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ABSTRACT

The focus of this qualitative study was to make a space to hear the voices of site-based teacher educators who work with preservice teachers in site-based teacher education programs, especially in those circumstances where problems arise. The study focuses particularly on the emotional dimension of the engagement between preservice teacher and teacher as well as teacher and university teacher educators. In this thesis I argue that it is the discursive practices within and between schools and universities, engaged in the co-production of a new teacher, that have significant emotional implications for the production of the subjectivities of site-based teacher educators. It provides a detailed analysis of interviews with fifteen teachers who had worked with unsuccessful preservice teachers.

While the study of emotion discourse is a growing field in education, there is limited work on site-based teacher education and almost nothing from the perspective of the site-based teacher educators. If and when the emotional dimension has been explored in initial teacher education, it typically involves university staff and/or their preservice teachers. Using discourse analysis and employing a feminist post-structuralist lens informed by Foucault, I was able to make sense of the intensely emotional experiences of the teachers involved. This thesis aims to make clear how teachers’ subjectivities are produced by the often intersecting and competing practices within their work place but also, by the powerful discursive practices of the university that operate to position the teachers as outsiders inside teacher education. Accordingly, this thesis extends the current literature on initial site-based teacher education by using emotion discourse of teachers as a focus for interpretation.

Negative emotional experiences have the potential to seriously impact on the long term sustainability of site-based teacher education. The thesis makes recommendations that will assist universities and particularly initial teacher education programs to foreground the discourses that structure the lives of site-teacher educators and to find ways to counter these often very negative discursive practices.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

While with an eye made quiet by the power
Of harmony and the deep power of joy
We see into the life of things.

Wordsworth (1798) from "Lines composed ... above Tintern Abbey.

OUTLINE

This study focuses on the experiences of teachers working to support preservice teachers in site-based teacher education programs\(^1\). It emanated from my personal experiences working with preservice teachers and with university staff undertaking the task of school/university liaison. My interests stem\(^2\) from my time as a teacher educator, firstly based in schools, then more recently as a university lecturer. This thesis pays particular attention to the emotional experiences of a number of site-based teacher educators\(^3\) who were working with preservice teachers who experienced difficulties while undertaking their placements in a school setting\(^4\). Investigating the nature of the emotions that result from an interactive relationship (such as the one that exists between a site-based teacher educator and preservice teacher) can provide an understanding of ‘more subtle, often unspoken elements in human interactions’ (Lasky, 2000, p. 844).

One of the accepted “truths” of the teaching profession is that teachers are professionals who typically interact with one another and provide collegial support and ideas. However, when the demands of their classroom, their colleagues and their profession

---

\(^1\) The term site-based teacher education refers to professional education beyond the traditional school setting – involving in this sense, sites such as early childhood settings and kindergartens as well as primary and secondary schools.

\(^2\) Throughout this thesis I will engage in a process of mixing tense. Things that occurred or were written in the past will be described in the past tense but if the issue being addressed is still prevalent in the present, I will use the present tense.

\(^3\) I will use this term to name the teacher who works within a school with a student (preservice teacher) on professional placement – co-operating teacher; associate teacher; mentor teacher are terms commonly used in the literature.

\(^4\) The professional placement is often referred to as the “practicum” in the literature related to initial teacher education (ITE); clinical placement, fieldwork education, even internship are other terms commonly used in ITE and other professions such as nursing, social work etc.
compete for time and energy, teachers’ emotional resilience\(^5\) can be stretched, often to breaking point. How teachers deal with their emotions and particularly the range of emotions associated with competing discourses at play in the induction and assessment of new professional colleagues is an important area of study. Teachers’ narratives provide an avenue for such studies and my study explores those discursive practices of schools and universities as they “produce” site-based teacher educators’ subjectivities.

BACKGROUND

In 2002 I was enrolled in a PhD program focussed on the place of reflective practice in initial teacher education through a nested participant action research project. Such a project seemed highly appropriate, given my position in the university as a teacher educator and it was progressing very nicely … at least until the day that staff at my university campus received notification that one of our students, who had recently “failed” his professional experience placement at a local school had threatened to harm academic staff involved in the assessment of his placement. At the time, staff in my faculty were told to remove their names from their doors and leave the premises if they so desired. Coincidently this threat came the same day as two students were killed on the campus of another Australian university, Monash in Melbourne. A photograph of our threatening student was circulated to staff in the faculty as well as security staff on the broader campus. My colleagues were clearly emotionally distressed, as was the teacher who had assessed the student at the centre of this event. The university offered support and counselling to the teacher and kept him informed about the student’s whereabouts and the manner in which the university was addressing this matter.

It was as a direct response to this event that I decided to change the focus of my PhD study and begin the investigation on which I now report.

As a university academic, I am responsible for leading the development and management of site-based programs across five different campuses at my university and more than twenty different education programs, with 3000 students studying both on campus and by distance education. When reflecting on that task, I realised that there were numerous occasions when teachers in schools were placed in emotionally-

\(^5\) Emotional resilience refers to an individual’s capacity to cope in stressful circumstances. Resilient individuals are more able to adapt to adversity while the less resilient struggle to cope with stressors. The “individual” notion of ER will be explored later in this thesis.
demanding situations when our students were not able to achieve the desired outcomes from their site-based programs. While the number of times that a student was actually awarded a failing grade in the faculty was quite small (about 0.3%) the number of teachers affected by students who experienced difficulty was, I believed, much greater. Consequently, I felt that my study could potentially lead to a better understanding of the experiences of these teachers. Such understandings could also enable me, and colleagues with similar roles to mine, to address some of the fundamental causes underlying these experiences.

HISTORY

Teacher education is a broad and complex endeavour, with a vast array of variables influencing its success – students, teacher educators, course content, institutional regulations and standards (both internal and external to the university), workplace cultures, political agendas and resourcing pressures. The interaction of these and other issues result in preservice programs becoming almost quixotic – highly dependent on individual contexts and the personnel within them.

I have chosen the title Conduct unbecoming to reflect aspects of initial teacher education, on a number of levels. The focus of my study was to explore teachers’ experiences through their narratives, and the construction of their subjectivities as site-based teacher educators. Accordingly, I think that Simon’s (1985) discussion about the ‘denigration of the value of professional training (for teachers) by the public schools in England’ (p. 81) is useful in contextualising the importance of teacher education not only for schools, but also its place in universities. Simon recounted the history of teacher qualifications and noted that traditionally, heads of schools in England did not deem it necessary for teachers in “public schools” to have undergone teacher preparation, as schools were seen as an extension of the home, with the primary task being the socialisation of the young men, particularly the pastoral role more so than intellectual pursuits. He asserted that ‘approaches to teaching were traditional, handed down from generation to generation’ (ibid, p. 81), so the focus of “learning” was on the preparation of a gentleman, more so than intellectual pursuits. Consequently it was the former pupils of the school who then accepted the mantle of “teacher”, based only on them having attended that school. These teachers knew what conduct was “becoming of

6 The term refers to elite privately funded “greater public schools” of England.
a gentleman” so they were deemed to be acceptable individuals to undertake the task of educating these young gentleman in gentlemanly ways, rather than what might more recently be thought of as the task of a teacher.

According to Simon education held limited prestige as a science in England because not only was it ignored in the most prestigious schools, but it was also ignored in the most prestigious universities. Oxford and Cambridge universities made almost no serious contribution to the development of education theory and practice, until quite recently. Cambridge was the last university in England to appoint a Chair in Education – in 1948. Simon noted that this situation was not replicated in other Western countries, where the education of the middle class was taken very seriously. The point I want to make here is that in light of the commitment of Australian teachers to the principles of social justice and equity in our ‘classless society’, we might now consider such ideas as “conduct unbecoming” of the educational process more generally. Further, as the reader becomes immersed within this thesis, she/he may well find that the conduct of different stakeholders in initial teacher education programs covered by this study, could well be deemed “conduct unbecoming” of a professional within dominant present-day discourses of teaching with the outcome being that the difficult emotional experiences of teachers were accentuated. This unbecoming need not be only seen as negative, as unbecoming is the very driver of becoming, making the past and present not given but fundamentally ever-altering, virtual (Grosz, 2005, p. 4). Through unbecoming there are new possibilities – this thesis engages with some new possibilities in initial teacher education.

Finally, my focus here is on the notion of teacher subjectivities and as such highlights the notion of teachers “becoming”. When individuals confront difficult emotions it can result in their undoing – their (un)becoming – as their professional/normalised stance is undone when they suffer the deleterious effects of difficult emotions.

In the 1990s, education, particularly in the United Kingdom underwent significant changes that required universities to conduct two-thirds of their teacher education programs in schools (Maynard & Furlong, 1993, 1996). This was achieved by establishing collegial partnerships designed to draw upon the expertise of practising teachers and university-based staff. In the United States, much of the change in the
1990s revolved around the creation of the Professional Development Schools (Bullough, Draper, Smith & Birrell, 2004d; Slick, 1998). Historically, teachers in Australian schools have played a significant role in the preparation of beginning teachers. There has been a significant role played by experienced teachers in the pupil-teacher schemes in NSW, for example, where students, as young as thirteen and fourteen were trained in an apprenticeship model by the experienced school mistress or master at the end of the working day (NSW Dept of Education, 1993). Only later in their education were some of these pupil-teachers given access to tertiary training, with the scheme being abolished in 1909. Teachers’ colleges were the primary site for teacher preparation/training and were controlled by separate state governments until the national education reforms of the 1980s saw them become part of the federally-funded and controlled university structure (Harman, 1989), where increasingly their status has been eroded.

Site based teacher education is considered to be one of the most important components of initial teacher education courses. Alexander and Galbraith (1997, p.18) stated that ‘teaching realities gained from experience in the school are universally proclaimed as essential elements in teacher training’. However, there have been numerous studies in the past twenty years, both publicly-funded or undertaken by education researchers, unions and welfare agencies that have explored, among other issues, the contribution that the site-based component makes to quality teacher education programs (Adey, 1998; Dinham & Scott, 1997; Gore, 1995; Hartsuyker, 2007; Niland, 1998; Ramsey, 2000). Attention has been focussed on issues that cross international boundaries including amongst others, governance and standards, research, professionalism, preservice curriculum and the role of teacher educators. It has been suggested that societal problems associated with the current rapid pace of change may be related to the failure of schooling and by extension, the failure of teacher education and teacher educators (Gore, 1995).

The Australian Senate Committee report, A Class Act (Crowley, 1998) asserted that university bureaucracies accorded education faculties low status within the institution, which resulted in cutbacks in staffing and funding. The Department of Employment, Education and Youth Affairs (DEETYA) report (Adey, 1998) outlined guidelines and standards for initial teacher education. From this point in time onwards, the standards debate has become increasingly prevalent, driven by a notion that if there are a set of
standards prescribed for entry into and exit from teacher education programs, such that many of the concerns identified by these studies, were to be addressed (NSWIT, 2004). Similarly, an accountability discourse that encourages measurement and comparison of the performance of schools and teachers has become increasingly normalised and naturalised in policies related to schools and schooling (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2004). However, associated with such studies is a greater recognition of the contribution that teachers in schools can make towards preservice teachers’ education and development (Sandholtz & Finan, 1998) and many teachers believe time spent in the schools is the ‘sine qua non of teacher education’ (Bullough et al., 2004d).

While there is a recognition of teachers’ contribution to initial teacher education and in spite of some problems inherent in the site-based teacher role, Zimpher and Sherril (1996, p. 291) emphasised that the ‘new conception of how one learns to teach’ is achieved by linking the learning of preservice teachers with the experience of practicing teachers and teacher educators through school-university collaboration. It also imperative that teachers are active players in these processes, and that they have the capacity to exercise power in such relationships. Genuine partnerships are often problematic because of the different ‘cultures and distinctiveness of teacher education institutions and schools’ (Teitel, 1998) which means that universities develop programs that have distinctive roles for schools – roles that set schools apart from the universities. In each of the cases explored through this study, a preservice teacher was appointed to a school, to work with, almost always, one classroom teacher who had the responsibility of providing personal and professional support for the neophyte teacher. In most situations there was an expectation that the site-based teacher educator would play a significant role in the assessment of the learner, while final grading typically resided with the university.

The duration of the placement of a preservice teacher in an Australian school can be as short as 1 week but is more commonly a three to five week block. Some programs extend for as long as ten weeks, though this is likely to occur only in the final year of a four year program. A school-based placement is a time when a preservice teacher is immersed in the ‘complexities of practice [and is] exposed to numerous competing understandings about what it means to think and act as a professional’ and, as such, it is characterised by conflict (Phelan, Sawa, Barlow, Hurlock, Irvine, Rogers & Myrick, 2006, p. 163). It is reasonable to assume that having an extra person in the classroom, in
the form of a preservice teacher would potentially increase the complexity, including the emotional complexity, of any classroom. The otherwise “balanced” situation can be fractured such that any teacher’s sources of support, methods of coping and established relationships can experience tensions and emotional upheaval under the public gaze of the preservice teacher and university supervisor. In such situations teachers may be forced to adopt new subjective positions (Smyth, 2001, p. 149) – not without professional and personal costs. This is the context in which this study was conducted.

**PURPOSE**

The traditional model of preservice teacher education is one in which schools “allow” university staff to use their classrooms for site-based placements – constructing a situation where schools, as teacher education ‘sites’, may have limited agency. According to Fendler (2003) researchers rarely listen to teachers when they develop policy and teaching guidelines such that the absence of teachers’ voices in the published literature on teacher education provides fertile ground for any study. Stanulis and Russell (2000) asserted that the viewpoints of teachers are not typically reflected in teacher education and the positioning of teachers as equal partners needs to be addressed. In this study I wanted to understand not only teachers’ place in teacher education, but also the teachers’ feelings in relation to teacher education because, according to Denzin (1984, p. 1) to ‘understand who a person is, it is necessary to understand emotion’.

