufficient experience.

This disregard for the skills of teacher educators has resulted in its low status, both in school and higher education, with teachers often being directed to mentor trainees as part of their own professional development. Some feel forced into the role and see it is another yet another burden. Others are enthusiastic amateurs, often still relatively inexperienced as teachers themselves, resulting in variability in the quality of mentoring in school. In addition, the lack of attention to the expertise of teacher educators may lead schools to recruit trainees who they perceive as already being able to function as teachers, thereby excluding those who don’t ‘fit’ within their organisation. This in turn may lead to a reduction in the supply of teachers, but only time and further research will reveal the impact of the current trajectory of school-led initial teacher education.

If school-HEI partnerships continue in some form, HEIs may look for ways to cut costs and the tutor visit may appear to be an expensive luxury that is easy to remove or reduce.
Murray (2008) has argued that the relatively recent changes in teacher education have had a detrimental impact on HE-based teacher educators resulting in an erosion of their professional identities and confidence. This is in part due to the casualization of the teacher education workforce in higher education as a result of shift towards school-based ITE has already resulted in the shift towards school-based ITE. The increased use of casual staff has resulted in great variability in the skills, knowledge and expertise of tutors visiting PSTs in school, potentially adding to the belief that tutors contribute little to the PSTs’ development during school placements.

The visit to school has the potential to be an important learning event for not only PSTs, but also for mentors and teachers. Removing or curtailing the visits by expert HE-based teacher educators would not only result in further separation of the contributions made by the school and HEI to PSTs’ development, but also reduce schools’ access to a potential source of educational expertise. In addition, this research suggests that removing tutor visits could have a detrimental impact on PSTs, not only in terms of support and security, but also in terms of their development as autonomous, critical thinkers. In addition, PSTs may find they are not nurtured sufficiently through the difficult transitions and inevitable crises in confidence. Equally important, PSTs would lose a space in which they can be helped to examine practice in light of different forms of knowledge, as well as question practices and aims for education that have become routine and formulaic. The loss of this ‘expansive learning environment’ (Fuller & Unwin, 2003) that gives access to wide-ranging
opportunities for learning would lead to PSTs’ training being centred on the immediate needs and concerns of the school.

If the importance of the tutor visit is to be recognised, roles, responsibilities and models of partnership will need to be reviewed. In particular consideration must be given to how the tutor contributes to these overarching frameworks through their visits to PSTs. Separatist and HEI-led models of partnership risk the contribution of higher education to PTSs’ development being overwhelmed by the emotionally charged and pressured school context. The collaborative model offers the potential for the contribution of higher education to be seen, understood and ultimately valued by school partners. Tutors have expertise and knowledge that is likely to be useful to schools and their visits present opportunities to school partners. For tutors too the visit is a valuable source of knowledge, enabling them to keep in touch with the reality of school life. The visit therefore has the potential to bring partners together, as well as helping the PST engage with and consider different, conflicting points of view. Collaboration suggests joint ‘ownership’ of the PST, implying the need for strong links between tutors and mentors. Each needs to acknowledge the expertise of the other. This is more difficult for mentors as they have no experience of the higher education role. It is therefore important that tutors share their goals and practices and reveal their knowledge and rationales.
When reviewing the roles of each partner, consideration needs to be given to how these are carried out in practice during the school visits. An example is the role of supporting PSTs’ engagement with educational theory and research. Pre-service teachers may leave the security of the university with various intentions as a result of the ideas they have encountered, but the school setting places them in a challenging and highly emotional context in which they are confronted by the practical reality of teaching. It is little wonder then that these good intentions and nascent understandings of theory are left behind. The tutor visit therefore presents a valuable opportunity to bring these ideas back into focus in the context of practice. If this knowledge remains examined only in the HEI context, it may remain there and sustain the divide between theory and practice. If practice is considered in the university, so theory should be considered in the school context.

As well as reviewing the nature of partnership and roles and responsibilities, HEIs and tutors need to scrutinise the visits themselves. There is the danger that visits and the practices used become routine. An example is the purpose and use of written feedback. It is currently used routinely, but ineffectively, but could be developed as a mechanism to strengthen continuity between visits and stimulate a dialogue. The importance of optimising the impact of practice becomes even more important as resources become ever more limited and choices have to be made about how best to use the limited time. Goals and intentions need to be realistic, focused on what can have the greatest impact in
terms of the development of PSTs’ thinking and self-conceptions as teachers. Not only does the nature and purpose of visits need to be reviewed by HEI and school partners, but also shared with PSTs. It is vital that the PST voice is heard and taken into account.

Practice on the visits needs to empower PSTs and help them construct their own understandings. This involves developing a shared understanding of the issues and the priorities for development, why they are important and how they might be achieved. Importantly, assumptions should not be made about PSTs’ understanding of advice and targets. Their understanding needs to be assessed through conversations about how ideas might be implemented in future practice. If done in collaboration with the mentor, the visit has the potential to strengthen the influence of the tutor through engendering greater commitment and understanding to the priorities for development identified.

The involvement of mentors in discussions is also important in developing the relationships and shared understandings needed to support PSTs’ development. The triad also provides a more powerful context in which to examine practice in relation to theory, context and values. In this way the PST can be helped to make sense of how the context impacts on practice and understand tensions and different viewpoints. Disagreements, if approached constructively, can be opportunities for growth for PSTs and reduce the likelihood of them being caught in the middle.
If tutors are to optimise their contribution to the development of PSTs through the visits, they need to develop relationships and ways of working with mentors and PSTs that enable beliefs and views to be shared and differences discussed. Pre-service teachers need to feel able to share emergent thinking, dilemmas and areas of conflict. Teaching and learning to teach are emotional enterprises and this must be recognised by allowing PSTs to express their emotional reactions. Listening to PSTs’ ideas and experiences not only shows they are valued, but allows teacher educators to gauge their thinking and establish the next steps for progress. In addition, tutors also need to know the PSTs; their expectations and needs; their beliefs about teaching and learning; their fears and vulnerabilities; and their priorities and concerns. By taking account of these rather than working against them, PSTs will be more receptive and engaged.

Another key role for tutors associated with their external position was that they brought different sources of knowledge and approaches to teaching. Increasingly, due to inspection, schools are regulated environments that aim for uniformity in teachers’ practice through set schemes, lesson plans, policies and rules that PSTs are expected to follow. The PSTs’ guest status makes it difficult for them to question the practices they observe or are inducted into by school staff. The tutor is in a position to legitimise and encourage an exploratory approach and act as an advocate for the PSTs’ autonomy. They are in a position to act as brokers, negotiating with the school to allow PSTs to try different strategies and approaches. In addition, they can give permission for the PSTs to
question the school’s routine practice and takes some risk, which is an important part of PSTs’ growth as teachers.

The tutor visits are potentially an important opportunity for learning for all involved, but if higher education is not to be lost from ITE it needs to demonstrate its value. This implies the need for systematic evaluation of visits and what they achieve. Visits are also idiosyncratic and tutors work in isolation from their colleagues. For the visits to be more coherent so that all PSTs can benefit, practice and experience needs to be shared and professional conversations had about the purposes and goals behind them. Most importantly, the objectives need to be evaluated and practice reflected upon. Through this, effective practice can be disseminated and new tutors inducted to this aspect of their work.

Tutors have the best intentions for PSTs and work under increasingly challenging circumstances. Achieving everything they hope for is unlikely because so much is beyond their control. In particular, mentors need to be committed to their role. Without the commitment of schools and their valuing of what HE can contribute, the influence of tutors may continue to be limited. In the face of poor practice, both in terms of teaching that PSTs observe and mentor practice, tutors will inevitably feel the need to engage in damage limitation. Unless mentoring is recognised as important and given a high status
and time, tutors may struggle to optimise the opportunity that the visit offers both PSTs and mentors.

In closing, the European Commission has called for more research into teacher education and teacher educators (European Commission, 2013). However, the place of education in universities is already precarious. The withdrawal of higher education from ITE, whether by design or unintended consequence, would further erode its position and status. This may have serious implications for research in education and reduce the UK’s capacity to conduct such research (McNamara & Murray, 2013). Indeed, fears that expertise in ITE will be lost from the higher education sector, with a resulting decline in education research, are starting to be realised. There are already signs that the current policy in England is affecting the involvement of higher education in ITE, to the extent that some HEIs have decided to withdraw altogether (Beauchamp et al., 2013). Recent policy may have signaled the end of a meaningful contribution to ITE by higher education.

6.3 Reflective critique

This section reflects on the methodology, techniques and tools used, identifying the key strengths, limitations and challenges of their use in practice.
The sample

The number of participating tutors was small, although it was not intended that the sample would be representative of science teacher educators in England. The recent research on tutor identity reveals that multiple identities exist and that even teacher educators working in higher education are a heterogeneous group. The research questions were not science specific and the evidence gathered can only be considered in relation to the practice science tutors, rather than the HE-based teacher educator population as a whole. Therefore, the decision to select secondary science tutors may limit the extent to which those working in other subject disciplines can relate to the findings.

The interviews

The initial face-to-face meetings supported the development of the relationships needed for tutors to share their practice and for PSTs to feel comfortable giving their honest opinions, which they appeared to do readily. The tutors’ readiness to talk led to some interviews lasting over two hours, which generated a great deal of data. It was also difficult to keep the interview focused at times and there was a tension between maintaining the focus and not closing the tutor down when they wanted to talk about issues that arose.
The time between the visit and the interview varied; some were conducted immediately afterwards, whilst others had to be carried out a few days later. The longer gaps had an impact on the tutor’s recall of events, but the use of the field notes and recordings were helpful. On occasions tutors were surprised by some aspects of their practice, suggesting that the recordings helped them to view the events less subjectively. However, the recording was difficult to control, which occasionally disrupted the flow of the interview.