The research was built around teacher stories to highlight the impact of emotion (the irrational, the unpredictable, the unconscious, unbidden and often uncomfortable) on teacher identity. Importantly, I wanted to foreground the emotionality of site-based teacher education in arguably the most emotionally-charged situations in teacher education – ones in which the preservice teacher experienced difficulty. In my experience of schools, schooling and teacher education, I believe that emotions are silenced on different levels and it was important for me ‘to locate emotions and emotionality [by exploring] the discourses in which they are marginalised, trivialised, controlled and overlooked’ (Parkin, 1993, p. 181) – and one of those spaces is site-based teacher education.
SIGNIFICANCE

Research to date gives limited attention to the construction of teacher subjectivities in relation to site-based teacher education and certainly not with a background structured on an emotional dimension. Naming and examining emotions that teachers experience will assist in developing understandings around the connectedness of emotions and social structures of schools (Ben-Peretz, 1996) and, as is the case with this study, between schools and universities. By examining the interactive and relational characteristics of the emotional experiences of teachers involved with preservice teachers experiencing difficulties, I wanted this research to move beyond “micro-analytic, subjective, individualistic levels of analysis, towards more “open-ended” forms of social inquiry in which embodied agency can be understood not merely as “meaning-making”, but also as “institution-making”” (Williams & Bendelow, 1998, pp. xvi-xvii). Consequently, the research also examined the taken-for-granted practices associated with universities and schools involved in teacher education. Good research generates a qualitatively new understanding of relevant fragments of social reality and has ‘capacity to challenge the guiding assumptions of the culture, to raise fundamental questions regarding contemporary social life, to foster a reconsideration of that which is taken-for-granted and thereby to furnish new alternatives for social action’ (Gergen cited in Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000, p. 278). I argue that this study does offer the opportunity to deepen our understandings of the productive and regulatory nature of institutional discourses, as seen through the framework of teachers’ emotional experiences.

The complex demands of site-based teacher education programs are a challenge for many universities. Meeting the requirements of external regulatory agencies, attempting to conduct quality programs in times of diminishing resources and meeting the demands on teaching staff that position teaching practice supervision as having limited value in terms of academic promotion, are just a few of these challenges. Further, universities face increasing difficulty in attracting sufficient quality site-based teacher educators to support preservice teachers for their school placement (Sinclair, Dowson & Thistleton-Martin, 2006). While this study does not engage directly with many of those issues, it does provide the opportunity for university staff as well as teachers to consider differently many aspects of the site-based programs. University staff are very aware that when a preservice teacher experiences difficulties in achieving the desired outcomes of the program, the impact can be quite negative, not only for the preservice teacher but
also for the teachers and university staff as well. A problematic or ‘unsatisfactory’
preservice teacher can have a serious impact on the well-being of the school-based
teacher educator as well as negatively influencing relationships between the school and
partner university. There will be significant pragmatic implication for universities if
they lose the support of teachers as there are already diminishing numbers of teachers
willing and qualified to undertake the important practical and intellectual task of
supporting a neophyte teacher. Teacher education relies heavily on the contribution
these teachers make to their programs, and I believe providers will need to confront and
address issues raised in this study.

Although there are other studies identifying negative outcomes for teachers (Duquette,
1998; Fry & Martin, 1996; Griffith et al., 1999) I argue that none have focussed on the
connection between the emotional experiences of working with a preservice teacher
who fails the program, the taken-for-granted practices of schools and universities, and
the subsequent impact on a teacher’s subjectivity. In teaching and the other
caring/feminised professions, there has been only limited research that focused on the
fundamental bases and resultant impact of “failing” students (Wayda & Lund, 2005).
This silence in the literature is typically associated with the silencing of emotions, but
also the silence related to failure per se. For an individual to be connected with failure,
whether it is personal or by association, the effect is emotionally draining in both
personal and professional terms. My study notes and foregrounds such emotions and
their social construction in teacher education as well as arguing for the need for teacher
education as a practice to confront dissonance and critique as essential elements of
learning.

Further, though this study has focussed on teacher education, giving voice to site-based
teacher educators, it speaks to all professions that have university/profession
relationships, such as those found in nursing, social work, allied health and provides a
foundation from which they might review their procedures, protocols and taken-for-
granted practices in order to enhance the outcomes particularly for the site-based
professionals with whom they work. As in education, individuals in those professions
struggle to balance the discourses of caring with the regimes of accountability, within
the power imbalances between the profession and university-based colleagues, and I
acknowledge these parallels in this study.
RESEARCH QUESTION

The initial question which guided the research at the start was:

What are the emotional experiences as described by site-based teacher educators when supporting a preservice teacher who struggled to achieve the desired outcomes of the program?

Other questions that were to be addressed in the course of my inquiry were:

What support did the teachers receive before, during and after the placement?
How did the teachers see themselves positioned in the site-based program and teacher education generally?

My intention was not to validate the teachers’ perceptions of these difficult relationships but to give voice to them in a narrative study. However, as the research progressed it became obvious that such a study could not be a descriptive, phenomenological project – I was studying more than “a phenomenon”. As the analysis progressed it became clear that there were more discursive issues in play of which I had not previously been aware (especially in a theoretical sense) and which could not be understood by simple narrative analysis. It became clear that I needed to use a different lens and to employ an analytic technique that would allow me to identify discourses (both productive and regulatory) present within the data. Accordingly, the second phase of the analysis was underpinned by just such an understanding of discourse – one informed by poststructuralist framework informed by Foucault (Youdell, 2006). One of the strengths of poststructural analysis is that it enables the study to ‘produce specificity in the analysis of a particular phenomenon’ (Gore & Parkes, 2008). Consequently, the study raised the following questions:

What are the taken-for-granted discursive practices that operate to constrain the field of teacher education?
How do these practices produce the emotional experiences of these site-based teacher educators?

At this point I must make it clear that to change the nature of my research question in this way was not unproblematic. I found this change of perspective to be a methodological dilemma that related to the impact that a more critically reflexive stance, which is valued within the academy, may have on the feelings of the participants who gave me their time and their stories at the beginning. Ultimately, I am presenting here an account that was not what I originally intended, and for which participants had not given, and may not have given, consent. I remain conflicted over this dilemma although I acknowledge that there must be an emergent aspect of any research – an
interplay between the design and that which emerges. The emergent issue is a result of the learning that occurs through engaging in research that in turn demands a shifting lens, which exposes different issues as it mediates the text.

When I engaged in the initial conversations with the teachers around their experiences, I was at pains to make clear to them my intention of ‘telling their story’ - to present the teachers’ authentic voices - not mediated through a theoretical research lens. However, by applying analytic techniques informed by a poststructuralist framing, I created an abrasion – a collision between my initial realist, liberal humanist feminist framework and the effects of a second, poststructuralist reading. This was a tension between my need to hear the authentic teacher voice and an equally pressing need to tease out aspects of teacher subjectivity and the power of institutions. To have continued solely with a narrative description would have resulted in a study that failed to capture what emerged as the deeper issues involved in the construction of teachers’ emotional experiences and would have ignored the important discursive aspect of the context of study. This aspect of the research and the ethical dilemma associated with this reflexive turn are outlined in greater detail in Chapter 3.

OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

The thesis I argue here is that the emotional experiences (and resultant subjectivities) of site-based teacher educators supervising unsuccessful

preservice teachers, are the result of taken-for-granted discursive practices that constrain the field of professional experience in teacher education. The research is reported in the following five chapters. After this introductory framing of the text, Chapter 2 provides a detailed review of the literature related to emotions with specific attention to teacher education. Primary attention has been given to studies undertaken in Australia (even though they are limited), England (where the focus is more specifically on school-based mentoring of teacher candidates), the United States, and Canada – the vast majority of which were reported in peer-reviewed publications. The review presents an historical overview of “emotion” research combined with a drilling down to research associated with education in a broad sense, then to more finely focussed attention on site-based teacher education, which is particularly limited when considering issues of emotions. The

8 “Unsuccessful”, in this context, addresses a range of outcomes – some of the preservice teachers were given passing grades for their placement, but upon reflection, their site-based teacher educators were not satisfied with their overall results. Some preservice teachers were awarded failing grades.
chapter also examines complementary literature related to other disciplines that involve site-based components and identifies common themes across such professional fields. This is a long and complex chapter, in which I attempted to do justice to the complex nature of teacher education itself, weaving together the range of literature that I have studied in a way that draws attention to all aspects of the field in their interconnection and inter-relation. In some ways its structure and range forces the reader to acknowledge the difficulties that initial teacher education has in preparing the ground for such complex practice as teaching.

In Chapter 3 I provide an outline of the research design and specific method(s) chosen to conduct this study. This chapter outlines in detail the conceptual drivers that resulted in the significant changes made to the theoretical approaches employed. I have chosen to use two case studies to exemplify how important it was, theoretically to make these changes, even when they resulted in the ethical and methodological dilemmas noted above.

Chapter 4 elaborates on the interpretations of my “findings”. The interpretations are inevitably complex, partial and overlapping as I work against the teachers’ stories conceding always that there is no singular interpretation of the text – another reader may have a different interpretation from mine. But my reading is the one presented in this study and I have attempted to honour the perspectives of the teachers, while simultaneously bringing to bear the critique and understanding afforded by my own positioning within the field and the use of poststructuralist lenses. I incorporate the voices of the teachers in an attempt to illustrate for the reader the sources of my “readings”, but also to allow scope for other interpretations. Like Chapter 2, the range, depth and implications of these stories re-presented here may provide a challenging “read” because of their interconnections, interweaving themes and issues, and their unassuming portrayal of the complexity and scope of what teachers do, and feel. I hope the reader, once armed with the quality of information provided by the participants here, will find the subsequent chapters are less challenging, and that the argument I go on to develop is almost an inevitable outcome from the basis of evidence constructed here.

I move in Chapter 5 to weave together my interpretations of the teachers’ narratives with particular discourses that have been described in the literature related to teacher education but not previously covered in Chapter 3. This chapter highlights the
importance for school and university staff to develop understandings of the discourses and associated issues of power that circulate within and between the different sites of teacher education. This chapter also explores some implications of these new “understandings”.

Chapter 6 brings the study to a conclusion when it suggests possible policy and practices that could be enacted in response to the outcomes, especially in relation to teacher education as a process of co-production. I provide suggestions for further research that could arise from this study, particularly in cross-disciplinary studies, because of the synergies between teacher education and education in other clinical-based “caring/feminised” professions, both in terms of the site-based component, but importantly because of the issues of power associated with such programs.

As I move to present my thesis in the chapters that follow, I note at the outset the degree to which the site-based teacher educators, whose stories are voiced here, in all their emotional strength and power, need recognition in the process of professional education as a whole. In what follows, their accounts challenge us to ask why so little of what they know, and feel, has influenced the shape of preservice teacher education in the university setting.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

“The real voyage of discovery consists not of finding new lands but of seeing the territory with new eyes” Marcel Proust (1913)

OUTLINE

In this chapter I draw on an extensive review of literature related to emotions and specifically emotional experiences of site-based teacher educators working with preservice teachers. The literature on emotions is so inter-related that it became impossible to segregate theoretical underpinnings from specific contexts or from specific foci, so the structure of the chapter may appear fragmented – but that is how this field is operating. To present the literature in a structure that disaggregates organisations from socio-cultural work or schools from organisations or “shaping emotions in organisations” from schooling, has been problematic. Accordingly, while I have attempted to work from a broad historical background to a narrower focus of preservice teacher education literature, that proved difficult. So, each section will inevitably have the “flavour” of other parts.

The first section of the literature review addresses an education research history that has ignored ‘emotions’ as a topic. I then look specifically at issues related to the gaps and silences this has produced. I then provide an overview of major issues in emotion research including studies related to gender, culture, and the shaping of emotions. A justifiably significant section is devoted to researchers such as Megan Boler and Michalos Zembylas, whose work on emotion discourse and identity formation was highly influential in the direction my study took. As this study is focused on the difficult emotional experiences of site-based teacher educators engaged in supporting preservice teachers, the third section draws heavily on research that identifies emotional complexities in site-based preservice teacher education, with a deliberate emphasis on
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9 I refer to the teacher in the school who works with a preservice teacher – somebody engaged in a tertiary initial teacher education program as a site-based teacher educator. Different countries adopt the term “co-operating teacher”, supervising teacher, teaching associate, mentor, etc.

10 In this study I differentiate between discourse on emotions which I understand to be the discursive nature of emotions to establish, reinforce or resist power relations in identity formation, and emotion(al) discourses, which are the ways we express our feelings. Both are social practices. Gee (1991) would describe the former as big ‘D’ discourse and the latter as little ‘d’ discourse.
“practicing teachers” rather than preservice teachers, and the issues that are identified in the published research as bases for difficult emotional experiences. That there is limited research attending to the emotional experiences and emotional expressions of this group of teachers is both evidence and consequence of what I argue here is their marginalised position in teacher education.

**INTRODUCTION**

A literature review is a multi-purposed component of any research project, designed to ensure that a study connects with the field while identifying gaps, silences and areas for further analysis or interpretation. As indicated in the opening chapter, my study has tried to make sense of the experiences of school-based teacher educators who have taken on the responsibility of supporting a preservice teacher. For a range of different reasons (which will become clearer in the later chapters), each teacher who volunteered to be part of my study had experienced significant negative emotional episodes during, and in most cases after, the time they spent with a preservice teacher in their school. At the time I commenced this work, my own knowledge of painful episodes was very limited and wholly framed by my personal experiences with preservice teachers I had experienced as “difficult”.

I commenced - as might many beginning researchers - with the sense that I had an idea of where I needed to look and what I needed to read to give me a sound basis for my study. Initially I intended that the structure of the chapter would reflect, to some extent, the meandering path I took in order to make sense of my project. That would have meant the final sections were devoted to the work of feminist and poststructuralist authors, while the early sections would have focussed on cognitive psychologists. I considered that this would give the reader insight into my reflexive journey through the project. However, in attempting this I realised that such a structure would not have enabled me to foreground what became the important work that underpinned the study.

I wanted to begin with a thorough exploration of the literature in the field. That exploration was guided by the language of my experiences – emotions in terms of stress, anxiety, guilt, frustration – so that was where I commenced.
My first reading was in the area of emotions in organisations generally, as there appeared to be little published work related to emotions in education, certainly even less in teacher education and almost nothing in preservice teacher education from a site-based teachers’ perspective. I have chosen to include empirical studies from refereed publications only and I have included work from Europe, North America, South-East Asia and Australia, though I must concede much of the work from England is related to “mentors” rather than the typical school-based teacher educator, who in the Australian context, would usually engage with a preservice teacher for much less time than is reported in this literature. The review examines qualitative, quantitative and mixed method studies.