**The data and analysis**

The extent to which any instrument can elicit unconscious knowledge and practice is questionable, with success in some part being dependent on the skill of the interviewer. The tutors may have constructed rationales where none existed; Alan in particular was conscious of ‘post-justifying’ his actions. There is also the possibility of defensive rationalising when practice is below expectation.

A particular strength of the research was the inclusion of the voice of the PSTs. The data collected from them captured their impressions and perceptions. It was possible that PSTs felt obliged to find something positive to say about their tutors’ contribution, being generally appreciative of their efforts, although they seemed to respond frankly at the time. Treading the line between evaluation of the tutor and finding out how the PST had benefited from the visit also proved challenging at times. Occasionally the PSTs were personally evaluative in their comments about the tutor, such as saying the tutor was
great or expressing concern that the tutor was not doing the job well. Although the interviews focused on the specific aspects that were helpful and why, there is the possibility that the evaluative comments may have affected the analysis and interpretation of the data.

I conducted the research having my own experience and views of the role, as well as knowledge of the tutor. This brought advantages as examined in section 3.5. Due to the nature of the interviews and my own inexperience as an interviewer, my views and values may have influenced the tutors, but my knowledge enabled me to probe their rationales, suggest alternative actions and explore why these were not taken.

Considerable rich data were generated through the interviews. Whilst this allowed for the findings to be grounded in the tutors’ voices, it was time consuming and difficult to process and analyse. It also meant that choices had to be made about what to report and it was not possible to present all aspects of their knowledge and practice in detail, for example their actions in relation to quality assurance, summative assessment and mentor support. What is presented therefore only provides a glimpse of tutors’ work and the justice it does to their expertise is necessarily limited. The process of selecting which aspects to report also meant that findings were filtered through my own experience and what I believed to be important. In addition, examining the knowledge and practice of all six tutors through the themes has resulted in the fragmentation of the accounts of the
individual tutors. An important step in ensuring that I did not lose sight of each individual participant was comparing the interpretations to the ‘case summaries’ and meta-interviews (section 3.5). Although I did not have the benefit of a co-researcher to separately code and check interpretations of the data, I did share my interpretations with my supervisor, which helped me to gain some distance and check my interpretations.

The intention of the research to be a co-construction of practice with the tutor was perhaps over-ambitious. Although the interviews allowed practice to be co-constructed to some extent, and the meta-interviews allowed for some verification, true co-construction would have necessitated the tutors’ involvement in the process of analysis. This would have been difficult due to the time demand on tutors, who were already finding their workloads difficult to manage. However, overall the approach taken and methods used were considered suitable for the scale of this research and the data of sufficient quality and quantity to address the research questions.

*Personal reflections*

Coming from a scientific background, I began with naïve notions of the nature of social research and struggled at times to move away from a positivist view. This study has supported my development as a researcher and helped me to develop a much deeper understanding of its complexity and value.
My view of the HEI role in ITE has also changed significantly, having previously been limited by my own experience. Some of the findings and conclusions have surprised me and caused me to reflect on my own practice. For example, tutors’ well-intentioned assumptions about PST fragility may actually work against successful relationships and outcomes, as might the subtle management practices that tutors use to ensure the smooth running of the visits. Lastly, I particularly valued the willingness of the tutors and PSTs to talk openly about their practice and experience, particularly when the experience was difficult. I hope that I have represented them fairly and with the respect they deserve.

*Ethical issues*

Although great efforts were made to avoid disrupting the visits, this was difficult in practice. The boundary between ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ was not clearly delineated. To school staff and the PSTs I was an outsider who was kept at a distance, but tutors treated me as a colleague, even to the point of consulting me about the lesson observed. This made it difficult to remain ‘invisible’ during the visits and maintain a professional distance a times. A balance had to be struck between keeping at a distance and interacting with participants, so as not to alienate them. My strategy was to remain close, but focused on my note pad and to respond with questions or vague statements of support.
The PSTs were willing to talk about their experiences, but there was a tension between eliciting their reflections and minimising the time demand. On some occasions the PST wanted to talk at length. On a few occasions, I found myself to be in the role of counsellor. As this was not relevant to my research and I did not want to usurp the tutor’s role, I simply listened sympathetically and advised the PST to talk to their tutor. A particularly significant ethical dilemma was presented by Rafid, who did not make the progress expected. The dilemma was whether to proceed or withdraw completely. Supporting those who struggle is an important part of a tutor’s work and so this was potentially a valuable opportunity to capture that expertise. Rafid confirmed his willingness to proceed prior to each visit and was reminded that he could withdraw his agreement to the recording or my observation at any time. When it came to discussing his teaching with his tutor, I absented myself from the room, giving him the recorder so that he was in control of what was recorded. He reported that this had made him feel more comfortable, although I felt very conflicted on the third visit just before he suspended his course.

6.4 Recommendations

The discussion of the findings (Chapter 4), and the implications of these, suggests many possible recommendations in relation to the contribution that tutors may make to ITE through their visits to PSTs on school placements. However, the most important recommendations at a national, school and individual tutor level are presented.
National policy

1. For the Government to monitor the impact of the current reforms to ITE in relation to the experience of PSTs and the impact this has on PST retention.

2. Through consideration of the evidence, identification of the skills and knowledge required of teacher educators and how school-based teacher educators can be supported in developing these knowledge and skills, thereby raising their status.

HEIs and schools partnerships

3. To review partnership arrangements between HEIs and schools paying attention to the tutor visit and how the limited time can be best used. Importantly, this process should involve PSTs, agreed roles shared with them and the effectiveness of visits evaluated.

4. To consider the training and education of tutors supporting PSTs through school placements, drawing on the expertise of tutors recognised to be accomplished practitioners.

5. In the event of the involvement of higher education in ITE being lost, to consider how they can work with schools to continue to make a valuable contribution to the education of teachers.
Higher education teacher educators

6. To engage with PSTs as partners in their development through sharing their principles and rules of practice so as to foster an understanding of the basis for their decisions and actions, as well model the value and complexity of professional practical knowledge.

7. To critically interrogate and evaluate the effectiveness of their practice on school visits in relation to their role and goals for PST development.

8. To consider continuity between visits so as to support a dialogue with PSTs about their learning in school following the visit and any issues arising.

9. To develop more effective strategies for helping PSTs make use of the ‘space’ afforded by the external position of the tutor and their distinctive knowledge to critically engage with how the ideas met in the university relate to their practice in the school setting.

6.5 Suggestions for further research

Tutor practice remains an under-research area in ITE and this study has highlighted many further questions that need to be addressed. The changing context for ITE in England makes further research imperative. An important consideration in any further research is
the voice of the PSTs. The following areas would develop the research evidence base and inform the discourse surrounding changes to ITE, as well as the professional development and induction of HE ITE tutors:

- Further research on how teacher identity, personal governance link with knowledge to inform practice.
- Mentors’ perspectives on the tutor visits and how this supports their work with PSTs.
- Case study of ‘expert’ tutors working with several of the PSTs they work with on school placements in order to further develop an understanding of the practices that PSTs find beneficial and how tutors’ practice is differentiated.
- The practice and impact of mentors and tutors supporting PSTs who are failing to make progress.
- Comparison of the practices of tutors in different phases and subject areas.
- Comparison of different models of tutor visits linked to the perceptions of and outcomes for PSTs.
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Appendix 1: Literature search terms

Initial teacher training / education/ preparation + influence /impact/partnership
Teacher educator + role/ responsibility / practice /influence /pedagogy /practicum /school visit
Tutor + role/ responsibility / practice /influence /pedagogy /practicum /school visit/feedback/knowledge
University tutor + role/ responsibility / practice /influence /pedagogy /feedback/knowledge
HEI tutor + role/ responsibility / practice /influence /pedagogy/feedback/knowledge
Supervisor + role/ responsibility / practice /influence /pedagogy/feedback/knowledge
Supervision + role/ responsibility / practice /influence /pedagogy/feedback/knowledge
Craft knowledge + eliciting / tutor/ teacher educator
Practical knowledge + eliciting / tutor/ teacher educator
Professional knowledge + eliciting / tutor/ teacher educator
Student teacher + learning / influence/development/school placement/practicum/experience
Trainee + learning / influence/development /school placement /practicum/experience
Pre-service teacher + learning / influence/development/school placement /practicum
Student teacher /Trainee / Pre-service teacher + Tutor/Teacher educator/supervisor + relationship/dynamics/interaction/
Appendix 2: PST consent and information form

The Practice of HEI Tutors in Initial Teacher Education and their Influence on Student Teachers

From:
Sandra Amos
Faculty of Education and Languages Studies
The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
MK7 6AA
S.J.Amos@open.ac.uk

October 2011

Dear [Student Teacher name],

I am writing to invite you to participate in research I am undertaking for the Doctorate in Education at the Open University. The research is focused on the practice of Higher Education Institution (HEI) tutors during visits to PGCE student teachers on school placement, and the influence that this practice has on the student teacher.

This document sets out the details of the research. I hope very much that you will be willing to take part.

Further details about the research

Background
HEIs have a long history of involvement in the initial education of teachers. Some research has looked at knowledge and expertise of the HEI tutor, but most of this is focused on the work carried out with student teachers in the HEI sessions. Very little research has examined the practice of HEI tutors when they visit student teachers in school.

Aims
I aim to contribute to our understanding of the expertise of the HEI tutor through researching the strategies, approaches and practices they use with student teachers during school placement visits and the tacit knowledge they use in the decision-making that informs that practice. A secondary aim is to explore the influence the tutor has on your development as a teacher.
Participants - why you?
HEI tutors are the primary focus of this research. In order to gather data of their influence on student teachers, I will need to collect the views of the student teachers they support. Your tutor has expressed an interest in taking part in my research and this is why I am contacting you now.

What's involved?
If you agree to take part, you will be asked to complete an initial interview to provide some background information about your views of learning to teach and what you hope to gain from working with your tutor and mentor. I will accompany your tutor on some or all of the visits s/he makes to you in school, observing lessons and audio recording the post-lesson exchange between you, your tutor and mentor (if s/he is involved and is agreeable). There will be a short follow-up interview with you after the visit, which will be conducted by telephone after the visit at a mutually convenient time. At the end of your course, there will a final interview lasting approximately 1 hour.

Possible risks and disadvantages of taking part
There will be a modest time commitment involved for the interviews and I am not able to recompense you for this time.

You may feel uncomfortable at being asked questions about your tutor’s practice. Your tutor will be given the interview schedule and the questions will not invite criticism or evaluation of your tutor. The interview questions will focus on the influence of particular practices. The confidentiality of the data you provide will not be compromised.

Whilst every effort will be made to ensure that all those involved cannot be identified, including the use of pseudonyms, it may be possible that other people working on your course (e.g. your mentor) to work out who the participants are from contextual clues in publications arising from the research.

You may worry that participating or refusing to participate will impact on your training and assessment. Measures will be taken to avoid this. Tutors will not be told who has or who has not expressed a willingness to participate. All the tutor will know is which student is participating. In addition, the data collected from you will not be shared with your tutor in any way, until after you have completed the course and with your permission. When data is shared through publications, it will be anonymised to ensure students cannot be identified, as far as is possible.

School staff may react negatively to an additional visitor. Permission will be sought from the school and your mentor to collect data on school premises.
Possible benefits
This research may provide your tutor with the opportunity to talk about and reflect on his/her practice. This may have a positive impact on how they work with you. You will also get the opportunity to give your views and contribute in a positive way to ITE research.

What happens to the data?
I will comply with the data protection regulations and principles set out by the Data Protection Code of Practice and the Guidelines for Open University Students on the use of Personal Data for Research Purposes. Copies of these documents can be supplied to you on request. The key points are that:

- Only data pertinent to the research will be collected
- You have the right to decline to give information
- The data will be anonymised and confidentiality will be assured as far as is possible.
- You will have full access to the data collected from you.
- The data will be kept indefinitely on a secure server at the Open University until such time it is no longer required by the researcher and it will then be destroyed.
- The data will be password protected and will only be able to be accessed by the researcher.
- The raw data will not be shared with any third party.

What happens after the research is complete?
The EdD takes 3 years to complete, although there is the possibility of an additional year. The data collection phase is scheduled for 2011/12. Once the doctorate is complete in 2012, the data collected from you will be destroyed, although anonymised data may be used for subsequent research papers.

What if I have concerns or want to make a complaint?
It is very important to me that I behave professionally and ethically at all times. I will follow the British Educational Research Association’s Ethical Guidelines (2004). I also hope that you will be able to raise any concerns with me personally. If you feel that you cannot do this, you will be able to contact my supervisor or a member of the Doctorate in Education team at the university. In the first instance, you should send an email to FELS-ed@open.ac.uk.

I am prepared to participate – what do I do next?
Please read through the consent information below. If you decide not to participate, please let me know and I will not contact you again. If you do decide that you would like to contribute, please send an email entitled ‘Tutor practice research’ to Sandra Amos at S.J.Amos@open.ac.uk with your full name and address, copying and pasting the statement below confirming you have read and understood the information provided here.
I understand that:

- This research is being carried out for a Doctorate in Education (EdD) and is not funded by an external organisation.

- That the research aims to develop a better understanding of the practice of the HEI tutor on school visits, the knowledge that underpins this practice and decision-making, and the influence that this has on the student teacher.

- There is no compulsion for me to participate in this research and participating will not affect my training as a teacher or my assessment against the QTS standards.

- If I do choose to participate, I may withdraw my participation at any stage or occasion with no negative consequences.

- I will receive no financial reward or recompense for taking part.

- Any information I give will be used solely for the purpose of this research, which may include academic publications after completion of the EdD.

- The information that I provide may be shared with the person supervising the EdD research.

- The data will be anonymised before any data is shared in a public arena.

- Confidentiality will be respected by the researcher with regard to the information I give, including the use of pseudonyms and other measures in order to preserve anonymity to the greatest possible extent.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information.
Appendix 3: Mentor consent and information form

The Practice of HEI Tutors in Initial Teacher Education and their Influence on Student Teachers

From:
Sandra Amos
Faculty of Education and Languages Studies
The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
MK7 6A
S.J.Amos@open.ac.uk

November 2011

Dear Colleague

I am writing to request your permission to collect data in connection with some research I am undertaking for the Doctorate in Education at the Open University. The research is focused on the practice of Higher Education Institution (HEI) tutors during visits to PGCE student teachers on school placement, and the influence that this practice has on the student teacher. This research will not involve you in additional work.

HEI tutors are the primary focus of this research. However, as a mentor you may be involved in the work of the tutor when he visits the student in school, through for example, joint discussions after observed lessons. The tutor and student you are hosting have both agreed to participate, which is why I am contacting you now.

What’s involved?
I will be shadowing the tutor on his visits to the student teacher in school. [I have an enhanced CRB disclosure.] I will make myself as unobtrusive as possible. I will be taking field notes and audio recording exchanges between the tutor and student. I am asking for your permission to record these discussions between tutor, student and yourself, if you are involved. These recordings will be only be used to help the tutor to reconstruct his thinking and reveal the thinking behind his actions after the visit. Conversations between you and the tutor alone will not be recorded or observed. It is important that your normal working practices are not compromised by this research. Therefore, if you do not wish discussions that you are normally part of to be recorded in any way, please decline permission, rather than simply absenting yourself from these discussions.
Possible risks and disadvantages
There are no significant risks or disadvantages. This research will not impact on your workload in any way.

Data Protection
I will comply with the data protection regulations and principles set out by the Data Protection Code of Practice and the Guidelines for Open University Students on the use of Personal Data for Research Purposes. The key points are that:

- Only data pertinent to the research will be collected
- You have the right to decline to give information
- The data will be anonymised and confidentiality will be assured as far as possible
- The data will be kept on a secure server at the Open University until the EdD has been completed and then it will be destroyed
- The data will be password protected and will only be able to be accessed by the researcher
- The data will not be shared with any third party. Raw data may be shared with the research supervisor in an anonymised form.

What happens after the research is complete?
The data collection phase is scheduled for 20011/12. The EdD should be completed by January 2014. Once the doctorate is complete, primary data will be destroyed.

Ethics
I will follow the British Educational Research Association’s Ethical Guidelines (2004). Should you have any concerns, I hope that you will be able to raise these with me personally. If you feel that you cannot do this, you will be able to contact my supervisor or a member of the Doctorate in Education team at the university. In the first instance, you should send an email to FELS-edd@open.ac.uk.

I happy to give my permission – what do I do next?
Please read through the consent information below. If you have no objection to being recorded in the normal course of your mentoring work with the tutor please be prepared to sign in the box below to confirm that you have read and understood the information provided here when I bring a copy of the consent when I visit with the tutor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>School:</th>
<th>HEI partner:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor:</td>
<td>Student:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have read and understood the nature of my involvement in the research and I agree to take part according to the consent information provided.

Signed:
Mentor Consent Information

I understand that:

- This research is being carried out for a Doctorate in Education (EdD) and is not funded by an external organisation.

- That the research aims to develop a better understanding of the practice of the HEI tutor on school visits and the knowledge that underpins that practice and decision-making.

- This research will not impact on my workload in any way.

- The research necessitates audio recording of the exchanges between tutor and student during school visits. The researcher may attend these visits with the tutor.

- There is no compulsion for me to participate in this research and participating will not affect my work as a mentor or my relationship with the HEI.

- If I do choose to participate, I may withdraw my participation at any stage with no negative consequences.

- I will receive no financial reward or recompense for taking part.

- Any contribution I make to the data gathered will be used solely for the purpose of this research, which may include academic publications after completion of the EdD.

- Any contribution I make to the data gathered will be kept securely.

- The data will be anonymised before any data is shared in a public arena.

- Confidentiality will be respected by the researcher with regard to the information I give, including the use of pseudonyms and other measures in order to preserve anonymity to the greatest possible extent.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information.
Appendix 4: Tutor initial interview schedule

Initial Interview – Tutor

Section 1: Background

- Which do you prefer? ITE or ITT and why?
- How did you come to be an ITE tutor? Route? Teaching background? Subject? Motivation?
- How many years in ITE? How many years at this HEI?

Section 2: Current role

- What does your post entail?
- What do you see as your role as the university PGCE tutor role in the enterprise of ITE?
- Do you have a vision for the sort of teacher you hope to develop through your work with the student teachers? Can you describe this teacher?
- What is important to you in fulfilling the ITE HEI tutor role?
- How important is your role in ITE in your view?
- What are the challenges you face in the role?