In this review I do not intend arguing for a definition of emotions – they are too complex to “define”, but suggest that Boler’s (1999) attempt at capturing that complexity useful. She argues cogently that emotions have physiological (felt), cognitive (thinking/evaluative), linguistic (attributing meaning), culturally specific (as opposed to universal) and political dimensions. The examination of the literature will demonstrate the complex nature of emotions and the slipperiness in attempting to “fit” research associated with them into any particular place. It will become clear to the reader that there have been and continue to be different discourses on emotions ie emotions as socially constructed; emotions as biological/psychological entities; emotions as political. Such discourses are historically embedded in constructions and assumptions that will be explored in this chapter. The chapter also address issues of silences/gaps in the emotion literature with an attempt to describe the historical, cultural and gendered underpinnings of those silences and gaps.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

It is well recognised that there has been limited attention paid to researching emotions and publishing “findings” until recently. Emotions have been associated with the feminine, as well as the irrational, and are situated in a “binary” with rational and cognitive, and as such were deemed to be of lesser value (Day & Leitch, 2001), thus under-represented in the literature. Anderson and Smith (2001) argued that “[t]he gendered basis of knowledge production is probably a key reason why the emotions have been banished from social science and most other critical commentary for so long” (p. 7). As Williams and Bendelow (1998) suggested, research in sociology has tended to
reflect ongoing debates such as quantitative versus qualitative methodologies, biological versus social patterns of behaviour, and positivism versus naturalism. Further, they asserted much sociological research has overlooked the opportunity to transcend the binaries of reason/emotion, body/mind, public/private and nature/culture. Commentators such as Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) then Oatley and Jenkins (1996) stated that the fundamental basis for the silence is founded on a suspicion in Western (masculine/rational) thought that there is something amiss with emotions and the associated sense of the irrational. Boler (1997) for example, declared that the idea that emotions are a threat to rationality and self-control, reflects a complicated history of Western fears and philosophical traditions which place high value on a rational model of self. Similarly, Winograd (2003) suggested that negative attitudes associated with public expression of emotions, are related to the “myth of rationality”, and that bureaucracy is intertwined with a system which privileges rationality and marginalises emotional experience.

However, researchers have also argued that the issue of “absence” was more than merely the incapacity to see emotions as “rational”. For example, Bartky (1990) posited that any theory of emotions that asserted emotions should be seen as “rational” and thus acceptable, was conceptually impoverished. Boler (1997) similarly criticised the use of “binaries” as she believes they function as a policing apparatus, and that describing emotions as “rational” merely privileges rationality at a time when theory is simultaneously attempting to value the non-rational. Further, she rejected a “language of rationality” as a means of assessing emotions and asserted that any emotion not seen as rational (such as shame) should not automatically be labelled as irrational. “Validation of emotions” is also connected to irrationality/rationality binaries that are reinforced by polarised language and gendered role expectations, such that “annoyed”, “angry” and “bitter” are each assessed differently. Some are seen as legitimate and others are not, and the individual is forced to justify her expression of emotion in this “validation” discourse (Campbell, 1994).

When attempting to “explain” of the absence of emotion research, some have claimed that the connection of women with emotions resulted in any discourse on emotion being seen to some extent as a discourse on gender (Lutz, 1990) and consequently not worthy of study. Abu-Lughod and Lutz’s work in the early 1990’s debunked notions that are implicitly based on cultural models which link women and emotionality and which
pervaded different fields of research, at that time (1990a). Further, Williams (2001) argued that any notion that emotions are related to irrational thought and therefore gendered as feminine, is unsupported in research. He proposed that ‘emotions provide reason with salience, direction and purpose in hitherto ways neglected or dismissed’ (p. 8).

Established social structures that privileged a male world view also contributed to the emotional/rational (and gender) bifurcation. There is general agreement in the literature that emotions and gender are connected and that emotion discourse plays an important part in maintaining inequality between men and women at work. Acker and Feuerverger (1996) for example, asserted that we cannot ever explore emotions without considering issues of gender, as the gender division in emotional labour is well documented. Ollilainen (2000) and Domagalski (1999) have both explored the nature of women’s emotions and emotional displays in the workplace. They suggested that women engage in emotional labour as they moderate their private emotions to fit in to gender-appropriate behaviour, such that only those who display “appropriate” emotions are seen as normal.

A number of writers also claimed that the meanings attributed to emotional displays by women perpetuate women’s place as subordinate to that of men. Emotional responses constitute gendering processes, in that women’s responses are labelled as irrational and women may be devalued and marginalised in the workplace. Emotions associated with males are seen as valid. It is deemed appropriate for men to express say, anger, but women are labelled pejoratively if they express anger (Sachs & Blackmore, 1998) and tears are seen as inappropriate (Ollilainen, 2000). Within dominant discourses of masculinity, emotionality is associated with emotional strength, and when emotions move outside the realm of private into the workplace there is an expectation that they should be managed and counselled (Domagalski, 1999). Consequently, emotional expression becomes a site of social control.

Winograd (2003) suggested that because women tend to express emotional traits that are highly valued in some sectors – emotions such as restraint, patience, care, non-
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11 Emotional labour has its foundation in Marxist theory and is the outcome of emotion management – the regulation of emotions. Hochschild (1979, 1983, 1990) noted that emotion management requires effort and “this leads to a commodification where the organization controls the worker’s emotions” (Zembylas, p. 48, 2005).
aggression, nurture and passivity – they inadvertently subordinate their status by taking up that discourse, and their diminished status in a patriarchal culture becomes more entrenched. For many women, the maintenance of relationships is central to much of their decision making, their moral judgements, and to the coherence of their identities (Ingleton, 1995). Ingleton’s study, working with academically successful female students in tertiary institutions, explored personal narratives that indicated shared histories of silence and compliance in education, such that many of the women’s learning experiences were driven by a desire to avoid shame, or maintain pride, as ‘the choice of compliance is far safer than rebellion, but it school[ed] women for complicity in their own subordination’ (ibid, p. 330). It is research such as this that propelled feminist researchers to ‘focus on how the experience and display of emotion [as a] site of social control or a site of political transformation’ could be used to disrupt the dominant systemic status quo (Winograd, 2003, p. 1644). There have been many studies that have highlighted how gender and emotions are produced in and through educational practices and how they are interconnected with each other – studies involving girls, early career teachers, teachers and memory work for example (Boler, 1999; Davies, Dormer, Gannon, Laws, Rocco, Taguchi, et al., 2001; Gordon, 2006; Zembylas, 2005b).

Concomitant with the silence in the general education literature is a distinct lack of attention to emotions in teacher education. Sutton and Wheatley (2003) provided excellent critique of this aspect of emotion research. The opening statement in their review exposed the limited recent research related to the emotional aspects of teachers’ lives. They claimed that:

researchers know surprisingly little about the role of emotions in learning to teach, how teachers’ emotional experiences relate to their teaching practices, and how the socio-cultural context of teaching interacts with teachers’ emotions (ibid, p. 328).

As early as 1996, Blackmore argued that the complexity of teachers’ stories of their working lives requires us to theorise emotions better and move away from the notion that emotions are irrelevant to professional practice and only part of the private expressive lives of individuals. However, as recently as 2005, Van Veen, Sleegers and van de Ven reiterated that there was still limited research that addressed the relationship between emotions and identity formation within the ‘framework of an explicit theory of emotion’ (p. 896). Consequently, they published a special edition that examined a selection of new research, which adopted theoretical approaches from social-
psychology, sociology, philosophy and education. All of these affirmed that emotions constitute an essential element of teachers’ work and identity formation (p. 918).

**Individualism (and Isolation)**

Associated with the literature (or silence in the literature) on studies of emotion and with connections to arguments of “irrationality” is another closely aligned theoretical position: the argument that emotions are individual events. One particular area of such research is that which presents work related to ‘emotional intelligence’ (EI) – knowing when and how an individual should respond in a given situation. Goleman’s (1995; 1998) work found a strong foothold in popular discourse through its legitimised “scientific” basis in neurobiological science. It argued for recognition of emotional intelligence as an important aptitude for living, as proponents of EI sought to understand how individuals perceived and managed emotions in an effort to foster personal development (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997; Emmerling & Goleman, 2003). However, Beard, Clegg and Smith (2007), Zembylas and Fendler (2007), amongst others, suggested that this work was not useful because it was a model which perceived emotions as something an individual possessed and was able to control and regulate. According to Tamboukou (2003) emotional intelligence means that for teachers to be “transmitters” of emotional intelligence they must firstly learn how to discipline themselves emotionally (p. 215) – reiterating the notion that emotions are rational and cognitive, residing within the individual. Some critics even suggested that work such as Goleman’s was more to do with commercial exploitation than contributing to psychological understanding (Sternberg, 2000).

Further, Boler (1999) (whose work I explore in more detail later in this chapter) pointed to the contradictory nature of statements that, on one hand argue for emotional control, as demonstrated by identifying somebody who has “emotional intelligence”, while at the same time suggesting that emotions are neurobiological processes ‘over which we have no control ... which depicts us as passive … and [emotion as] an individual, physiological reaction which occurs naturally’ (p. 211). Boler (1999) and Hepburn and Brown (2001) challenged dominant discourses on emotions that posited emotions as a private problem. Boler noted that such an argument is difficult to resist because emotions are hard to define. She asserted that the individual/ private/personal discourse was an attempt to place the responsibility on the individual to ‘police’ her or his
emotions in the interests of organisational success, as a management strategy. Similarly, Hepburn and Brown (2001) noted that organisations and individuals have adopted the label of “stress” that inadvertently places the requirement to cope with the employee, who is then required to undergo self-help programs. Such a stance results in an affirmation of existing power relations and workplace practices, because it is the individual who is the “source of their own stress problems [which then] provide a convenient by-passing of other relational, structural and institutional changes that need to be made” (p. 709).

Gardner (1999) is to some degree critical of Goleman’s individualised conception of emotional intelligence because of its apparent inability to consider historical and cultural influences or social hierarchies in their arguments. Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) original definition of emotional intelligence was narrower than Goleman’s, and did not specifically address social policy, though nevertheless included the individualistic notion of emotional control as an important feature. It is worth noting that the American Education Research Association has a Special Interest Group – Social and Emotional Learning. The group suggested that one of the reasons for an interest in social and emotional learning is because ‘social and emotional competencies are demanded by employers’ (Weissberg, 2007, p. 2).

Individuals may think of emotions as something we do rather than something we learn, so that we think of ourselves as passive victims of emotions over which we have no control - that our emotions are located within us and are seen as natural, like the weather – ie we can not help how we feel. However, there are significant studies that present alternate views – that meanings and emotions are social products, which are responsive to contexts, both internal to and external to an individual (Schmidt & Datnow, 2005). The following section examines literature that recognises emotions are not the result of isolated, individualised occurrences but rather something quite different.

**Emotions: beyond the “individual”**

In what way does the group contribute to the emotional experiences of an individual? How does an individual respond/know how to respond in, or to, a group? These questions have puzzled researchers who are interested in making sense of emotions as social constructions. According to Blackmore (1996) the complexity of any individual’s
stories demands that we theorise the structure and nature of emotions better and move away from the notion that emotions are irrelevant and only a part of the private expressive lives of individuals. Researchers such as Fineman (2000), Harre and Parrott (1996) and Schutz, and DeCuir (2002) as well as Lupton (1998) presented cogent and consistent arguments that emotions are social constructions created through a set of complex interpersonal and intersubjective interactions. They are created and negotiated between people and are ‘complex constructs influenced by learning, interpretation, and social influence’ (Conrad & Witte, 1994, p. 423). Bloomfield (2004) also asserted that ‘emotional experience is not an individual, internal, psychobiological phenomenon but the product of cultural, social and political relations’ (p. 6). The studies present similar positions in relation to the interpersonal nature of emotion construction, with slightly different emphases.

Context is an important influence on the construction of emotions (Parkinson, 1995; Williams, 2001). Parkinson (1995) was one of the early writers in this field and he posited that any investigation of interpersonal emotions must look at the context in which they occurred. He drew attention to the physical as well as more abstract barriers that separate individuals in the workplace, noting that typically we mix with individuals who are “legitimised” by the institution. Consequently the range of emotions and emotion displays available to individuals is also limited – “[a]nyone whose institutional role defines their relationship with others ... is subject to emotional control of some sort by the organisation that surrounds them’ (p. 204). We only mix with the kinds of individuals chosen by the institution as “best fit” for organizational success, in “spaces” defined by the organization such as isolated classrooms. In Williams’ work (2001) in relation to contexts, he maintained that emotions are central to social life and emotional actors assumed different emotional postures in different social situations. He agreed with the idea that emotions are culturally mediated but argued that they are also a socially structured and structuring force in their own right.

Researchers such as Hearn (1993) and Hargreaves (2001) attended to the social aspect of emotion construction. Hearn, while recognising that emotions are social and ideological constructs, also asserted that they are psychological and mental states. Hargreaves recognised that it was through interactions with others that interpersonal emotions are constructed but added that these emotions may be actual, remembered or imagined. While cultural, social and political issues are closely related, the following
section draws specifically on the work associated with culture, politics and power in the construction of emotions.

**Culture, politics and power**

Socio-cultural studies present sound arguments in relation to the construction of emotions, as opposed to the idea that emotions are innate and beyond control. Parkinson (1995) and Abu-Lughod and Lutz (1990a) for example, have explored conventions that different “societies” hold regarding emotion displays. They argue that cultural norms determine the range of emotions that are available in a given societal context (see, *inter alia* Scherer & Wallbott, 1994; Stipek, 1998). Some cultures applaud the expression of anger, say, while others do not (Eid & Diener, 2001). Similarly, some cultures demonstrate grief by engaging in loud wailing while others adopt a quiet and restrained response. Further, Scollon, Diener, Oishi, and Biswas-Diener’s (2004) study noted that certain specific emotions can be perceived quite differently across cultures: pride is conceived of negatively in India but not in other groups they investigated. Inuit people were required to have “smiling training” to work in a supermarket chain, as there was no cultural concept of “hi” or “hello” in their society (Fineman, 2000). Stearns (1994) and (Schutz & DeCuir, 2002) suggested that there is a significant self-reflective element in emotional expression; that it is influenced by historical standards (so that emotional expressions may change over time). For example the notion of extended periods of mourning diminished in the time of the industrial revolution partly in response to the declining mortality rates but also because of the impracticalities of extended periods of grief in a time of increasing industrialisation (Lupton, 1998). Similarly, there exists a self-reflective element in socio-cultural standards, such that individuals may seek opportunities to publicly express emotions that are seen as acceptable in their culture. The choice of particular labels for particular emotions is historically and discursively bound (Edwards, 2001). Edwards argues, for example, that the obsolete word *melancholy* and its modern descendant *clinical depression* are not the same emotions labelled differently; the labels as well as the emotion are ‘intrinsically tied to social conditions, rights and responsibilities, which change historically and differ across cultures’ (p. 238).

One particular area of research on emotions and emotion discourse that influenced my study is the work of the feminist poststructuralists, whose work is strongly informed by
Foucault (1983, 1988, 1990). According to Foucault, all aspects of an individual’s life are the result of some kind of disciplinary formation, such that subjectivities are ‘produced, negotiated and reshaped through discursive practices’ (Zembylas, 2003b, p. 113). While Foucault’s work did not explore emotions specifically (Tamboukou, 2003), it is in a Foucauldian tradition that feminist and poststructuralist researchers examine the role of culture, power and ideology in creating [historically situated] emotion discourses. They claim that emotions are socially organised and managed through social conventions, public scrutiny and family obligations as well as religious and legal norms. Emotions are discursive practices Poststructuralists also argue that emotions are an integral part of discursive practices, which shape and produce all social practices and subjectivities, including those associated with my focus here, teacher subjectivity. A teacher’s identity as a professional subject is produced in educational discourses, which have particular normative positions or regimes of truth about teachers’ emotions (Zembylas, 2003a).

A number of researchers have explored the political nature of emotions. It is not within the scope of this review to address this issue in depth, but it has recently gained traction as an area of study. Emotions have a political dimension in that decisions in relation to when and how emotion should be felt and displayed are interpreted in the interests of organisational regulation and how social groups function (see inter alia Berlant, 2004; Boler, 1999; Shields, 2005). Berlant (2004) for example, discussed emotions in the broadest political sense and interrogated the political imperatives of the ‘compassionate conservative’ elements in American politics. Shields (2005) focussed attention on the ‘politics of emotion manifested in interpersonal relationships’ – as “correct” or incorrect emotions in particular contexts (p. 4).

Boler’s work (1997; 1999; 2004) represents a move beyond more traditional psychological and socio-cultural discourses to recognise the political discourses on emotions. Her work is of most interest to me because it foregrounds issues of power. Boler criticised poststructuralism’s failure to address emotion discourse in its own terms; she recognised the importance of doing so because of the connections of emotional aspects of subjectivity to power, culture and identity. In her analyses, she
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Discursive practices define the rules that control both language and behaviour, and constitute the means by which people become positioned in relations of power (Foucault, 1972).
identified four discourses on emotion in Western thought – rational (managed by the mind and focussing on control) pathological (related to urges and more embodied), romantic (transformation from the heart) and political (self-determination and agency) – the first three of these suggest emotions are private experiences, located in the individual (Boler, 1997). Boler argued that the silence in cultural studies about the politics of emotions could be addressed through philosophical studies informed by feminism and poststructuralism. She asserted that these theoretical frameworks have the capacity for analysis of the dependence of capitalism and nationalism on ‘emotional equilibrium’ of both workforce and the general population (p. 209). A significant aspect of Boler’s work is the reconnection of the psycho-analytic to socio-cultural theory. Boler (1997) noted that contemporary feminist philosophies of emotion challenged the separation of emotion and cognition; they perceived emotion as collaboratively constructed rather than private, and gender-related rather than gender-specific. She asserted that Western cultural traditions do not value emotions, and that emotions are largely ignored in pedagogy because of the dominance of patriarchal hegemony.

Boler also explored political discourses by interrogating the political and sociological agendas served by emotions (Bloomfield, 2004). She argued that while emotions are a primary site of social control, they are also a site of political resistance (Boler, 1999, p. xiii). Her early studies, published in Feeling Power, explored how different scholarly disciplines shaped how individuals experience emotion ‘and how these disciplines do or do not legitimise emotions as a worthy object of inquiry’ (p. xx). Even arguing that emotions are rational responses maintains a dualism of rationality/irrationality which privileges the former at the expense of the latter (Boler, 1997). Her more recent work extended her contribution as she explored emotions in educational leadership but still maintained her attention to questions of power and social hierarchies (Zorn & Boler, 2007).

Zembylas, a contemporary of Boler, is also a leader in emotion research in education informed by poststructuralist theories (2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004, 2005a, 2005b, 2007). His work on the theorising of identity emphasised the aspect of power relations inherent in interactions between individuals and the contexts in which they work and live. He argued that teacher identity is not singular but is a ‘polysemic product of experience, a product of practices that constitute the self in response to multiple

13 I have tried to succinctly capture her much more detailed analysis.
meanings that need not converge on a stable unified identity’ (Zembylas, 2003b, p. 107). Like Boler (1997; 1999), he argued that research on emotion should go beyond the work already done by historians, sociologists, psychologists and philosophers to address issues of how ‘discursive, political and cultural aspects define the experiences of teacher emotion’ (2003b, p. 188). His research examined emotions as cultural formations, which he believed played a critical part in the construction of teacher identity, subjectivity and power relations. He asserted that individuals organised their lives based on previous emotional experiences which are highly variable, both in terms of situations and responses. Accordingly, understanding the complex nature of the relationship between emotion and other aspects of teacher identity is no simple task. Further, Zembylas (2003a) claimed that as discursive practices shift in time and space then so too do identities. Identities, like subjectivities, are constantly “becoming”. They are a ‘dynamic construction’\(^\text{14}\). Cultural myths about a singular teacher identity – teacher as expert, professional and unemotional, aim at creating a situation where there is little scope for anything different. It is through poststructuralist lenses that researchers are able to see how teachers participate in this process by ‘adopting or resisting these dominant discourses’ through a process of collaborative construction (Zembylas, 2003b, p. 109).

Another of Zembylas’s contributions is his foregrounding of the “productive” nature of emotion as a discursive practice, which, he claimed, made ‘individuals into socially and culturally specific [subjects] engaged in complex webs of power relations’. Subjectivity is produced, negotiated and reshaped through discursive practices (2005a, p. 9378). According to Zembylas (2003b), individuals perform their emotions under the influence of some “authority” – imagined or actual – in order that they are not perceived as different. He showed that (school) culture, through policies, procedures and social conventions encodes the rules that regulate what a teacher is supposed to feel (as well as what they say, how they dress, etc.) such that these emotion “rules” constitute the teacher’s available emotions and subjectivities as a teacher. Moving outside the “rules” and the acceptable teacher identity may mean the individual is engaging in “conduct unbecoming” a teacher.

\(^{14}\) Some authors appear to see “identities” and “subjectivities” as interchangeable. My understanding is that identity is how the individual sees or describes herself while subjectivities are produced as an interplay between how others see her and her construction of herself in the world – both are “becoming” – fluid and unfixed.
Zembylas (2005a) and Campbell (1994) argued that emotions are discursive practices. The actual words used to label emotions need to be recognised as more than some pre-existing entity with predetermined and agreed upon characteristics, but rather as active non-innocent labels (Zembylas & Bekerman, 2008, p. 402). This suggests that the choice of a particular label for an emotion has an effect on the individual and/or the speaker. Hepburn and Brown (2001) warned of the need to adopt a reflexive stance when choosing language to represent the organisational life of individuals because of the ‘different rhetorical possibilities of categories like stress’ (p. 712). How the word is interpreted has implications beyond the speaker. The choice of a label is not “innocent”.

For example, to be labelled as “an angry young man” may have quite positive connotations in dominant masculine discourse. If a male displays emotions on the sporting field (such as hugging his team mates in a victory celebration) it is perceived quite differently from a display of “feminised emotions”, like tears of sadness as a result of a traumatic event. “Acting like a girl” is a phrase used to dismiss such emotion displays. Similarly, for a female to be labelled “angry” has different connotations and effects from being labelled “bitter”, according to Campbell (1994). The labelling of an emotion as “bitterness”, as an example, could be a means of silencing or dismissing a person’s emotional expression. In cases such as these, a dismissal of the emotion is a dismissal of the significance to a person of their own life.

The next section continues the discussion in relation to emotions and culture, but within the context of organisational influence, social, cultural, political and power in the construction, and then the subsequent shaping/expression of emotions.

**Organisational**

Emotional complexity is recognised as the connection of social, interactional, linguistic and physiological processes encompassing action and agency such that experiences of emotion are ‘inextricably interconnected with belief, context, power, and culture’ (Lasky, 2005 p. 901). The issue of emotions in organisations has received particular attention in the research literature but according to Blackmore (1996), much of the interest in organisational theory about emotions was largely psychologically-oriented and ‘the political, ethical and moral dimensions of emotion are often ignored’ (p. 338). However, there is now increasing attention given to the place of emotions in organisational contexts, including schools, because organisations recognise that they
cannot stand apart from, or ignore the emotions in their communities. Employees are part of these communities; their emotions cannot be understood outside of the context in which they occur.

Organisations inherit rituals for emotion expression from outside but they also adapt them to create their own codes (Fineman, 2000; Vince, 2001). Vince (2001) suggested that to understand organisational learning required an understanding of how ‘emotions are ignored or avoided in an organisation’ (p. 1338). There exists an inescapable connection between an individual’s work and family life, according to Senge (1990) and as such there is a concomitant connection between emotions experienced within, and those external to organisations. Schools as organisations are typified by hierarchical structures that, in the majority of cases, have males in leadership positions, where the teaching staff (who are predominantly female) work in individual classrooms with groups of children, who often come from circumstances very different from that of the teacher. How such structures and cultures are connected to emotions and emotional expression will be explored in more detail later in this review. The next section explores the literature recognising this connectedness of an individual’s emotions to their working life.

**Valuing of Emotions – centrality to working lives**

As I have argued in the preceding sections, in much of the literature about emotions there exists an artificial barrier between the personal and the professional, and there has been an expectation that the emotional resides with the personal, the private. In reality, as Parkinson (1995) argued, this does not happen. When examining any workplace and the people in it, one needs to consider emotions as central to these people’s working lives (Barbalet, 1996). Putnam and Mumby (1993) suggested that ‘emotion … is not simply an adjunct to work; rather it is the process through which members constitute their work environment by negotiating a shared reality’ (p. 36). Further, they asserted that it is not appropriate to dismiss emotions as irrelevant in the workplace, to treat them ‘as part of the expressive life of individuals, as disruptive, inappropriate, illogical, biased, weak and value-laden’ (p. 40) and therefore somehow to be left at the door of the office, or at the school gate. There is strong agreement that there has only been limited research that explored emotional labour in work settings (see *inter alia* Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002) and such research is only now receiving the attention
that other aspects of organisational behaviour have commanded for some time (Ashkanasy, Hartel & Zerbe, 2000b; Karabanow, 2000).

While it is clear that the political, ethical and moral dimensions of emotions were often ignored in organisational theory, there has been some attention given to the psychological aspects of emotions. Putnam and Mumby’s (1993) analyses of earlier studies related to organisational theory suggested that typically those studies dismissed emotions as irrelevant and asserted they should only be considered as aspects of the personal and individual. However, on closer inspection, Putnam and Mumby argued that emotions such as embarrassment, shame and guilt are actually central to many aspects of organisational order – including, school order. Further, Blackmore (1996) declared that emotions, as a manifestation of moral and political positions, are central to understanding the motives underpinning teachers’ work and the desire of some teachers for educational leadership. Humphrey’s (2000) psychologically-based work contended that job characteristics influenced employees’ feelings of well-being such that work requirements could outweigh social norms as they influenced emotional displays. Consequently, workplace and social norms could create conflict between what the employee determined was appropriate and what the client deemed appropriate. For example, in the nursing profession, the adoption of rituals of behaviour to maintain a “professional distance” only serve to objectify the patient; whatever control they have resides within a limited framework that constructs them only as “sick” and consequently they are often denied agency (Martin, 1998).

Individuals whose workplace undergoes reforms may experience emotional dissonance associated with a lack of ownership over the reform process, which may result from not being included in the process; they are nevertheless expected to undertake the implementation. For example, Schmidt and Datnow (2005) studied school reform and noted that teachers showed very little emotional attachment to school reform when it stayed at the broader school level. However, when reforms impacted on teachers’ classroom interactions they experienced both positive and negative emotions as a result of requirements to change practices, which then impacted on how they perceived their role and their identity as teachers.

Domagalski (1999) claimed that organisations deliberately treat stress, for example, as an individual, apolitical and ahistorical disorder so that employees are required to deal
with it themselves. Further, she argued that constraining the expression of negative emotions means that individuals do not get to know if others have similar experiences. Such a constraint effectively covers up any notion that the organisational conditions may be creating the stress (see, *inter alia* Hepburn & Brown, 2001; Newton, Handy & Fineman, 1995). Fineman’s (2000) research suggested that organisational management selected staff who operated in a predictable and efficient manner, and irrational forces such as emotions were seen as disruptive if not managed. Domalgalski (1999) also noted that in organisational reform such as that explored in the Hawthorne studies, where the socio-emotional needs of employees was explored, supervisors were instructed to maintain a controlled posture in case there were any irrational, emotional events that might interfere with functioning in the workplace.

**Emotions in organisations**

In more recent times, there has been a movement away from organisational research that adopts rationalist tendencies to studies that adopt a socio-cultural view of the workplace. The edited work of Payne and Cooper (2001) explored, among a range of issues, the important connectedness between cultural and emotional aspects of organisational life. For example, the chapter by Beyer and Niño in this book built around a significant social and cultural event at a university and addressed issues associated with the importance of recognising the powerful place of culture in emotional experience and expression. They argued that cultures guide and channel emotional expression (2001).

One of the most significant authors in this field of emotion research on organisations is Hochschild, whose studies focussed on emotions in organisations, and who coined the phrase “emotional labour” (1983, 1990). Emotional labour research is now quite extensive and it examines how organisations have applied normative expectations and established boundaries for the acceptable expression of emotions of their workers (see, *inter alia* Hochschild, 1990; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Hochschild’s work was important in that it identified emotion as not merely the private act of an individual, but something commodified into a product for the purposes of business. Further, Hochschild’s studies have much to offer teaching in that her analysis of gendered professions and the professional status of caring work because emotion work involved in successful teaching is assumed to be natural and fundamental to what it is to be a woman, and as such is not recognised as professional, skilful work and is unrewarded (Bolton, 2007).
An important aspect that Lutz (1990) identified in Hochschild’s (1983, 1990) research was the recognition that emotions need not be interpreted as chaos but as a signal that problems exist - ‘such that emotions may involve the identification of problems in women’s lives and therefore be political’ (p. 88). Similarly, Flam (1993) claimed that ‘negative’ emotions have received almost no attention in work and organisational studies, and it is suggested that such research was not encouraged because it could potentially illustrate underlying problems within an organisation. A number of researchers, such as Putnam and Mumby (1993) also asserted that managing feelings and the expression of emotion in order to appear in control for the benefit of the employer consequently denies the presence of stress and ambiguity in the workplace (Tracy, 2000). To argue that emotions and emotion research are deliberately silenced in organisations was a significant move away from the popular discourse on emotions, which was effectively a discourse on gender and notions of irrationality, as mentioned previously.