Section 3: Visits

- How many student teachers do you tutor through the PGCE year?
- How many visits do you make usually?
- When do these visits occur approximately?
- What preparation if any do you do in advance of these visits?
- What is the purpose of your visits? What do you hope to achieve, if anything, as a result of your visits? Does the purpose change as the student progresses through the course?
Section 4: The Course

- Is the course you work on have an explicit model of beginning teacher learning underpinning it? What model? What view of how student teachers learn?
- What school placements do students complete during the course?
- What is expected of them in these placement in terms of teaching and learning to teach.
- What is the relationship between the work in university and the school placements?
Appendix 5: Tutor post-visit interview protocol

Post visit tutor interview schedule

Are you happy for me to record this interview? The recording will be kept on a password protected secure server. Have you any questions before we start?

Section 1: Intentions and planning

- This is the second visit to X. What thoughts about X were you bringing to this visit? Has s/he got any particular issues or difficulties that you are aware of?
- Did what you know about the student affect how you thought about the visit?
- What about the school – new school for X and your visit to him in this context? What do you know about it in terms of its training of teachers?
- Did what you knew about the school affect how you thought about the visit?
- Did you do any particular preparation for the visit?
- What did you hope to achieve as a result of this second visit to [student name]? What’s important to you?
- Did you do any preparation for the visit? If so, what? Why?
- What are your expectations of students by this second visit? Does your approach change from visit 1? How?

Section 2: Walking through the visit

- What did you do when you arrived? Who did you see, talk to? What was the focus of the discussion? Why?
- You had a lesson plan. What did you look for? Gain from it?
• Play recording and stop to talk when you remember what you were thinking. I will stop it if I want to find out something.
• Lesson observation – what did you do / write? Why?
• Post-lesson discussions – who managed / led these? Why? What did you want them to achieve? What was talked about and why? How was it approached?

**Section 3: Post-visit reflection**

• Did you achieve want you wanted to achieve? Do you
• Do you think you achieved what you set out to achieve? Do think the stent has taken on board what you said? How do you know? Would do you do anything differently next time?
• Has your thinking about the student changed?
• What will be your priority next visit?
Appendix 6: PST initial interview schedule

Student teacher Initial Interview

General introduction

Hi [name]. I hope you are well. We agreed that I would call you today at this time to conduct an interview about the visit last [day]. Is this still convenient for you?

Thank you

This interview is designed to give me some understanding of your background and expectations as a student teacher. Are you happy for me to record this interview? The recording will be kept on a password protected secure server.

The interview will last no longer than 20 minutes. Is that alright with you?

Please try to answer as honestly as you can. If there are any questions that you cannot answer, or that you do not want to answer, please say so. Your responses will be kept completely confidential and will not be shared with your tutor.

Are there any questions before we start?

1. Why did you decide to train as a teacher?

2. Why did you choose the PGCE rather than a school-based route such as a SCITT, GTP or Teach First?
3. Can you describe the sort of teacher you want to be? What’s important to you?

4. Are there any issues that concern you about doing this course and developing into this teacher? Do you think there will be any challenges or difficulties? If so, what?
   What concerns you most? What do you think will be most difficult?

5. How do you think the university side of the course will help you to develop into an effective teacher?

6. What do you expect your tutor to provide you with?

7. What do you expect your mentor in school to provide?

8. Looking ahead to your tutor’s visit, how do you feel about it? Probe why.

9. What do you expect to happen in the visit?

10. What do you hope to gain from the visit?

Thank you for doing this interview. I really appreciate your support and hope you get some benefit from being able to talk about and reflect on your experiences.
Appendix 7: PST post-visit interview schedule

Student teacher visit 1 follow-up interview

General introduction

We agreed that I would call you today at this time to conduct an interview about the visit
last [day]. Is this still convenient for you?

Thank you

This interview is designed to give me some understanding of what you gained from your
tutor’s visit. I am not asking you to evaluate your tutor or his or her practice or make
personal comments about her/him. What I am interested in is your expectations,
perceptions and experiences and what you think you have gained from them.
Are you happy for me to record this interview? The recording will be kept on a password
protected secure server.

The interview will last no longer than 30 minutes. Is that alright with you?

Please try to answer as honestly as you can. If there are any questions that you cannot
answer, or that you do not want to answer, please say so. Your responses will be kept
completely confidential and will not be shared with your tutor.

Are there any questions before we start?
1. How did you feel prior to the visit? [Probe why].

2. Did you do any special preparation prior to the visit? If so, what?

3. What did you expect to happen in the visit?

4. Did you get what you expected from your tutor? Anything surprising or missing?

5. Thinking about the discussion you had with your tutor about the lesson, what do you remember most clearly from that discussion?

6. Was there anything that s/he said that you found particularly useful in terms of your teaching?

7. Do you think you benefitted from the visit? In what ways?

8. Did the visit leave you with any intention to do anything in particular?

9. Did the visit affect your thinking about teaching, learning or schools?

10. What was most difficult or challenging about the visit?

11. How did the discussion you had with your tutor about the lesson compare with the discussions you had with your mentor after lessons? Similarities? Differences?

12. How did you feel at the end of the visit?

That’s all my questions. Thank you for supporting my research.
Student teacher visit 2/3 Interview

General introduction

Hi [name]. I hope you are well. We agreed that I would call you today at this time to conduct an interview about the visit last [day]. Is this still convenient for you?

Thank you

Are you happy for me to record this interview? The recording will be kept on a password protected secure server.

The interview will last no longer than 30 minutes. Is that alright with you?

Please try to answer as honestly as you can. If there are any questions that you cannot answer, or that you do not want to answer, please say so. Your responses will be kept completely confidential and will not be shared with your tutor.

Are there any questions before we start?

1. Thinking back to the first visit – did you read the feedback from your tutor?
2. Did this affect what you did later?
3. How did you feel prior to the second visit? [Probe why].
4. Did you do any special preparation prior to the visit? If so, what?
5. What did you expect to happen in the visit?
6. Did you get what you expected from your tutor? Anything surprising or missing?
7. Was there anything that she did that was particularly helpful?
8. Thinking about the discussion you had with your tutor about the lesson, what do you remember most clearly from that discussion?
9. Was there anything that s/he said that you found particularly useful in terms of your teaching?
10. Do you think you benefitted from the visit? In what ways?
11. Did the visit leave you with any intention to do anything in particular?
12. Did the visit affect your thinking about teaching, learning or schools?
13. What was most difficult or challenging about the visit?
14. How did the discussion you had with your tutor about the lesson compare with the discussions you had with your mentor after lessons? Similarities? Differences?
15. How did you feel at the end of the visit?

That's all my questions. Thank you for supporting my research.
Appendix 8: Tutor consent and information form

The Practice of HEI Tutors in Initial Teacher Education and their Influence on Student Teachers

From:
Sandra Amos
Faculty of Education and Languages Studies
The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
MK7 6AA
S.J.Amos@open.ac.uk

October 2011

Dear [Tutor name],

I am writing to invite you to take part in research I am undertaking for the Doctorate in Education at the Open University. The research is focused on the practice of Higher Education Institution (HEI) tutors during their visits to PGCE student teachers on school placement, and student teachers’ perceptions of the influence that this practice has on them.

This document sets out the details of the research. I hope very much that you will be willing to take part.

Further details about the research

Background
HEIs have a long history of involvement in the initial education of teachers. Some research has looked at knowledge and expertise of the HEI tutor, but most of this is focused on the work carried out with student teachers in the HEI sessions. Very little research has examined the practice of HEI tutor when they visit student teachers in school.

Aims
I aim to contribute to our understanding of the practical knowledge of the HEI tutor through researching the strategies, approaches and practices they use with students during school placement visits and the tacit knowledge they use in the decision-making that informs that practice.
**Participants**
I am looking for the cooperation of experienced tutors who have a secure identity as an HE science teacher educator. Ideally, they will be working on an HE science PGCE course as their main occupation, have extensive experience in the role and visit student teachers on school placements.

**What’s involved?**
If you agree to participate, you will be interviewed at the start of the project to provide some background information about your work and experience in ITE and your ideas about the role you fulfil. I will aim to accompany you on some of the school visits you make to the student(s) willing to be involved, observe any teaching, audio record the discussions between you the student and mentor, (if s/he is involved) and take field notes. I will also need copies of the written feedback you give to the student. This data will inform the follow-up interview with you after the visit, which will be conducted after the visit at a mutually convenient time.

**Possible risks and disadvantages of taking part**
There will be a modest time commitment involved for the interviews and I am not able to recompense you for this time.

You may be concerned that the student is being given the opportunity to criticise your practice to the researcher. Whilst the confidentiality of the student’s data must be maintained, you will be given the student interview schedule and questions will not invite criticism of the tutoring. The interview questions will focus on the student teacher’s perception of the influence of particular practices and will not invite evaluation of your tutoring.

Whilst every effort will be made to ensure that all those involved cannot be identified, it may be possible for close colleagues and students to work out who the participants are from contextual clues if they read any subsequent publications.

Student teachers may worry that participating or refusing to participate may impact on their training and assessment. Measures will be taken to avoid this. I will seek the student’s permission and reassure him or her that any data collected will not be shared with tutors in any form until after they have completed the course and only with their permission.

School staff may react negatively to an additional visitor. Permission will be sought from the school and mentor concerned to collect data on school premises. All parties concerned will have the right to deny access to conversations that they feel are inappropriate to share with me.
Possible benefits
When I first became a tutor on a university PGCE course, I had no experience of the role and no induction on to what it entails or how it can fulfilled effectively. I learned through experience. It is still the case that HEI tutors tend to work in isolation from each other, particularly when they are in schools. The pilot research already conducted indicates that this research will provide you with the opportunity to talk about and reflect on your practice, consider the influence you have on your students through the school visits and recognise the expertise you bring to the role. It will be interesting!