A number of studies reported negative effects on staff who engaged in emotional labour (Karabanow, 2000; Kruml & Geddes, 2000). Karabanow (2000) claimed that if workers displayed emotions that they did not actually feel, then their feelings would become less authentic and so their emotions were effectively owned by the employer – expressions such as smiling at difficult customers. The study also found that workers who have less control over the environment in which they work experience greater levels of stress, because of the energy required in maintaining “emotional control”. Further, these workers reported feelings of guilt, when they resigned because they could not maintain the pretence of “distance” that the organisation required. Organisational culture exerts implicit and subtle forms of control. Similarly, Kruml and Geddes (2000) noted that employees who express their feelings when interacting with clients are likely to be healthier than those that do not, and that “faking” emotions runs the risk of leading to emotional exhaustion. When individuals display emotions that are different from those they feel, the situation potentially leads to an alienation of working lives and “personal” identity. This, in turn, results in depression, lower self-concept, anxiety or despair such that extensive emotional labour produces forms of self-estrangement and has a deleterious effect on workers (Pugliesi & Shook, 1997). Other studies indicated that emotional tensions arise when workers are required to respond differently at work than they would normally – disguising feelings and shaping private emotions in order to fit company policy (Erickson & Ritter, 2001).
It is clear that it is neither possible nor desirable to disconnect the emotional experiences and expressions of an individual’s working and family life. The following section continues the discussion of the issue of the “control of emotions” and explores literature related to management, shaping, and cultural constructs, as well as political and power structures and their impact on identity and subjectivities. The section examines the work of authors from a range of different disciplines and different theoretical positions.

The Construction of Emotions

As noted in my discussion of emotional labour above, there is a distinct contradiction between the espoused ideas that emotions are irrational – beyond reason – and the simultaneously-held notion that there is an expectation that individuals can “manage” or “control” their emotions in order to meet the acceptable/desired norms of a particular setting at a particular time. Hochschild (1990) argued for the development of a sociology of emotions and suggested that it would provide an insight into how individuals experienced and evaluated social interactions such that what is felt about, and in social settings, would be as important as the outcomes of social interactions (p. 117). Further, when we examine emotions in organisations we have the potential to discover the social structures in operation within them, and the impact on the working lives and subjectivities of their employees.

I have detailed the research literature that attests to emotions being collaboratively constructed rather than a private manifestation of an individual’s inner self. The process of being emotional locates the person in the world of social interaction, as emotions are felt in relation to other interactants (Denzin, 1984). According to Williams (2001) emotions may be culturally mediated, organised and accounted for in various ways and are also a ‘socially constructed and structuring force, possessing both socially responsive and socially efficacious dimensions’ (p. 49). Also, emotional actors assume different postures in different social situations depending on the context. Other researchers have explored the embodied pain when an individual is excluded from a social situation; ‘affective states such as embarrassment, shame, guilt, or jealousy can also serve as signs that one is not living up to the standards of valued others’ such that individuals will work to not be excluded (MacDonald & Leary, 2005, p. 203).
Organisations by their nature and structure appear to impose mechanisms which shape and control emotional expression and social practices that deal with emotion discourse.

Social rules appear to objectify individuals who then find it difficult to escape from the rules and norms as they become deeply embedded within them. Research by Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) and Pugliesi and Shook (1997) suggested that colleagues were the most influential agents of emotional socialisation. Their studies indicated that individuals in an organisation learn the rules of emotion by observing and imitating colleagues as well as by trial and error. Consequently, emotional responses have an organisational feel to them, as well as a sense of the outside world.

Identifying problems such as injustice through exploring instances of expressed anger, recognising sadness as an indication of loss, and responding to examples of fear that are related to danger, would seem to be a very productive yet underexplored need in the workplace. Accordingly, examining the control/shaping of emotions could potentially uncover a previously suppressed public acknowledgement of problems in the workplace (Lutz, 1990). However, it is not sufficient to examine words and/or acts alone. The practices within which they are located need to be explored as well. Studies informed by poststructuralist traditions potentially can reveal how emotions are shaped and performed in order to find ways to resist the regimes that permit the expression of some emotions while disciplining others, so that maintaining appropriate behaviours comes to be seen as reinforcing the power of certain rules or norms.

As mentioned previously, Zembylas is one researcher whose work is strongly influenced by poststructuralist theory. He adopted the term “genealogies of emotions” (Zembylas, 2003b, p. 111) to explain particularly the historical aspects of teacher identity formation and the role that power plays in that process in terms of personal, political and cultural aspects. He maintained that by investigating discursive practices, he was able to explain how ‘identity is subject to the social and historical context of practices and discourses’ (p. 114). Zembylas proposed that ‘emotions are discursive practices operating in circumstances that grant powers to some relations and delimit the powers that enable some to create truth and others to submit to it, that allow some to judge and others to be judged’ such that emotions become a “property” of spoken language (2003b, p. 115). Of particular interest is Zembylas’ (2003 a, b) assertion that if individuals are aware of the technologies of power that govern their emotions then there
is a greater likelihood they will be able to develop strategies to change the political, economic and institutional regimes of truth within which they are operating.

Research indicates that institutions establish rituals and practices that constrain the lives and emotional expression of individuals in order to ensure their efficient and smooth operation, free of distractions. Winograd (2003), and Evans, Rich, Davies and Allwood (2005) among others have adopted a stance similar to Zembylas in relation to the importance of understanding emotion as “political”. While Evans et al. (2005) argued that silencing negative emotions may sustain social hierarchies and effect social control, Winograd (2003) asserted that ‘[t]he rules for emotion inhibit the free expression of emotion, particularly anger expressions that might be aimed at hierarchical/patriarchal structural arrangements or at larger economic and political structures’ such that emotions become sites of social control (p. 1642). According to Parkinson (1995), cultural norms ‘set constraints and possibilities for the ways in which emotions are expressed in everyday life’ (p. 226) to the extent that some organisations try to control the emotions, emotional interactions and emotional expression of employees through some sense that ‘if you capture the heart the head and hands will follow’ (Ashkanasy, Hartel & Zerbe, 2000a, p. xii).

Mastenbroek’s (2000) analysis of historical patterns of emotional expression led him to propose that formal rituals and rules have diminished over time so that there has been an increased demand on individuals to self-control and emotional restraint, resulting in stronger demands on one’s own judgement and an ability to make others feel more at ease in a given situation. The next section explores the literature that interprets the effect of such regimes on the individual and the social contexts in which they work and live.

**Showing Emotions**

Research suggests an ability to display felt emotions assists in negotiating meaning around roles and relationships. It also aids in the development of a sense of community through shared understandings (Putnam & Mumby, 1993, p. 50) while failing to note that emotions can have deleterious effects on the individual (Symanski, 1991). For example, Sachs and Blackmore (1998) asserted that in most situations ‘headwork is privileged over heartwork’ such that emotions may be left unacknowledged and even
denied (p. 270). Tracy (2000) explored the emotional experiences of staff in what she calls a ‘total institution’ – a cruise ship – where staff were unable to leave the workplace per se. She noted that difficult emotions were expected to be dealt with in an individual’s own time and space such that the staff never discussed issues like “burnout”. Consequently, the cruise staff effectively colluded in perpetuating a myth that burnout was a private problem. As such, they never questioned senior management in relation to this issue. Tracy asserted that in such circumstances ‘self-control mechanisms can be stronger and more repressive than traditional management control programs’ through a process of self-subordination and self-surveillance (p. 119). While Sharrad (1992) suggested that socialising with colleagues away from the workplace can reduce stress, for the participants in workplaces exemplified by Tracy’s (2000) study, that was almost impossible.

Emotional expression or inhibition has been the focus of a number of studies (see inter alia, Acker & Feuerverger, 1996; Kruml & Geddes, 2000; Lupton, 1998; Vince, 2001). For example Acker and Feuerverger (1996) suggested that when emotional displays are deemed unacceptable, the response by the individual is typically a “ritual” such as apology, humour, or a pejorative labelling by colleagues who might have dismissed emotionality in terms such as “bleeding heart”. Sometimes management took the form of “reframing”, where the person reframed the meaning of the emotion so that it became more acceptable to others (Acker & Feuerverger, 1996, p.408). For example, the young teacher who excitedly tells her colleagues about her class’s outstanding assignments may be forced to adjust her response in the face of dismissal by less engaged colleagues. Pugliesi and Shook (1997) also argued that ‘inhibition of genuine emotional expression has uniformly negative effects’ (p. 310). Vince (2001) examined issues of power and politics in organisational change and he found that ‘avoiding powerful emotions ... both represented and reinforced existing organisational power relations (p. 1339). Karabanow’s (2000) study of life in a refuge similarly found that the greater control an employee had over the environment, the less the likelihood of burnout and feelings of guilt. As early as 1991, Symanski expressed concern at the lack of attention to the emotional needs of university staff who were working with students experiencing difficulty on nursing placements. It was noted that burnout, loss of academic staff and an erosion of teaching standards would result when such issues are not addressed. In this way it seems that situations which support and “permit” the expression of emotions are more conducive to the well-being of employees. Lupton (1998) drew attention to the
need to recognise that not only are emotions constructed in discourse but there are also ‘bodily manifestations’ which can ‘betray emotional states even as the individual may attempt to cover them’, by blushing or sweating, for example (p. 32).

With this background, the following section explores research associated with what I have labelled “difficult emotions”, as it would appear it is appropriate in most contexts to experience and make public positive emotions, but less acceptable to display “difficult” emotions.

**Difficult Emotions**

As recently as 2007, Liljestrom and Roulston suggested that there is scope for researchers to explore the issues associated with painful emotions, such as anger, because they are under-researched. Fineman (2000) claimed that when emotions *are* actually named the speaker tends to use labels belonging to “anorexic” emotions. All the weaker emotions, such as satisfaction, annoyance and stress are mentioned, while emotions such as despair, hate, plotting, boredom, or hurt, anger and shame are silenced. For example, teachers’ responses to feelings of anger are typically little more than a grumble; anger is restrained and guarded. This situation reflects the female ideal of gentleness, kindness and nurturing (Winograd, 2003) and positions the angry teacher as beyond the norm – as unprofessional. Day’s (1998) research in the field of emotions in teacher education suggests that powerful emotions could inhibit the capacity to learn while noting that the importance of working with colleagues who are not necessarily of like-mind, and that dissonance needs to be embraced.

If the practicum is to be a learning experience for site-based teacher educators, then work needs to be done to reduce stress levels that occur in this enterprise. Strategies that enable learners to demystify the emotional dimension of their learning should be part of the repertoire of site-based educators as well as university staff (Winograd, 2003). When preservice teachers and their school colleagues experience dissonance they should be provided with appropriate self-images so that they are in a position to resolve any difficult emotional experiences (Elliott, 1995). Britzman’s (1998, 2003) work is at the forefront of educational theory and research that considers how emotional and

---

15 deMarrais and Tisdale, 2002 use the word “difficult” rather than negative because they do not see emotions, such as anger as being necessarily negative
affective engagements with knowledge and learning influence the work of teaching and learning. She asserted that learning contains and even begins in frustration, breakdown, uncertainty, and not knowing, and argues that educators must engage with approaches to, and practices of, teaching that recognises learning as fraught with uncertainty and emotion.

Ashkanasy, Hartel and Zerbe (2000b) noted that there has been quite a deal of work that attempts to categorise strong emotions such as pride and shame, linked to success and failure in education, connectedness to the establishment, belonging, differentiation and self esteem. However, research also suggests that it is often the difficult emotions that are dismissed by “observers” while positive emotions are well-received. Dismissal of strongly-felt emotional responses to a given situation is demeaning to an individual and Campbell (1994) suggested public expression and “uptake” of the emotion is what constructs our emotional life, such that an emotion may be limited in its meanings and productivity depending on whether it has been acknowledged or dismissed. Dismissing difficult emotions, through not listening and other means, functions to individualise an emotion, throwing it back as the speaker’s problem. Consequently, emotional expression is successfully blocked through this type of social interaction. Campbell also contended that strong emotions such as bitterness were collaboratively shaped by both the speaker and the listener, such that the recount of the “experience” and how it is received actually produces “bitterness” – the expression and response interact.

Widdowfield (2000) claimed that when studies identify emotional episodes, it is insufficient to give them only a passing mention. For example, I noted that Stanulis and Russell’s (2000) study of interactions between preservice teachers and site-based teacher educators identified quite strong negative emotional experiences for the participants but the study failed to elaborate the issue in any significant manner. The study discussed emotions as if they are unproblematic. This could be interpreted by as another form of silencing. Reports on the importance of emotions in social interactions suggest that it would be more appropriate for researchers to foreground such matters than to leave them “hanging”, as they are clearly important findings and warrant attention.
In raising the issue of difficult emotions in this section, I have highlighted the limited research but more importantly recognised their significance – how that are expressed, felt and received – in the lives of individuals.

In the first half of this chapter I have outlined the field of “emotion” research in a broad and general manner in order to set the scene for the reader, both theoretically and empirically. The remainder of the chapter explores the literature addressing emotions and emotion discourse with attention to teacher education more specifically as it brings together many of the issues previously raised but with specific attention to research that focused on teachers, schools and significant “others” who are involved in emotion discourse of teacher’s lives and learning in the context of preservice teacher education. The research outlined addresses important issues for teachers, such as teacher/parent interactions, school reform agendas, issues of power, in, for example, the context of discursive practices of schools and schooling. Accordingly, this section of the review does not attend to the research addressing emotional aspects of students in relation to their learning and subjectivities as young learners. There is significant work in the field in relation to preservice teachers’ perspectives and this study does not attempt to explore the emotional dimension of site-based work from that perspective or from the perspective of university staff. I would recommend Bloomfield’s (2006) work for readers interested in the preservice teachers’ perspective and emotion discourse of site-based programs in education.

**EMOTIONS IN EDUCATION**

While Cohn and Kottkamp argued in 1993 that the absence of teachers’ voices in the dialogue around school reform is a serious omission and could lead to a ‘demeaned and demoralised profession’ (p. xvi) I have also argued elsewhere (Hastings, 1999, 2004) that the perceptions and ‘voices’ of site-based teacher educators have not been recognised in the published literature in relation to preservice teacher education. Much of this work is fragmented and has had minimal effect on teacher education courses, as well as discourses of initial teacher education\(^\text{16}\). For this reason, the teacher education workplace, the connection of personal and professional lives and emotion discourse in

\(^{16}\text{It is also noted that there has been very little attention paid to the voice of site-based clinical educators (nursing, physiotherapy, speech pathology etc) in the past 25 years (McAllister, Higgs & Smith, 2008).}\)
relation to subjectivities became important issues for me to explore within the literature as my study progressed.

Significant studies focusing on the emotions associated with tertiary education (including teacher education) are emerging. However, in this section I do not address the broad landscape of tertiary education but, rather, examine the emotion research that is focussed specifically on teachers and their place in site-based teacher education. My major consideration in selecting studies for inclusion in this review is to indicate work that shows inattention to emotions, both in the terms of a research agenda and in terms of inattention ‘by’ teachers themselves. I include literature related to emotions in the teacher’s workplace and school cultures as well as work that attends to issues of emotion and caring. I also include studies that focus on teacher emotion and identity formation – all of which are inter-related. What I hope to achieve here is elucidation of that sense of the emotion work which forms such an integral part of a teacher’s life in general. This will provide the reader with an understanding of the added complexity that occurs in the workplace when a preservice teacher joins the school and classroom context.

According to Woods and Jeffrey (2002) teachers place a high priority on feelings in teaching and learning and teaching is considered to be a highly complex and social activity, so the capacity to elicit strong socio-emotional affect seems obvious (Leary, 2000). However, significant attention to emotions in schools and schooling did not genuinely occur much before the early 1990s. Some of the very early work was undertaken by Nias (1987; 1989b), Little (1990), Tickle (1991), Noddings (1992), Britzman (1992) and Hargreaves (1993, 1994) – all from quite different theoretical standpoints.

Nias (1989b) was one of the first to “speak” about emotions in the context of schools and schooling. She described how students have the capacity to make teachers feel guilty and worthless as well as loved and successful – and in 1996 she was surprised to find that teachers were still neglecting their own physical and emotional health and while apparently willingly sacrificing these to the perceived needs of their students.

17 For research focusing on the emotional dimension of preservice teachers and where their voices are heard see the work of Bloomfield (2004), nurse education, social work supervisors (Green, Gregory & Mason, 2006, Milner & O’Bryne 1986, Sharp 2000, Urdang, 1995) and academic staff (Goldenberg & Waddell 1990, Hawe 2003, Litchfield 2001).
Hargreaves (1998b) posited that research and policy in education had ignored or minimised the emotional significance of teachers’ work. In his early work, Hargreaves emphasised the need to move emotions out of “the private” and give emotions their due status in educational reform. He has written prolifically in this area (see for example, 2000, 2004, 2005) making an important contribution through his work on ‘emotional geographies’ (Hargreaves 2001) – a framework based on his studies of parent/teacher interactions which acknowledged the multi-faceted emotional nature of such relationships. He presented emotional geographies ‘as the spatial and experiential patterns of closeness and/or distance in human interactions and relationships that help create, configure and colour the feelings and emotion we experience about ourselves, our world and each other’ (p. 1061). What is particularly noteworthy in later work from Hargreaves (2005, p. 968) using this “framework” is his suggestion that it aids in the identification of inhibitors and facilitators of the emotional bonds that arise from people’s interactions. However, according to Hargreaves, difficult emotions are often denied or repressed, which results in situations where teachers may regard any discussion of their emotional vulnerability as being professionally inappropriate, so emotional experiences are problematic to investigate and difficult to articulate. Noddings (1996) argued the case for the inclusion of teachers’ stories in teacher education, especially those that portrayed feeling, and she showed that good teachers come to terms with and productively used their emotions.

Day and Leitch’s (2001) study provided powerful insight into the importance for teachers of attending to the emotional dimension of their work, particularly in relation to professional development opportunities. However, the authors appear to connect emotionality to irrationality and cognition with rationality, which I think is a weakness in their conceptualisation of emotion work (Day, 1998; Day & Leitch, 2001). Their conceptualisation seems to ignore any concern with power and the production of certain valued types or forms of teacher subjectivity, with which I am concerned here. Given these broad understandings, and my need to attend to the emotional discourse and discourses on emotion, I drilled down more deeply into the literature related to schooling and site-based teacher education – school cultures and the “good teacher” discourse.
Workplace Conditions - Culture and Caring

Emotions and power are interconnected (Williams, 2001) such that emotions are always embedded in relations of power and status, ‘where culture and power are inseparable components of school life (Lasky, 2000, p. 844). A number of researchers argued that it is appropriate to explore the school context and emotions as interconnected. For example, Van Veen, Sleegers and van de Ven (2005) claimed that teachers’ emotions need to be studied in a manner that enables researchers to make meaning of the different, divergent and often conflicting expectations that colleagues, management, and others have in relation to the context in which they work. Further, Winograd (2003) asserted that the ‘culture of schools and teacher education under-emphasises emotional labour as a dimension of teacher’s work, such that the culture of schools, which is based on masculine organisational cultures, tends to privilege dispassionate, emotionally flat and rational discourse’ (p. 1660). However, when women ‘attempt to rectify [their] humiliating situation by emulating the protectionism and elitism of the other professions [they] subscribe to patriarchy’s contempt for the familiar, for the personal’ (Grumet, 1988, p. 58). Similarly, as Sachs and Blackmore (1998) asserted:

…social interactions in schools, such as those that might occur between teacher and students, produce emotions and reflect them, are sites where emotional dynamics may be unpredictable, and the meanings of emotions may be transparent for some and alien to others. Schools and classrooms are characterised by ‘competing emotions’ [and] norms of rationality are invoked to regulate emotionality’ (p. 270).

In her research on school reform in the USA, Little (1996) too, noted that ‘it is the relentless negotiation of principle-as-practice and the reshaping of workplace conditions and relationships that deplete or restore teachers’ emotional energy’. She argued that these sorts of contextual conditions heighten teachers’ emotional experiences (p. 353).

One specific feature of cultural expectation of teaching and what appears to be an essentialised ideal is that of the “caring/nurturing” professional (Clandinin, Downey & Huber, 2009). Caring is a central component of teacher’s work, essential to their sense of self. Researchers like Hargreaves and Goodson (1996) argued that care as well as cognition were at the heart of the teaching profession. They claimed it was care, more so than cognitive challenge, which helped retain young people in schools, particularly at secondary level. They also asserted that there are ‘specific skills and dispositions that are essential to attain effective and committed caring’ (p. 21). However, maintaining a
caring disposition is not as simple as it might seem as care is an emotion not ultimately controllable.

Lasky (2000) found that teachers experienced difficult emotions when their understandings of caring are different from those of their students’ parents. When teachers and parents hold inconsistent views, teachers feel their work is being subverted, which results in a sense of powerlessness, then in a distancing from the parent. Further, anxiety, anger, frustration, guilt and other negative emotions are a consequence of teachers not achieving a sense of purpose in their work, such that teachers can become professionally immobilised when their identities are challenged in such circumstances (see also Lasky, 2005). Hargreaves, too noted that the caring nature of teachers could actually work against them as they made heavy emotional investments in maintaining collegial relationships (1998a), while Forrester’s (2005) study found that in response to the ‘performance culture’ of schools there had actually been a shift away from the recognition and valuing of the caring aspects of teaching. Such a situation creates even greater complexity for the teachers involved: on the one hand the inspectorial system denies the importance of the emotional aspects of teaching while on the other there is a plea to put emotions at the centre of what it meant to be a good teacher.

The notion of caring as an aspect of teaching is prevalent in the literature. For example, Ben-Peretz (1996) noted that conflicts and dilemmas occur when teachers engage in acts of caring. They see these acts as a taken-for-granted aspect of their work, while simultaneously being conscious that caring does not fit some professional ideal of “distance”. Fernandez (2000) argued that while some professions might require a detached relationship with a client, teaching is a profession in which caring is fundamental. Numerous researchers have contested any suggestion that caring is at odds with professionalism (Hargreaves, 1998c; Hargreaves & Goodson, 1996; Hebson, Earnshaw & Marchington, 2007; Noddings, 1996; Wharton, 1993) while Ayers (2001) argued that caring is directly related to striving for the best outcomes for the learner – a driver of professionalism. Noddings (1996) refuted suggestions that emotions can impair judgement and that any teacher should remain cool, dispassionate and maintain distance from students. She deplored the detachment implied by notions of professionalism in teaching and claimed that it was consequently not surprising that a loss of control of emotional expression aroused feelings of anxiety, guilt, confusion and anger. Hebson, Earnshaw, and Marchington (2007) also suggested that conforming to a
model of dispassionate and uncaring teaching that lacked emotional engagement for the 
sake of a (successful) assessment in a school inspection, could result in teachers’ loss of 
‘one of the most satisfying parts of their job, as the emotional relationships with 
children built up over time … are often difficult but also spontaneous and variable’ (p. 
690). The teachers in that study would not accept accusations of incapability because 
they did not agree with the definitions that were being used to define capability. They 
thought that the inspectors negated the importance of emotional work, which they felt 
was at the core of their identities as teachers.

There are some examples in the literature that advocate for the controlling of emotions 
as a positive aspect of an individual’s life. Hargreaves, while conceding that teaching 
required significant emotional labour, also argued that emotional labour was not always 
a negative aspect of teacher’s work. Rather he asserted that dispassionate educators are 
dysfunctional and have an impeded ability to make judgements (1998c, p. 560). 
Teachers in his study found emotional commitment was at times “energising” and these 
findings are supported by research in a range of other “caring” sectors. For example, 
Miller, Birkholt, Scott and Stage, (1995) studied staff working with the homeless and 
revealed that controlling emotions was not always detrimental while Wharton found 
hospital workers who controlled their emotions were often more likely to feel job 
satisfaction (1993) – arguing that such professions often appeal to people who are 
attracted to the notions of “support” and want to be identified as carers.

Labaree (2000) asserted that since the inception of age-based classes in the nineteenth 
century, teachers have been expected to conduct their teaching in isolation between four 
walls, and to concentrate on issues of control, which left little space to develop a 
collaborative culture across classes. Teaching still takes place in a professional context 
characterised by a “performance culture” that encourages autonomy and independence 
(teachers to work in isolation) while simultaneously increasing the level of surveillance 
by outsiders through standards frameworks and ‘rituals of verification’ (Day & Sachs, 
2004, p. 5). Whether teachers are forced to work independently of colleagues because of 
school structures and policies, or whether they “choose” to avoid the gaze of others, 
teaching is coloured by a culture of isolation (see, inter alia Nias, 1996; Fernandez, 
2000; Winograd. 2003). According to Nias (1996) the depth of teachers’ feelings, 
especially when their practice is challenged, is not a reflection of an immature 
emotionality but an ‘attachment to their own moral values and priorities and … the
normative isolation in which they often work’ (p. 299). More recently, Fernandez (2000) has suggested that teachers have attempted to survive the demands of their work and workplace by ‘burrowing deeper into a culture of isolation characterised by privatism, individualism, presentism and conservatism’ (p. 253) that results in limitations in ‘[an individual’s] access to resources for action and opportunities to act’ (Barbalet 1996, p. 76). Winograd (2003) argued that a culture of isolation propagates a belief that learning to teach is an individual’s ordeal and that feelings of inadequacy should be kept to one’s self. This may account for professional isolation being frequently cited by teachers as one of the main causes of teacher stress, as noted by Dussault, Deaudelin, Royer and Loiselle (1997). They proposed that research should examine of the structures of schools and schooling in order to address this issue. The McNess, Broadfoot and Osborn (2003) study also revealed that teachers are concerned about the negative effect on the job satisfaction (related to autonomy and choice) that the performative nature of reform agendas is having.

While teachers undertake much of their teaching in isolation, research shows that interpersonal relationships in a workplace may be instrumental in explaining the variations in reactions to similar stressors experienced by teachers in different settings (Leiter & Maslach, 1988). Acker (1995) noted that teachers developed collaborative strategies in an effort to deal with the frustrations that they encountered in the workplace. According to Hargreaves (1994, p. 150) it is just such collaborative cultures that generate mutual benefits for individuals and allow them to ‘celebrate the interpenetration of personal and professional lives among communities of teachers’ so that when personal and professional pressures arise, colleagues are able to offer advice and support to assist their peers. When preservice teachers enter the school as a workplace, such a culture is essential for their nurturance. However, the absence of such cultures results in a climate not conducive to addressing the demands of a preservice teacher, particularly one who experiences difficulty.

The workplace, associated cultural beliefs and behaviours, the colleagues with whom teachers work, as well as parents and “visitors” such as preservice teachers, all contribute to the construction of the emotional working life of a teacher. The following section considers research that identifies the importance of the connection between the personal life and that working life of the teacher.
Role of emotions in relationship between personal and professional lives

Individuals develop standards of behaviour and feelings in both their private and professional lives. It is not just about emotions and emotion management/expression in the ‘working life’ (Wouters, 1989). As early as 1989(b) Nias raised the issue that some teachers were finding emotional satisfaction in their working lives rather than outside of the school setting, while research conducted by Woods, Jeffrey, Troman and Boyle (1997) showed that, at times, teachers are so emotionally drained by work at school they are unable to give attention to their own children when they go home. However, the authors also noted that tensions still existed as these teachers tried to ‘accommodate two opposing courses of action where choice is limited …[and] tensions invade the inner self, arouse stronger emotions … for those teachers who combine self with the teacher role’ (p. 21). According to Jeffrey and Woods (1996) a ‘teacher’s self is indistinguishable from the professional role’ – an assertion based on research with teachers who underwent an OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education) inspection in the United Kingdom, particularly in relation to the intense scrutiny occurring during such events (p. 325). I find the idea of “a teacher’s self” in this context somewhat problematic as it appears to present a notion of a unitary single “self”. The notion of a single self is contested by other researchers who adopt different theoretical starting points and understandably construct different “readings” and different “truths”. It is these authors who I believe more fully examine the relationship between emotion and identity and it is their work that I explore in the next section.

Emotions and identity

The literature related to identity is highly complex. It struggles to make sense of the connectedness of identity, emotions, self and the role of emotions in identity formation (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009). Numerous authors such as Lasky (2005) have attempted to unravel this complexity. Lasky defined identity as the way in which an individual defines themselves reflexively and to others. Her work reminds us that an individual’s personal and professional identities are interwoven so that anything affecting a professional identity will affect a personal sense of self worth. It is now well supported in the literature that emotions and identity are inter-related but it was as recently as 2005 that Van Veen and Lasky expressed concern that research leading to a systematic understanding and conceptualization of teachers’ emotions in relation to their work and identity had yet to occur. At that time it was suggested that a teacher’s construction of a
“teaching identity” is a result of action(s) within social settings whose values reflect the
setting’s cultural histories, such that the context provides mechanisms, limits and
practices that direct individuals towards a particular end (Smagorinsky, Cook, Moore,
Jackson & Fry, 2004).

Fineman (1993) viewed emotions as being directly related to how individuals think
others perceive them and their identity. As such, they are highly significant. Further,
Nias (1996) stated that emotions are rooted in cognition and the social and cultural
forces that shape them and are, in turn, shaped by them. She argued that ‘the emotional
reactions of individual teachers to their work are intimately connected to their identities
- their sense of self - and also to how they view others. Similarly, Britzman (1992a)
asserted that teacher identity is produced through a dynamic process with emotional
highs and lows. These clearly impact on the teacher subject at any given point in time,
such that teachers may feel overwhelmed by the requirements of their work and may
become so overwhelmed by challenges to their identity they experience powerful
negative emotions (Van Veen, Sleegers & van de Ven, 2005).