What happens to the data?
I will comply with the data protection regulations and principles set out by the Data Protection Code of Practice and the Guidelines for Open University Students on the use of Personal Data for Research Purposes. Copies of these documents can be supplied to you on request. The key points are that:

- Only data pertinent to the research will be collected
- You have the right to decline to give information
- The data will be anonymised and confidentiality will be assured as far as is possible
- You will have full access to the data collected from you
- The data will be kept on a secure server at the Open University until the completion of the research. It will then be destroyed
- The data will be password protected and only accessible by the researcher
- The raw data and personal information will not be shared with any third party. Data may be shared with the supervisor of the research, but will be anonymised before doing so.

What happens after the research is complete?
The data collection phase is scheduled for 20011/12 and the doctorate is due to be completed by December 2013. Once the doctorate is complete, research papers may be published.

What if I have concerns or want to make a complaint?
It is very important to me that I behave professionally and ethically at all times. I will follow the British Educational Research Association’s Ethical Guidelines (2004). I also hope that you will be able to raise any concerns with me personally. If you feel that you cannot do this, you will be able to contact my supervisor (Professor Judith Lathlean: J.Lathlean@soton.ac.uk) or a member of the Doctorate in Education team at the university (email: FELS-edd@open.ac.uk)

What if I decide that I want to withdraw once the research is underway?
You are at liberty to withdraw from the research at any time without giving reasons. You will be able to request the destruction of any data collected that you have contributed to and your request will be respected.
I am interested in taking part – what do I do next?
Please read through the consent information below. If you decide that you would like to participate, please send an email entitled ‘Tutor practice research’ to Sandra Amos at S.J.Amos@open.ac.uk with your full name and HEI address, copying and pasting the statement below confirming you have read and understood the information provided here.

Name: 

HEI: 

I have read the information and understand the nature of my involvement in the research. I agree to take part according to the consent information provided.

Signed: 

I understand that:

- This research is being carried out for a Doctorate in Education (EdD) and is not funded by an external organisation.

- The research aims to develop a better understanding of the practice of the HEI tutor on school visits and the knowledge underpinning that practice and decision-making.

- There is no compulsion for me to participate in this research and participating will not affect my work for the HEI that employs me.

- If I do choose to participate, I may withdraw my participation at any stage with no negative consequences.

- I will receive no financial reward or recompense for taking part.

- Any information I give will be used solely for the purpose of this research, which may include academic publications after completion of the EdD.

- The research necessitates audio recording of the exchanges I have with student teachers when I conduct school visits and the researcher may attend these visits with me.

- The student teachers who I tutor, and who agree to participate in this research, will be interviewed at the start of the research, at the end of their course, and after
each visit in which data is collected. I will be made aware of the interview schedule, but not how students respond.

- The information that I provide may be shared with the person supervising this EdD research, but will be anonymised beforehand.

- The data will be anonymised before any data is shared in a public arena.

- Confidentiality will be respected by the researcher with regard to the information I give, including the use of pseudonyms and other measures in order to preserve anonymity to the greatest possible extent.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information.
**Appendix 9: Example of coding transcript**

Transcripts were imported into an Excel spreadsheet. This allowed for several codes to be allocated to statements and facilitated sorting and grouping codes. Coded statements from one transcript are provided here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement from transcript</th>
<th>Coding 1</th>
<th>Coding 2</th>
<th>Coding 3</th>
<th>Coding 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUTOR</strong> Quite well. I don’t know it as well as some schools because I’ve only been there probably 2 or 3 years. And they do have…not as much now, but they used to have a lot staff turnover. So you thought you got to know them and then … but it's a bit more stable now.</td>
<td>knowledge of school staff turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUTOR</strong> Yes, chaos. But not in the science department. I think that's team room is a nice, buzzy supportive place for student teachers to learn, and actually most student teachers are really quite positive about their experiences at (school). But for me, the rest of the school isn’t run as a particularly tight ship … one of my colleagues described it as everybody who works there runs around, and they all work incredibly hard and they tell each other they all work incredibly hard and a fabulous job, but actually, in terms of student outcomes, they do quite a poor job we think. I just don't think they give their kids a good deal.</td>
<td>judges it as a positive school environment for trainees</td>
<td>school is chaotic, but science department supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>yeah, but I do worry ... I think ?????? that of there they are going to be fine, but I do worry ... it just depends on the classes they get, but I've had student teachers there last year and one of them just didn't become the science teacher he could have been because he spent so much of his time just dealing with behaviour. And because it's just such one long placement it's quite crucial. concerned for trainees' development as teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>So we always think very carefully where they go for the second placement so that it challenges them in terms of their teaching - teaching their subject. [...] He taught this year seven class and you never saw behaviour like in your life and the teacher said oh yeah they are like that. knowledge of school - pupil behaviour school doesn't challenge trainee in terms of subject teaching concerned for trainees' development as teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Yes and that's not right. It's not an easy place to learn to be a teacher of your subject; useful in developing the (behaviour management) skills, which is fine, but ... knowledge of school - place to learn school doesn't challenge trainee in terms of subject teaching concerned for trainees' development as teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I do actually. I do quite a bit. In curriculum school groups, two weeks before I talk them through what the nature of the visit will be - that's all 11 of them - they have to fill in that form profile and they send it to me before my visit ... a couple of days, just so I can have a look at it. It all has to be organised by e-mail and conversations ... probably two or three e-mails per visit. visit preparation - preparing trainees visit preparation - looks at trainee profile visit preparation - preparing mentor managing mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>To check that they're okay; that they're happy; that they're being supported; that they're getting mentor time; they're with a good range of classes at this point. I mean, it's very early. So they've had a little bit of key stage three with a view to possibly some key stage four down the line; they've thought about sixth form in their timetable; making sure the mentors are happy and feel they know what they're doing.</td>
<td>goal for visit - check trainee support</td>
<td>goal for visit – check timetable</td>
<td>goals for visit - check mentor ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Because J, it's only his second year of mentoring whereas L has been doing it for quite a number of years. So it's that.</td>
<td>knowledge of mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>In terms of the intellectual business I say to them ... despite what you say to them, they always think it's an assessment visit, and it isn't really. I know it says assessment point one, but it's very much about another perspective on their teaching and it might be quite a different perspective.</td>
<td>visit preparation - preparing trainees</td>
<td>visit goal - give another perspective on teaching</td>
<td>visit purpose - to get trainee to think about their teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>and it's part of that relationship, isn't it? I haven't spent a lot of time with them on a one-to-one basis [...] they tend to be in a group of 11 or in the big group, or have an odd conversation with me here. So that's quite nice; getting to know them. I don't feel I know either of them very well at the moment.</td>
<td>knowledge of trainee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>That would be quite typical, arriving at that time before a lesson and wandering over to the team room. It's one of the few schools that does allow you to just wander over and knock on the door and they let you in. [...] It's nice to meet them before the lesson to find out what are their intentions, because if it all goes for be wrong, at least you knew they had some really good intentions</td>
<td>relaxed relationship with school</td>
<td>find out trainee's intentions for lesson</td>
<td>reassures trainee by being positive and friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Probably a bit of chitchat I imagine ... just a bit of chitchat and then I would be very much about what her intentions for the lesson were and what she thought my intentions were. What we want to think about focus and some good and always remember to do it and some don't. So having a plan beforehand is really helpful, because that has the focus for their own development on it, and their intentions are in the lesson plan. You can understand what's going on if you've got a plan, or at least understand their intentions can't you?</td>
<td>find out trainee's intentions for lesson</td>
<td>looks at lesson plan for focus and lesson intentions</td>
<td>ascertains trainee's perspective on intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Oh yes, you need to know about the context and also what she thinks of them. What does she think they're like? And it's nice to get a sense of have they got to know the pupils at all as individuals, and at this stage I'm really dead impressed if they say, <em>there's a real highflyer; he sits there or she sits there is a couple who struggle, or they don't get on.</em></td>
<td>Find out about lesson context form trainee</td>
<td>assessment of trainee - knowledge of pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Quite often, even at this early stage, they've already begun to pick up on these individual differences and been thinking about it. So I get a sense of how they know the pupils. Do they know their names? Do they know anything about them?</td>
<td>knowledge of ITE trainees</td>
<td>trainee's relationship with pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Yeah, because if they don't know, the pupils are not going to make progress, because that's the key thing. If they don't understand the nature of the children are trying to teach, they are really going to struggle. And how important they see that.</td>
<td>important that trainee knows pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Usually, if I remember to, particularly if they are year 12 as well. But I think it's important that she says <em>yes you can do that</em> rather than ... she might think I'm checking up on her. I don't want her to think it's for that motive [...] although in a sense I am saying to you know what you're doing...</td>
<td>talks to pupils</td>
<td>Asks trainee's permission to talk to pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I asked him about the class....Because, what does he think they're like? Because sometimes year 12 classes can be ever so recalcitrant. They'll sit there and won't speak to you, and I just wanted to see how they were behaving with K was typical to what they were like, and he said [...] they're quite chatty and prepared to share their answers with people. So it's just to get a flavour of the lesson and what he thought about the students in the class. And it was a bit of chitchat as well.</td>
<td>talks to mentor to get information about pupils</td>
<td>talks to mentor to check typicality</td>
<td>talks to mentor to understand context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>He wouldn't normally be in that lesson, but he hadn't seen her teach very much because sometimes the way the timetable falls in those two days they don't get to see them - and to talk to me I suppose.</td>
<td>knows mentor hasn't observed trainee much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I think so, yeah, but he said not very much. I got the impression that he had not talked to the other teachers very much, which is a bit of a disappointment. But, you know, they're very busy. Because he hasn't worked with her a great deal, but it's early days so that's fine.</td>
<td>finds out about mentor's knowledge of trainee</td>
<td>has expectations of mentors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Some mentors are really good. They liaise with their colleagues, you know, even if they haven't got the student teachers a lot in their lessons, they talk to colleagues a lot, and I got the impression that the mentor hadn't really done that. Whereas L is good at that.</td>
<td>expectations of mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I also talked to the mentor about what he felt about it, because he is a physicist and it is helpful to talk to somebody who knows ...</td>
<td>finds out mentor's view of lesson as a subject specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>To get his perspective on how she's doing with this class, from a very snapshot ... and again just to build relationships, because I don't know him that well, because he's quite new.</td>
<td>finds out mentor's view of lesson</td>
<td>builds relationship with mentor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>And also, [...] I try to get a sense of what their judgements are like, and I'm not judging their judging, [...] but get a sense of did he think that was good? Because people see things in different ways. You know, some things that I think are brilliant another teacher might think are not very good. But actually we quite agreed.</td>
<td>gets sense of the mentor's judgements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I thought the questioning she did at the start ... for somebody who's taught barely anything was really [good] and he thought so ...</td>
<td>assesses trainee's questioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>he said that before I said it because I get him to say it first. So that gives you a sense that he's making some quite nice decisions about what is effective physics teaching for year 12.</td>
<td>gauges mentor's thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I couldn't talk to them well. Normally I can ask them what they're doing and look at the questions, but I felt I couldn't do any of that. I asked them how they're doing; are they struggling with it? Get a sense of how they're engaging with it - at the right level, and the right pitch, that sort of thing. Were they enjoying it?</td>
<td>talks to pupils to gauge engagement with work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Yeah, actually that. I was surprised how much they had been writing down as a bunch of young male physicists. They were writing reams. Even the one group who seemed to be really struggling to get going - the pair she'd given the more challenging questions to do - and she was spot-on. She said I've given them this is because of the wording; they've got to decode the wording before they make sense of the physics. And that's exactly what they said they were having trouble with ... so well done K! You spotted that. And I didn't twig that for a while and just thought that they were perhaps some of the least able ones in that class and they're struggling, but no they weren't. [...] But they soon flew and when I went back they'd done loads.</td>
<td>observes pupils to judge progress</td>
<td>evaluates trainee's decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>So just get a sense of is it at the sort of right level? Are they finding it engaging? That sort of thing. Do they know what they're doing and why? The number of times you ask children in classrooms what are you doing and why? And they haven't got a clue what they're doing.</td>
<td>lesson observation evidence of level of work</td>
<td>lesson observation evidence of pupils' engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I sometimes do that and sometimes I do it separately. It depends if my visit is arranged differently. Sometimes it's one mentor, one student - sometimes it's one mentor and two students - that's the way some schools organise it. I got a sense that... there was a lot of positives going on. I got a sense that they were both being very positive about them, because I think I got an e-mail from one of them saying everything's fine; they are doing really well, so I thought actually doing it together is nice, because then they can listen to each other and it will be good for J as well to listen to L, the more experienced mentor and look at her report. But if I had got a sense there were any problems, I would have said ... maybe next time we'll do it in two halves is maybe they've gone completely different ... but I think at this</td>
<td>gauges overall attitude of mentor</td>
<td>manages feedback discussion - inexperienced mentor learns from experienced mentor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stage it's okay; it worked quite nicely.

| TUTOR | No, which may be, if I'd had that conversation with the head of Department before that meeting, I might have done because I wanted to ... and I don't know how to deal with that; whether just to leave it... and it's been lodged here at the moment and I'm just mulling over what to do about it. | dealing with HoD concerns |
| TUTOR | No, because I did say to [...] the head of Department what you want me to do about it? and she said I don't really want you to do anything, I just want you to know. And I said but what are you going to do about it? and she said she will talk to them L and J (mentor's) about it. I left it at that. | dealing with HoD concerns | follows up issue in university |
| TUTOR | I desperately want them to talk about what they think they've really moved on; to recognise how much they can do - what they're thinking about and actually pulling together a plan and actually affect it in the classroom; and picking up kids for poor behaviour and thinking about the subject, and developing a plan [...] and they're not good at that. I struggled to get really good conversations from them. | feedback discussion - wants trainee to talk | feedback discussion - focus on positives | feedback discussion - focus on progress and thinking |
| TUTOR | The student teachers, but hopefully by February they'll be a bit better about that. They just don't recognise the things that they've developed in. | knowledge of ITE trainees - don't see progress |
| TUTOR | I don't want them to talk about standards; I just want them to talk about their own development and get them to think about it. | feedback discussion - wants to promote thought about development | QTS standards not mentioned |
Well, what they are good at is picking the bones of lessons. Most of them are really good at that and you almost have to say nothing really, because they just do it all. But often they can be too negative. I'm always having to say, now hold on, if we talk about the negatives, let's look at the things you are doing well. And it's pulling them and saying look what you can do.

If I have a philosophy as a teacher educator, my philosophy is that you've got to empower them to think that they can do it and lots of criticism can disempower. Some people it acts as the opposite and makes them even more damned determined, but a lot of people it can completely paralyse them and they can't move on. We've seen that so often. So for me it is about empowering them - that 'hey! look what I can do', because then they can start to make more progress.

And the interesting thing about that is ... X and I were talking about this and she's been doing that a lot recently [getting forms signed and out of the way] ... because she said then they relax, and I thought yeah she's right. So I thought I wasn't going to do it straightaway, because I wanted to signal that you need to do things in order to get this piece of paper signed. So I didn't want to do it straightaway just on a nod and a wink; I thought that's not very professional,

but I wanted to say look at what you're capable of; look at what you said and what your mentor said, and look what I saw in the lesson - let's get this signed and let's have a conversation about the really interesting things about where you're going from here. So that was the real purpose having had any a conversation with X about it.
| TUTOR | Time is very short. I've got half an hour to do ... it could be talk about the lesson as well, and at this stage that's not so bad, but at the next stage it's very pressured. So I have to manage the time otherwise will just end up having a chitchat and nothing gets achieved. And that's a waste of...the teachers are really busy. | feedback discussion - manages time to achieve |
| TUTOR | To go back and say, hey, look at what you have done and have achieved; you've still got loads to do, but my goodness, what you can do already and so quickly. So just to signify that I suppose isn't it? | feedback discussion starts positive - focuses on achievements |
| TUTOR | Just to get the context. It's like in an interview or questionnaire; you ask them the easy, factual questions at the beginning ... just let's get going with this, yeah. | finds out context - how much teaching |
| TUTOR | ...that was feigned surprise...To say, what? You've done that much already? You know, how you are with kids. What!? Did you? Because they all think they should be teaching masses and masses more and I'm always trying to rein them back - to say well that's loads already. | uses feigned surprise to manage trainee & mentor expectations |
| INT | So it was this message that, that's a lot, you're doing well, that's a lot for now where you are. So they get that message. | feedback discussion - easy questions start |
| TUTOR | Both, but I don't need to do much with her because she knows the more doesn't mean better. | knowledge of mentor |
**TUTOR**

you're very aware of what you would expect student teachers to be doing at this stage. Do you feel that this is something that needs constant reinforcement in school? With some teachers possibly. yeah.[...] Some of our least generous-spirited mentors tend to be ... and they can often be young people, often young women, who were themselves flying high from day one, and they just can't see that sometimes some people just take a bit longer; they get there and they get there very effectively, but they just take that longer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUTOR</th>
<th>knowledge of mentors - expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TUTOR

A different route, yeah. So I'm constantly reinforcing that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUTOR</th>
<th>manages mentors expectations of trainees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TUTOR

I can't remember. It might be because the lesson I was going to see was practical work. It might be because I worry about that a lot. It is one of the hardest things to think about. You know, year seven with Bunsen burners for goodness sake! A nightmare! Why did I pick up on it? I don't know. I can't remember why. I'm really sorry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUTOR</th>
<th>feedback discussion focus on practical work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TUTOR

Yeah, and I'm always interested in trying to challenge it, because it just gets rolled out, doesn't it? And it's usually rubbish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUTOR</th>
<th>feedback discussion focus on practical work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TUTOR

what she's achieved, and she's achieved masses in a tiny period of time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUTOR</th>
<th>trainee's achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TUTOR