Teachers do not feel good about themselves if they behave in a manner ‘counter to their
beliefs and values’ (Nias, 1996, p. 294); or if, for whatever reason, they are unable to
achieve their goals or purposes (Schmidt, 2000). Self-esteem research in the
psychological tradition claimed that self-esteem is most affected when there is a
disparity between accomplishment and aspiration (not just accomplishment) that results
in individuals experiencing anxiety, frustration (James, 1950) and even anger
(Liljestrom & Roulston, 2007). Similarly, Jacoby (1994) noted that when teachers are
unable to achieve the expectations they have of themselves they experience negative
emotions. Darby (2008) while choosing to use the expression “self-understanding”
rather than identity (which she thinks is too static) does note the heightened emotional
experiences related to accountability measures associated with events such as school
are powerful emotions in teaching because they are part of social bonding and the basis
of a teacher’s identity and self-esteem. Because they are part of identity building, they
are essential to the protection of self-esteem’ (p. 944).

Extreme emotions appear to be part of most teachers’ lives, particularly when
confronted by “external” imperatives. Research by Blackmore (1996), Golby (1996) and
Lasky (2000) among others, highlights the intensification of teachers’ emotions when they perceive an intrusion by parents or external officials into their classrooms. While teachers’ “core” values and notions of professionalism help sustain them under pressure from such external factors, researchers also tell us that teachers’ capacities can be overstretched at times. Feelings of guilt may result from being forced to comply to new regimes of which they do not approve, or shame felt when teachers are unable to live up to personal ideals constructed from their teacher subjectivities.

Other researchers, such as Kelchtermans (2005), have also argued for research that makes explicit the relationship between teachers’ self-understanding and cultural/structural working conditions. Studies that made explicit the connection between emotion and identity have opened up the field to illuminate identity formation, the construction of teacher subjectivities through emotion discourse, and importantly, the regulation of emotion expression in schools. Emotions such as love hate, fear, shame, joy, grief and the like are universally experienced. However, their expression is moulded and shaped by society (Ingelon, 1995) and for teachers, the school is a particular context that has rules that shape the kind of emotional expression in which teachers can “legitimately” engage. Clearly, there is scope for increased attention to emotions in future discussions on identity (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009). The following section will examine the literature that addresses the depth and impact of emotion regulation occurring in schools and classrooms.

**Emotion Regulation in Schools**

The range of different discursive practices in which an individual participates ‘results in the individual being constituted and reconstituted through social interactions rather than as a relatively fixed end product’ (Linehan & McCarthy, 2000, p. 35). Individuals in any work environment become socialised into knowing what behaviours and norms are given positive recognition and rewarded (Turnbull, 2000). Schools and/or universities, like all social institutions, have traditions, routines and rituals that they strive to maintain and reproduce and which consequently regulate and construct the professional life of a teacher. Likewise, schools and classrooms are characterised by competing emotions, where appeals to rationality are called upon to regulate emotionality and emotional expression (Sachs & Blackmore, 1998). The research on emotion regulation was extremely influential in guiding the study reported here. It was the call for the
silencing of emotions in the workplace that led to my “reading” and understanding of emotions as discursive products as well as discursive practices.

According to Lasky (2000), emotions are a social construction and they act as both a medium and a message of socialisation. When individuals and groups interact in social situations, unwritten rules or controls come into play, typically without the individual’s immediate awareness. Individuals in all cultures appropriate display rules according to cultural standards such that socialisation leads individuals to ‘internalise a kind of emotional grammar, a set of rules that defines and enables appropriate social participation’ (Bullough & Draper, 2004a, p. 285). The curriculum for becoming a teacher includes taken-for-granted rules about how to think and how to feel. Teachers as individuals are members of a range of different groups so that they are required (like most people) to negotiate their way through and around the different discourses available to them and they learn how to interpret and express their emotions through mimicry, teaching, from role models etc. (Parkinson, 1995). As teachers learn about ‘individual and collective emotions, [they] obtain cultural meaning because of their role in culturally available “scripts” for communicating and interacting’ (Lasky, 2000, p. 845). Members of the teaching profession are socialised into discursive practices that involve hierarchical supervision and normalising judgements that classify individuals according to appropriate or inappropriate behaviours or standards of performance that are embedded in relations of status and power.

The rules associated with “acceptable” behaviour are hard to dispute because individuals just “know” that this is how things are done and how it has always been. This custom and practice reinforces for individuals (subjects) what they should say or do to act in normal and acceptable ways and is through this process that subjects are normalised (Taylor, 2007, p. 59). Typically teachers do not question the accepted beliefs and ways of doing things but follow the rules in order to avoid being marginalised.

With respect to emotional expression, these rules appear unexamined.

In many circumstances, learning the rules for feeling occurs tacitly, as they are typically not taught explicitly through a formal process. Nevertheless, members of a community come to learn the rules quickly. However, in university subjects such as “classroom management”, preservice teachers are encouraged to remain calm and not get angry,
when say, a child, swears. In that context lecturers suggest that the preservice teacher, when working in a school, should maintain a professional demeanour – implying a “controlled” demeanour. A lecture such as this might be the first time that the preservice teacher encounters a specific discourse on emotions. Controlling emotions is a (western) cultural expectation and while it may appear in preservice teachers’ training programs as a peripheral issue, it is ‘collaboratively constructed in the everyday work teachers, students, principals, parents and teachers educators do [such that the] expressions of emotion serve to defend social norms and beliefs’ (Winograd, 2003, p. 1466). From our own experiences and those of others, we know which emotions are acceptable to express and which are not, and how much emotion is acceptable to express.

Emotion rules make teachers objects, but teachers find it difficult to escape from the rules and norms as they are deeply embedded within them. Foucault (1988) claimed that when a “control” or rule, such as emotional control is working, it is probably largely invisible because ‘the perfection of power should be then to render its actual exercise unnecessary’. It is happening almost “naturally” and it is so taken-for-granted (p. 18).

Further, developing such understandings/abilities is a constant challenge, as no workplace is ever free of emotions, so individuals have to learn quickly how to adopt appropriate emotional codes and so avoid discomfort or censure (Turnbull, 2000). Feeling rules intersect with school rituals and together they constitute both the teacher’s subjectivities and teacher emotions such that teachers must conform to these familiar identities. Undoubtedly there are instances where teachers display emotions “against their will” – poorly behaving children seeing the teacher cry may be seen as a victory of sorts. However, typically, teachers regulate and control their emotions and emotional expressions so the resultant behaviours become a set of expected skills, positive outcomes and dispositions that are used to “assess” teachers (Zembylas, 2003b, p. 123) such that exhibiting anger in a classroom presents an ‘unhealthy model’ to children (Liljestrom & Roulston, 2007, p. 276) and would be “frowned upon” by colleagues, parents and administrators.

The work of Kyriacou (2001) related to emotional labour recognised the importance of emotion in teaching, but is of concern in that the author argued for study related to teacher stress that basically required the teachers to deal with their emotions. He almost completely ignored the responsibility of the school organisation as a basis for negative emotional episodes. He supported a call for research into emotion control that directed
teachers to think about the future and not dwell on the “difficult” present. In contrast, Hartley (2003) warned against the drive for an ‘emotional literacy’ agenda in schools, claiming that it would be focused on instrumental and performative notions and would privilege ‘the safe emotions that are required not the deadly ones’ (p. 15). For Hartley, it is the ‘supposedly desirable ones that are the subject of emotional literacy programs’ (p. 15) because such a differentiation is essential to enable the ‘sophisticated consumer citizen’ to behave in an acceptable manner (p. 5).

It is research informed by feminist principles that focuses on ‘how the experience and display of emotions may be a site of social control or a site of political transformation and how emotions may serve to maintain the status quo of dominant patriarchal, hierarchical capitalist systems’ (Winograd, 2003, p. 1644). To not question what counts as normal school decorum is to perpetuate schools’ injustices, according to Feiman-Nemser (2001). In an environment such as a school, maintaining appropriate behaviour comes to be seen as re-enforcing the power of certain norms, such that ‘issues of identity lead directly to the question of what is “appropriate”, which in turn leads to the question of how acceptable emotional stances and identities get defined’ (Zembylas, 2003b, p. 112). Suppression of emotions has the potential to shackle professional communities of teachers, as they find safety in conservative, familiar, non-risky enterprises and do not use their emotions as a vehicle for change or social justice (Winograd, 2003). Foucault (1990) argued that all aspects of an individual’s life are subject to types of disciplinary formation such that any incident in a cultural or political context, however small, could play a significant part in an individual’s “becoming”.

As noted previously, reduction in formal social rituals and rules over time has resulted in greater need for individuals to show self-control and constraint, resulting in stronger demands on an individual’s own judgement and ability to make others feel comfortable. Mastenbroek (2000) asserted that in such a climate, individuals are more inclined to cover up emotions for fear of making a mistake. The fear to which the teachers referred was related to the very expression of anger itself as it would be indicative of not being in control. Liljestrom and Roulston’s (2007) study of female teachers’ episodes with anger revealed ‘vivid descriptions of powerful emotional experiences, often accompanied by tears’ (p. 284). An individual’s desire to express her/his emotions appropriately is what Foucault (1988) refers to as ‘technologies of the self’, where teachers perform/do their emotions, which they have to manage and control, such that
power is exercised through imposed self-interpretation, and such regulation functions to produce a particular kind of teacher-self. ‘One must understand the link between subjectivity and emotion in order to understand the ways in which emotions, as discursive practices and performances, are productive and how they relate to power’ (Zembylas, 2003b, p. 111), such that ‘subjectivity is produced, negotiated and reshaped through discursive practices’ (p. 113).

It seems appropriate to suggest that emotions are the object and subject of discursive practices in the same way that individuals are the object and the subject of experience, so it is important to analyse the discourse of experiences rather than the experience itself i.e. how teacher emotions are foregrounded or silenced, privileged or dismissed in the narratives. According to Bloomfield (2004, p. 3) the fact that emotions are disciplined and silenced by the ‘expectations of others and institutional sanctions that serve to legitimise who one can be’ makes them both discursive products as well as discursive practices ‘interweaving not only systems of legitimation and power but also contributing to the dynamics of subjectivity and identity formation’ (p. 6).

Feeling rules channel our subjective experiences, telling us when we should feel and when we should interpret our physiological states as emotional. Research suggests that such expectations are grounded in the socially-constructed selves that we bring into feeling situations and they vary across individuals and across cultural differences like race, ethnicity, gender and class (Conrad & Witte, 1994). Research also suggests that teachers typically blame themselves in situations when they experience negative emotions. For example, Winograd (2003) suggested that when teachers experience negative emotions such as embarrassment, shame and guilt they apportion blame to themselves and so the focus of attention is on their individual inadequacies. This consequently diverts attention from possible structural problems in schools. When teachers experienced feelings of guilt, it is typically a judgment imposed by the individual themself and, according to Bullough and Young (2002), it is ‘easy not to measure up, to demean oneself, to punish oneself and then to fail to forgive’ (p. 427). Similarly Boler (1997) argued that shame was ‘the distressed comprehension of the self as inadequate or diminished: it requires, if not an actual audience before whom my deficiencies are paraded, then an internalised audience with a capacity to judge me’ (p. 86). However, she also claimed that shame was socially formed rather than some idiosyncratic or individualised phenomena, as the judgements one makes about one’s
Forrester (2005) also noted that when teachers are not willing to conform to the expectations of a context that is under duress as a result of a reform agenda, they experience feelings of shame and their non-conformity results in conflict with colleagues when they should, instead, confront the external political imperatives driving the reform. Similarly, Woods, Jeffrey, Troman and Boyle (1997) suggested that tensions arise when an individual is faced with opposing courses of action where choice is limited or circumscribed, as is the case in school reform. Of similar concern in relation to teacher identity, according to O’Connor (2008, p. 119), the emerging performative culture associated with the “standards” movement is a discourse that ‘emphasises accountability and the public demonstration of professional attributes above teachers’ ethical and emotional qualities’. O’Connor claimed that teachers’ discussions about the emotionality of their work could form a counter-discourse to the performative, technical rationalist focus that arises from a standards agenda.

Schools are typically sites of conformity, conservatism, emotion regulation and places where teacher subjectivities are constructed through routinely uncontested and unquestioned discursive practices. What then do we see as the product of these discursive practices? The next section explores the literature in relation to the “good teacher” as an example of both the product of, and the producer of, such discursive practices.

**Good Teacher**

The research literature recognises the importance of acknowledging a socio-historical tradition that has constructed an image of the “teacher” as one who is stable and certain (Graham, 1997). Bullough and Young (2002) for example, asserted that there is a ‘socially recognised conception’ of what a teacher is, should do, should feel and how those feelings should be expressed, thus illuminating the vulnerable nature of teachers’ work and related emotions. However, when teachers fail to fit that recognisable image, they develop a diminished sense of self and practicum stories are replete with feelings, often intense, about the ways in which a teacher’s personal sense of self is compromised by personal history (Day & Leitch, 2001). It was Moore (2004) who argued that there is no “essential” or unitary notion of “the good teacher” and as such the changing nature
of the self is imbued with emotions. As Zembylas reminds us, they are ‘the very fabric constituting the self, but they are socially organised and managed through social conventions, community scrutiny and legal norms (2003b, p. 107).

A number of authors have commented on teachers’ propensity for comparing themselves to their colleagues. For example, Hargreaves (2005) noted that in making comparisons, teachers assess themself as either positive or negative reflections of their own practice, while Schmidt (2000) suggested that teachers create an identity from what others think about them by attaching symbolic meaning to other’s perspectives. Similarly, Nias noted that individuals create their identity from perceptions of how others see them but she saw this as problematic because the role the individual is “performing” does not necessarily allow them to be themself (1989b).

It appears that the standards movement in England had, and continues to have, a profound impact on what is considered good teaching. Like Moore (2004) Hebson, Earnshaw and Marchington (2007) asserted that ‘the role of emotional work teachers carry out in classrooms is increasingly contested’ under the standards agenda and these authors claimed that a performance culture driven by a standards movement denies the emotional aspects of teaching, although there is research available that recognises and celebrates emotions as central to what it means to be a good teacher (Day & Leitch, 2001; Hargreaves, 2005). However, as Feiman-Nemser (2001) indicated “good teachers” employ the “norms of politeness” to create and maintain harmony, although adherence to these norms can be a barrier to productive interactions, particularly mentoring interactions (p.1033). This potentially has a deleterious effect on outcomes for effective mentoring by site-based teacher educators when they are supporting a preservice teacher.