Very important, yeah. It's about building their confidence and making them feeling empowered as adult learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUTOR</th>
<th>feedback discussion - wants to build confidence and empower</th>
<th>feedback discussion - helps them see progress made</th>
<th>wants to help trainee take ownership of their own PD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I have to take it on face value because I haven't seen L (student) teach. [...] What did make me smile inwardly to myself, because I know that L (mentor) has quite a high tolerance of talk in her class and L (student) at the moment (because she's talked to me about this) she wants her class is much quieter than L (mentor) allows them to be. So her normal, desirable state is quite a lot quieter. So that made me chuckle, thinking ..., but yeah, they seemed perfectly ... low-level disruption; I have to say I thought she was really, really hot on that, but she might have been hot on that because they've been talking about it ... and that's part of the problem. The mentor's report is a bit out of date, because clearly she'd really focused on it because in that lesson she was so insistent on them being quieter ... and I think she did set out high expectations and that's probably not L (mentor) not knowing; I expect that's because she's moved on since that was written.</td>
<td>knows mentor is tolerant of noise</td>
<td>assessment of trainee - behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I think that's why I made a point of saying that in this report, because [...] on the whole they did behave appropriately and work well. You had high expectations, you know, I said really good things. Again, I don't know why she worries about it so much.</td>
<td>university requirements – report</td>
<td>manages trainee's expectations about behaviour management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I suppose what you're doing is saying look, this bit of evidence actually confirms what J (mentor) says - to make him feel better - I saw that too.</td>
<td>supporting mentor - confirming judgements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>I knew he would say that, because I'd already spoken to him and he would say that. I wasn't ever going to put him in that position.</td>
<td>knew mentor's view before feedback discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>And to get a sense ... because sixth form is so very different, so how does that compare with your other classes. And I know she is worried about a year nine biology lessons, because I've planned a lesson with her. So I know she is a bit worried about that. So I just get a sense of how that could be translated to her other classes.</td>
<td>knowledge of teaching knows trainee's worries seeks evidence of confidence with other classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>That's another thing that they worry about isn't it? That they they've got to know it all the time they finish the PGCE. No actually ... that's not possible.</td>
<td>knowledge of ITE trainees - subject knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>What the head of Department was saying was so contrary to all of this, so I felt like <em>what?!</em></td>
<td>making sense of HoD feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>she's worried about it ... she is worried about it. That's why she came to see me a couple of weeks prior to this... about this lesson.</td>
<td>knows trainee's worries - subject knowledge support of trainee - reassurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Because again, I'd only seen a sixth form lesson and I wanted to get a sense of the other end of the scale. What's that like? And get her to talk about it.</td>
<td>evidence - trainee talk about other classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Because one of the areas for development that came from the lesson was, okay, you're questioning was good, but it was always me to you, to me to you.</td>
<td>evidence comes from lesson observation</td>
<td>lesson observation suggests area for development is questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Ping-pong is how you described it, yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Yes, it was a bit like ping-pong, wasn't it? [...] I call it ping-pong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>And is that something that you’ve discussed in University?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>A little bit yeah. We’ve done a little bit on questioning and we’re coming back to it again. It’s quite low-level stuff on questioning, because it’s about hands up hands down.</td>
<td>link to university work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Yeah will stop then it J’s (mentor) turn for the areas for development and you really at this point stress how it’s not weaknesses at all. You actually use the W word but saying it’s not weaknesses at all; you really want to push that. So why that?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Because everybody’s got things to learn and given where they are, they’re not weaknesses - it’s not saying your weak or insufficient; they’re just things you’re working on and things you’re thinking about.</td>
<td>feedback discussion - areas for development not weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Because it’s really important that they think about ... you know, why do you get them to think about where they’ve come from? Well, because they need to do it, because J (mentor) hasn’t got the time to be there every day with her, so she’s got to do that.</td>
<td>feedback discussion - to promote trainee to think and evaluate</td>
<td>feedback discussion - to develop trainee’s ability to evaluate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUTOR</th>
<th>Because one of the areas for development that came from the lesson was, okay, you’re questioning was good, but it was always me to you, to me to you.</th>
<th>evidence comes from lesson observation</th>
<th>lesson observation suggests area for development is questioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Ping-pong is how you described it, yes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Yes, it was a bit like ping-pong, wasn’t it? [...] I call it ping-pong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>And is that something that you’ve discussed in University?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>A little bit yeah. We’ve done a little bit on questioning and we’re coming back to it again. It’s quite low-level stuff on questioning, because it’s about hands up hands down.</td>
<td>link to university work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Yeah will stop then it J’s (mentor) turn for the areas for development and you really at this point stress how it’s not weaknesses at all. You actually use the W word but saying it’s not weaknesses at all; you really want to push that. So why that?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Because everybody’s got things to learn and given where they are, they’re not weaknesses - it’s not saying your weak or insufficient; they’re just things you’re working on and things you’re thinking about.</td>
<td>feedback discussion - areas for development not weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>Because it’s really important that they think about ... you know, why do you get them to think about where they’ve come from? Well, because they need to do it, because J (mentor) hasn’t got the time to be there every day with her, so she’s got to do that.</td>
<td>feedback discussion - to promote trainee to think and evaluate</td>
<td>feedback discussion - to develop trainee’s ability to evaluate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I'm not a great fan of this reflective practitioner thing, because some people learn nothing from experience and some people learn loads, so you can't just assume that they can do that.

You've got to teach them the skills of self-analysis and evaluation, and part of that is asking the right sort of questions I think, to get them to think about it. I suppose. That's what I think.

No, I don't think they do. I think they're quite good at evaluating lessons, so that task, that resource worked, but them, as a teacher - I don't think teachers do find that very easy. I don't think I would. If you asked me what my strengths and areas for development are, I think I'd have struggled.

Well, because we don't have time to sit and naval gaze, because it's all do, do, do isn't it, and not think, think, think. So that probably. To encourage them to think about what they're good at and what they're not so good at. Because it takes all sorts of people to make good teachers, and unlike what Ofsted think, that there is only one way to be a good teacher, there are lots of ways to be a good teacher.

she doesn't understand it, does she? And why would she?

No, not at all, no. That would just add another level of difficulty to placements. Sometimes school say we can have a chemist and physicist and we usually can do that, but no.

Okay.[...] The support that you've provided goes from quite nitty-gritty stuff...
TUTOR: Well, I like to think I do lots of this, and not so much of the nitty-gritty, but I think I do lots of nitty-gritty. Perhaps at this stage you're doing more nitty-gritty.

TUTOR: Well, because K was here on the Friday and she'd been given this lesson to do for the following Tuesday. So there was very little time in school to do it. She just needed some help, because the head of Department wanted the lesson plan by Tuesday morning or something or Monday night. So she didn't have the opportunity. I do try to leave planning for the mentors, but sometimes in that situation she just needed me to help her, because she was in a panic. Because I actually think they're better at lesson planning than I am.

TUTOR: yeah I know. I hope that she doesn't transmit that over to K, because that will make K worried about asking and I don't want that at all.

TUTOR: Yeah, she might pick herself up a bit about it.

TUTOR: I like to think I manage it quite well, because I'm always on top of it [...] and now it's easy because I see them twice a week; the beginning and the end of the week, so it's easy.
| TUTOR | Yeah, because sometimes they come back here on Friday and they hear other people talking and they think, *oh god I'm not doing that; I'm not very good at that,* and they beat themselves up again about things like that. Because often it is the people who were doing things really well, or at least think they are, like to talk about it; and the other ones, who are perhaps less confident, won't say anything. And they think, *I can't do that, I'm not very good,* and [...] I think all L in particular that's very important, because she a bit of a worrier. | knows trainee is a worrier | knows ITE trainees compare themselves with others |
| TUTOR | Yeah, you always have to monitor that. So when you've worked with the mentor for a long time like L (mentor), you'll be fine. | monitors mentors' expectations |
| TUTOR | And I think J will be fine as well. He knows is not just about doing lots and lots [...] less is often quite good. | evaluates mentor's expectations |
| TUTOR | from planet Zog I think [...] *you must be up and running straightaway - what?!* | evaluates expectations of HoD as unrealistic |
| TUTOR | There isn't there (laughs). So you've got get your mentors on board, but, you know, with somebody like the head of Department, I would think probably even L and J would find it quite difficult to challenge her; she's quite a powerful lady... scary isn't she? So that worries me. So it's one I'm constantly going to keep an eye on, and you have to trust the students that they will tell you things if things... if they're not happy, because at the end of the day you can't do much else. | monitors school expectations – HoD | wants to get mentors on board |
| TUTOR | I always do that. I was doing it today and I thought *Oh God xxxx, you're telling another story.* | feedback discussion - uses stories about self |
**TUTOR** Yeah, I used to teach true stories... I'd tell stories. I'd get the book out and say *I'm going to tell you a story.* I didn't make it completely up off the top of my head. But I like narrative; I like reading; I like novels. So I like story, I like plots, I like...

---

**TUTOR** It just makes it more memorable, it makes it more meaningful, it makes it less abstract [???] Yeah I do tell a lot of stories. I know I did it today because I caught myself doing it.

---

**TUTOR** Well, that makes me sound like I think learning to teach as a linear thing and of course it's not is it? You go forwards and backwards and backwards and forwards, but in terms of managing that conversation you have to be like that.

---

**TUTOR** What are they dreading? To get it out on the table. And I'll talk before they go off into school for their 12 weeks, I shall again do hopes and fears and things like that so that they can share them. And they worry about workloads and all those sorts of things. Because talking about things helps.

---

**TUTOR** Because they go off on tangents and I make them focus. So it's partly about getting them better at analysing their teaching. *Okay, what was it I wanted to get out of the lesson? This is what I achieved.* Rather than, *I think it all went very well,* and it's all rather banal statements.

---

**INT** So you really wanted to focus her on that and since she'd chosen those things it was logical to do that?
<p>| TUTOR | I wanted to get a feel for whether she'd planned it or if it just happened. Because sometimes they do things in the classroom that just because it happens and they haven't really thought about it. Had she thought about how she was going to do it? What did she say? | feedback discussion - finds out about planning | use of questions - probe decision making |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| TUTOR | I wanted her to think why she did it, because I think it was a bit of a conscious decision actually, because it worked nicely with that group; I mean, a little bit more where they could just say what they thought, whereas if you had 30 year seven you couldn't possibly have done that, could you? So I think actually it was a bit more conscious than she thinks it was. | feedback discussion - gets trainee to think about reasons for actions | feedback discussion - make decision making explicit |
| TUTOR | [that was another example where you interject in a very positive way to flag up that that's unusual for student teachers to do that. Who was that for? Was that message for her or for J?] Both actually. | managing mentors expectations of trainees | managing trainee expectations |
| TUTOR | I'm interested in the thinking, because often at this stage the lesson might be completely awful, but the quality of their thinking suggests that things will be fine in the end. But as it turned out, what she did in the lesson was really good, but her thinking ... you know, she had thought about it. This isn't about them knowing stuff. This is about them using stuff, so I put it on the board of the mental reminder. I just like the way she gathered their ideas emerged on the board. I just thought it was really nice. | assessed trainee's thinking | feedback discussion - interested in trainee's thinking |
| TUTOR | a conversation about their thinking. | lesson is a vehicle for conversation about | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUTOR</th>
<th>trainee's thinking</th>
<th>trainee's thinking</th>
<th>trainee's thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, because the quality of their thinking will be so much better often than what goes on in the lesson. And I know X's project - they found that; the quality of student teachers' thinking was way ahead of actually what went on in the lesson.</td>
<td>assessment - trainee's thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes do that, it depends on time. Sometimes I say... but I got a sense that she was quite happy with that lesson, so that was a bit of a pointless question. So I thought well, it wasn't perfect so what would you do differently? So that's probably why I left that question out.</td>
<td>trainee's evaluation affects approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...] It's because if you just tell them something, they'll say, <em>all right then.</em> But if they've gone through the process of thinking it through and talking it through [...] then it will mean more.</td>
<td>feedback discussion - trainee thinking important</td>
<td>feedback discussion - trainee talking it through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to say that when I've done things like external examining and listen to teachers and other University tutors say to student teachers, <em>Oh, if that was me, I'd have done this,</em> and you think, that's not helpful is it? You've got 20 years teaching experience and you're not them, so what's the point of you saying that?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feedback discussion - avoids 'I would have done..'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah, yeah. And how she does it is her way and it might not be my way, but...</td>
<td>teachers are different - no one right approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I suppose like a lot of teachers I think back to individual student teachers in the past and what they were like and what helped them, and I think teachers do that a lot, don't they? It's having those little images that you reflect back on. My research area is in subject knowledge development and that informs a lot of what I do.

Yeah, it always does, yeah. So it's telling K that she's not to worry about her subject knowledge; it's dynamic; it grows through planning and teaching; it develops; you have to ask others; you have to some get help; you have to collaborate. So yes, in that sense. I'm trying to think what have I read that makes me feel so strongly you have to make them feel empowered and I can't think, but I'm sure there was something I read once that really hit home to me massively - God, that's so true. [...] I think sometimes it's seeing what other people do and thinking I wouldn't do that, and then you think, well why wouldn't I do that? You know, like saying to students well, if that was me I'd have done this. What's the point of that? That's a pointless thing to say. It just makes them feel like crap, doesn't it?

Because they can't be you because they haven't got 20 years teaching experience [...] and I have to say that a lot of my thinking - I've done quite a lot of external examining in my time - and those conversations you have with colleagues in other institutions - because often you visit failing students - we don't get many failing students here, so my knowledge of those are really limited probably here, [...] so it's probably not research but much more practical experience - is what's gone wrong and made this person not progress like they should have been, because if they were selected on the course they must've thought that they could have achieved QTS at the end of the day.
TUTOR: Yeah. I came away feeling a bit pissed off by [the head of Department]. For K's sake, I'm wondering again how that's going to affect her.

TUTOR: Yes [...] but I don't want to say anything to K, because it might not be a problem and I don't want to make it a problem. But I'll keep an eye on it. I just get really angry about the unfairness of it all - it makes me really cross.

TUTOR: They're so vulnerable. I wish people would realise and remember what it was like. They are so vulnerable.

TUTOR: Either they've never had it, or lost their generous spirit. We always say it's about having a generous spirit; a good mentor is generous in spirit.

TUTOR: Yeah, I think I ask more 'whys'. Why did you do that? What was behind that? And perhaps next I might actually ask, where did you get that from? Where did you read about that? I might actually start thinking about, well, have you thought about Neil Mercer's work for example. So those sorts of questions.

TUTOR: A mentor hasn't got the time. I try and not focus on behaviour all the time, because I think mentors are a focus on it, so I try not to - because I'm not an expert on managing behaviour. Teachers are much better at it than me. So yeah, I suppose I've got particular bees in my bonnet.

TUTOR: Don't focus on it too much, yeah. [...] Don't make it a massive focus unless it really is an issue. Yeah, because it's bound to be isn't it?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUTOR</th>
<th>Oh yeah totally yeah. It's like L. It's clouding everything she's doing at the moment, which is ridiculous. She's fine.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knows trainee worried about BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>But it's not am I do say that to them. Your lesson could be absolute [...] tits?, But that wouldn't really matter because by the time I come and visit you agree you will have all this wealth of evidence that you're teaching lovely lessons and doing all the right sorts of things, so that bit of evidence isn't going to outweigh all this evidence, is it? So in that sense... It's not like and Ofsted, all or nothing [...] it's about mapping their progress. Somebody who's got an official function gate-keeper keeps all that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evidence - status of visit evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mapping trainee's progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tutor role is gate keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>There should be, shouldn't they? Because I often think this. There should be, but there isn't actually and I never have done. Because even when I've not put through someone on the formal check visit, which I haven't done many times, but... no, I haven't found an issue. The trouble is they identify it ... if you get them to talk about things aren't going so well, it's more of a conversation rather than you telling them, then it just lowers that whole status about it being me doing the assessing. Well no, we're all doing the assessing; were all seeing where you are; and look, this is where you need to be and actually you're not not quite there yet, are you? It's that conversation, not me coming in and [non-verbal].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assessment - gets trainee to talk about unsuccessful aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involves trainee in assessment - not her doing it to the trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feedback discussion - conversation with trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td>it's an official record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university requirements - report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10: Final thematic template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Goals &amp; intentions</th>
<th>Subsumed within remaining themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Support</th>
<th>2.1 Support goals</th>
<th>2.1.1 to boost confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2 check trainee is OK</td>
<td>2.1.2 check trainee is OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3 check trainee is collaborating</td>
<td>2.1.3 check trainee is collaborating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2 Emotional support</th>
<th>2.2.1 Reactive</th>
<th>2.2.1.1 prior to visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1.2 detecting anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1.3 ways of dealing with anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2 Pre-emptive (Maintaining self-esteem / confidence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3 Professional issues</th>
<th>2.3.1 Advice</th>
<th>2.3.1.1 subject knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.1.2 workload / organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.1.3 teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.1.4 dealing with school staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.2 Practical</td>
<td>2.3.2.1 teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.2.2 evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4 Personal issues</th>
<th>2.4.1 Health</th>
<th>2.4.2 Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Assessment</th>
<th>3.1 Pre-visit assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Gathering evidence</td>
<td>3.2.1 School staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.2 teachers</td>
<td>3.2.1.2.1 context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.3 LSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.4 technicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2.2 Paper work</th>
<th>3.2.2.1 Lesson plans &amp; evaluations</th>
<th>3.2.2.1.1 about pupils’ learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2.1.2 about lesson structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2.1.3 of reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2.1.4 of trainee’s organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2.1.5 about context for lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2.1.6 knowledge of pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2.2.2 Mentor records</th>
<th>3.2.2.2.1.1 talking /questions to check understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2.2.1.2 looking at work / books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2.2.1.3 behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2.3 Lesson observation</th>
<th>3.2.3.1 pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.3.1.1 talking /questions to check understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.3.1.2 looking at work / books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.3.1.3 behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2.4 Talking to PST</th>
<th>3.2.4.1 decisions / thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.4.2 PST’s self-evaluation &amp; reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.4.3 work with other classes - wider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2.4.2 PST’s self-evaluation &amp; reflection</th>
<th>3.2.4.3 work with other classes - wider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Using evidence</td>
<td>3.3.1 to diagnose (formative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Assessment goals</td>
<td>3.4.1 to gather evidence from mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.2 check trainee is doing what is expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.3 formative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.4 summative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.5 gauge progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development</td>
<td>4.1 Aims / Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 General principles and approaches</td>
<td>perspective on teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 Build on strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 Trainee focused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3 Prioritising and focusing</td>
<td>4.2.3.1 long term view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3.2 to progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4 Practices to avoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.5 nature of approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.1.1 management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.1.2 supporting pupil learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3 Strategies used to achieve aims</th>
<th>4.3.1 to start the feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2 to support trainee’s own evaluation</td>
<td>4.3.2.1 dissecting / analysing/unpacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2.2 presenting evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2.3 probe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3 to challenge thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.4 to developing practice</td>
<td>4.3.4.1 Modelling teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.4.2 Direction / instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.4.3 focus on planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.5 raise awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4.4 Written feedback               |                             |
|                                     |                             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Management</th>
<th>5.1 Visit &amp; events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1 Visit organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2 Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.3 Feedback discussion</td>
<td>5.1.3.1 time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.3.2 impact of mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.3.3 dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.3.4 organisation</td>
<td>5.1.3.4 organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.4 HEI paper work</td>
<td>5.1.4 HEI paper work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 People</td>
<td>5.2.1 Trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.1.1 expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.1.2 development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.1.3 talk in discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.1.4 maintain effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2 Mentor</td>
<td>5.2.2.1 Influence practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.2.2 Expectations of trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.2.3 assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.2.4 paperwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.2.5 contribution in discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3 Senior staff</td>
<td>5.2.3 Senior staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 School placements</td>
<td>5.3.1 current placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.2 next placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.3 match trainee to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quality Assurance</td>
<td>6.1 Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.1 Assessment of trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.2 expectations of trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.3 Practice with trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.3.1 Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.3.2 Written feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Nature of experience</td>
<td>6.2.1 general indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2.2 timetable / classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Professional tutor</td>
<td>6.3 Professional tutor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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