It is clear that there has been significant research that attends to the integral place of emotions in the lives of teachers, students and administrators, with an increasing attention to issues of discourses of schools, schooling and teacher identity. In the next section I address some issues raised previously but now with an even tighter focus on site-based teacher education. For example, what does the literature say about the discursive practices that shape the emotional experiences of site-based teacher educators?
EMOTIONS IN PRESERVICE AND BEGINNING TEACHER EDUCATION

One of the significant components of preservice teacher education programs both nationally and internationally is the site-based experience (see, inter alia Santoro, 1999; Zeichner, 2002). Research in the field of teaching (and other “caring” professions) is replete with studies that identified positive outcomes for site-based teacher educators who supported preservice teachers in the field experience programs (Barnett, 1992; Koerner, 1992; Riccomini & Fish, 2005; Smith, 1998; Tatel, 1994; Tjeerdsma, 1998). The opportunity exists for teachers to experience increased levels of self-esteem and develop meaningful relationships through positive interactions with preservice teachers (Collis, 1995). The “practicum” is an opportunity for an experienced teacher and a preservice teacher to work collaboratively in order for the latter to develop knowledge, skills and understandings in relation to the complexities of schools in general, and teaching specifically.

Positive outcomes for both the teacher and the neophyte are often the result of increased confidence levels for the preservice teacher as she extends her knowledge of her new profession. Many teachers believe time spent in the schools is the ‘sine qua non of teacher education’ (Bullough et al., 2004d). However, because site-based education is a time when preservice teachers are immersed in the ‘complexities of practice [and] are exposed to numerous competing understandings about what it means to think and act as a professional’, it is characterised by conflict (Phelan et al., 2006, p. 163). It is not hard to understand that having an extra person in the classroom, in the form of a preservice teacher would potentially increase the complexity, including emotional complexity, of a classroom. The otherwise “stable” situation can be fractured such that any teacher’s sources of support, methods of coping and established relationships can experience tensions and emotional upheaval under the public gaze of the preservice teacher and university supervisor.

In 1993, Cole and Knowles noted that there had been limited work on exploring the experiences of participants when the preservice teacher failed to meet the requirements of the program, while as recently as 2005, studies by Pellett, Pellett and Heidi as well as Wayda and Lund indicated that this issue had still received only limited attention.

---

18 I have aggregated the research on preservice and beginning teachers working with mentors in the English model, as many of the themes are highly consistent.
19 I will revisit and problematise this “expectation” at a later stage.
Further, what attention has been directed to the topic has predominantly been from the perspective of the university and/or preservice teacher – rarely do we hear the concerns and opinions of the site-based teacher educators. For example, Butler (1998) compared the experiences of traditional and non-traditional preservice teachers and Bloomfield’s engaging study is one that examined in depth the painful emotional experiences from the perspective of preservice teacher (Bloomfield, 2004; Smagorinsky et al., 2004). My own work (Hastings, 1999, 2004, 2008), as a former secondary teacher, now university-academic represents some of the studies that have attempted to capture a sense of an emotional dimension of site-based teacher education, particularly in relation to teachers. Siebert, Clark, Kilbridge and Petersen (2006) noted that an ERIC search did not reveal any publications related to the impact that a failing preservice teacher has on a site-based teacher educator. Maybe the fact that three of these authors are in fact site-based teacher educators explains their interest, when other researchers appear not to be so engaged. Teachers believe it is essential that research is related to their world - research that is not done to them, but with them and for them (Del Gesso & Smith, 1993). The experiences of the participants in this study are also not unusual. Opportunities for collaborative work to develop shared school-university understandings were either not offered or were voluntary so that teachers needed to attend in their own time. Teachers see the opportunity to contribute to teacher education as recognition of their experience and it provides them with an active role in the process (Adey, 1993; Hawkey, 1998).

Much of the research that attends to site-based learning in schools is associated with mentoring models, such as in England (Maynard & Furlong, 1996) and Canada, where Bullough and associates, in particular, have established a sound reputation for interesting work, particularly around relationships in the university-school partnerships (Bullough & Draper, 2004a, 2004b; Bullough, Draper, Erickson, Smith & Young, 2004c; Bullough et al., 2004d; Bullough & Young, 2002). While my study examines emotional experiences in the traditional block placement that is typical of Australian universities, many of the issues raised in site-based “mentoring” resonate with the ‘co-operating teacher’ model which was explained briefly in the first chapter and will be further explored later in Chapter four.

As noted earlier, research has attempted to dispel myths about the need for professional distance between teachers, students; and it continues in the field of teacher education. The call for teachers to remain cool and dispassionate and emotionally in control is for
many researchers, such as Bullough and Draper (2004a), Lasky (2000) and Musanti (2002) a “cultural myth”. Musanti (2002) for example, stated that interpersonal bonding is a substantial component of the mentoring relationship and that emotional attachment is needed for the relationship between mentor and neophyte to succeed. Similarly, Bullough and Draper (2004a) argued that ‘teaching and mentoring involve intimate human interaction, commitment to others’ development, and both success and failure are understood to reveal something profound about one’s self, moral standing, and ability’ (p. 286). Such commitment makes it difficult to remain dispassionate while professionally engaged. Further, these authors asserted that while such dispassionate professionalism may help contain a mentor’s sense of vulnerability, emotions would inevitably spill out because mentoring and teaching required an ‘emotional investment’ (p. 286). Teachers involved in their research indicated that it was very difficult to keep their distance and remain emotionally uninvolved.

One of the difficulties for teachers/mentors who establish interpersonal and/or professional bonds with preservice colleagues is associated with the emotional turmoil that comes with dealing with the personal and professional needs of a “failing” student i.e. when they do not meet the expectations of the program. The following section pays specific attention to what existing research tells us are some of the underlying causes of difficult emotions for site-based educators working in preservice teacher education.

Causes of difficult emotions for site-based teacher educators

Fry and Martin’s (1996) study was some of the first work undertaken to examine the stressors associated with the task of supporting preservice teachers from the perspective of the teachers themselves. They identified five factors related to stress experienced by school-based teacher educators, one of which was the school-university partnership. They also noted behaviour by the university member of the triad$^{20}$ such as lack of flexibility, lack of enthusiasm, disregard for teacher comments and differing philosophical positions were causes of stress for the teachers. Further, they identified that the preservice teacher’s lack of success in teaching performance was a significant issue, particularly in relation to the student’s learning, as well as expectations and role ambiguity. The following section extends the identification of the literature in relation

---

$^{20}$Triad refers to the traditional threesome involved in preservice teacher education – preservice teacher, site-based teacher educator and university colleague.
to aspects of the work that result in negative emotional experiences for the site-based teacher educators. The sub-sections explore research on policies, practices and personal demeanours that may result in difficult emotional experiences for site-based teacher educators. All the sections are clearly connected and the differentiation is to assist the navigation through this complex web and in no particular order; no issue should be seen as more important than another.

Lost learning - students and preservice teachers
Research by Corbett and Wright (1993) showed that teachers have a strong sense of ownership towards the students and their learning. That sense of ownership and responsibility extended to the preservice teacher who came into the classroom, thus creating another dimension of concern for the teacher. This next section of the review looks briefly at research that explored aspects of teacher’s concerns for their students - both school and university - when the class was faced with a failing preservice/neophyte teacher. Gibbs and Montoya (1994) found that both the teacher and the students are disadvantaged in a situation where the preservice teacher is struggling. When a problematic preservice teacher threatens to impede their students’ learning, some teachers experience a sense of guilt about their own students’ missed learning opportunities (Bennett, Jones & Maude, 1994; Hastings, 2004; Siebert et al., 2006).

Siebert, Clark, Kilbridge and Peterson (2006) also stated that ‘witnessing another person’s daily struggle in such close proximity is naturally awkward’ and was the cause of much distress for some site-based teacher educators (p. 419). However, a number of researchers identified preservice teacher failure as a source of frustration for teachers. For example, Schmidt (1995) and Duquette (1998) noted that successful classroom teachers often felt frustrated when the preservice teacher was unable to achieve a satisfactory level of competence, especially in those situations when the preservice teacher failed to listen to advice offered by the teacher. Bullough and Draper (2004a) also reported that teachers were deeply troubled when interns did not respond to feedback, and they suggested this complicated the learning process. Similarly, Ballantyne, Hansford and Packer (1995) identified levels of frustration experienced by mentors working with beginning teachers whose needs they were unable to meet. These authors also described how the teachers ultimately adopted a non-critical role with the neophyte in order to maintain a positive relationship. While a non-critical stance may reduce emotional tensions it is related to issues of assessment. Ineffective assessment
can also lead to lost opportunities for learning causing different difficult emotions. This connection between emotion and assessment is addressed in the next section which focuses on issues of assessment as a source of difficult emotions for site-based teacher educators.

**Assessment**

Assessment and emotions are interconnected and tightly linked to the maintenance of positive relationships because a teacher’s identity is related to students’ success (Hargreaves, 1998c). Teachers often blame themselves for a preservice teacher’s lack of success, questioning their own ability as a teacher and subsequently worrying that the preservice teacher’s failure is seen as a reflection of their own inadequacies. The following section examines this connectedness as described in the literature on preservice teaching, where a significant degree of emotional tension resides around issues of assessment, whether this is assessment of teaching performance in the classroom, or ‘performing’ the good (preservice) teacher discourse in terms of commitment, dress and/or demeanour. The process of assessment potentially causes varying degrees of positive and negative feelings because there are situations of success and failure involved. The tasks expected of a site-based teacher educator are often conflicting and increasingly contradictory. At times they are required to perform ‘friend, colleague and helper’; roles that are perhaps incompatible with that of ‘evaluator’ and even ‘disciplinarian’. According to research by Travers and Cooper (1996), Siebert, et al. (2006) as well as Ilott and Murphy (1997) such contradictions may cause anxiety and stress. These researchers argued that assessment in education produces feelings of anxiety, distress, self-doubt, guilt, regret and relief. The processes of assessment and feedback that occur during site-based placements can be a time of stress and discomfort, such that stress, anxiety and discomfort result when there is a professional confrontation between colleagues (whether they be teachers, preservice teachers and/or university staff).

There are further, and possibly more damaging issues associated with the tensions that exist around the competing educational discourses in which the site-based teacher educator is positioned as supporter and assessor. When teachers find it difficult to criticise their preservice colleague, it may be that they are ultimately doing them and the profession a disservice, because, as Siebert et al. (2006) argued, the lack of criticism may give a preservice teacher an incorrect assessment of their capacity as a teacher.
Feelings of loyalty, such as between colleagues or between a site-based teacher educator and her pre-service teacher, keep relationships together when they may otherwise disintegrate (Barbalet, 1996). However, some research suggests that the processes surrounding an unsuccessful field placement become more difficult when the participants have developed a positive relationship, to the extent that ‘individuals are more likely to give up their own power or exercise it more judiciously’ in these situations (Schmidt, 1995, p. 838). This means that teachers tend to take great care when giving feedback, always appearing hopeful and positive (Bullough & Draper, 2004a). Jacques (1992), Ballantyne, Hansford and Packer (1995) and Martin and Rippon (2005) are among many researchers who argue that a consequence of attempting to maintain positive relationships with beginning teachers, is a situation where mentors are less likely to adopt a critical role. Further, the teachers and their “charges” effectively collude in avoiding the issues, through a conspiracy of silence. This is a view supported by Bradbury and Koballa (2008), who also found that conflict avoidance was a strategy used by triadic members of site-based teacher education programs in order to maintain positive relationships. However, they also noted that avoiding conflict restricts the opportunities for open communication, which are seen to be an essential component of successful programs. Jones (2001), in comparing English and German contexts, also noted the difficulties experienced by teachers, as they balanced competing discourses of assessor and colleague/partner, particularly in relation to power differential between the pre-service teacher and mentor in the dyad. However, she also asserted that teachers believe they carry a higher status in the triad, which involves the university as the third party, when they have an active role in assessment, and their opinions are actively incorporated into the program.

Duquette (1998) noted the significant issues related to field work assessment and suggested that universities need to maintain close contact with the teachers because of the emotional aspects of the process. In order to manage student failure, Litchfield (2001) proposed that universities should produce specific protocols addressing processes for student support. Further, she suggested that work needs to be done with respect to the discourse of failure, recasting this as a positive, rather than a totally negative learning experience.

In terms of assessment/evaluation of teachers’ contribution to preservice programs, Blocker and Swetnam (1995) noted that few institutions had formal evaluation
procedures for assessing the contribution of the site-based teacher educator. As recently as 2007, Clark stated that teachers expressed concern in relation to university assessments of their capacity as site-based educators, which was reflected in their request for feedback on their practice. Teachers also desired criteria and formal selection processes for appointment as a site-based teacher educator. They felt that this action would provide affirmation of their contribution to preservice teacher education (Clarke, 2001).

In those situations when the preservice teacher fails to achieve successful outcomes from the placement, the emotions are accentuated greatly. The following section pays specific attention to the emotional dimension of such episodes.

**Preservice teacher failure**

Teachers who work with preservice teachers sometimes find themselves torn between the demands of their classroom, their colleagues and their profession. When the experience is not as positive as hoped, teachers can find themselves in an emotionally demanding situation. Some examples of studies that attend to unsuccessful preservice placements include Bennett, Jones and Maude (1994), Bradbury and Koballa (2008), Carver and Kratz (2004) as well as Gibbs and Montoya (1994). Interestingly, none of these studies mentioned an emotional dimension of the situations, even though it would have been most unlikely that the events did not involve intense emotional experiences for the participants. However, Downes (1996) did assert that site-based teacher educators can become emotionally exhausted when their preservice teacher experiences difficulties resulting in a fail grade, especially when the teacher takes their role seriously. As a means of coping, teachers seek ways and means to support themselves through the placement. Consequently, the focus of much of the research on unsuccessful placements is typically on stressors and mechanisms that teachers might employ to overcome or manage the causes of stress - such as disengaging from “competing” activities (Fry & Martin, 1996; Griffith, Steptoe, & Cropley, 1999).

Assessment, emotions and identity are connected and studies such as that of Hawe (2003) indicated that so much self-esteem is tied up in assessment that both assessor and student feel a failure when a fail grade is awarded. As noted above, some teachers see preservice teacher failure as a tacit personal commentary on their personal/professional performance. Accordingly, the assessment of the preservice teacher can be construed as
an evaluation of the competence of the teacher, and teachers find such evaluations to be highly stressful and so often become negative emotional experiences (Kyriacou, 2001; Rikard, 1996).

It is worth noting that issues such as these in teaching are replicated in other “caring” professions. Research in the field of social work at an Australian university noted that there were almost no cases of student failure (Eisenberg, Heycox & Hughes, 1996). These authors noted in their literature review that assessment is an area of stress for site-based educators, and that the university’s support was often ambivalent. Further, they found research indicated that social work professionals felt there was a clash of discourses between that of “helper” and that of “assessor”. Shapton (2006) also noted that it is the site-based professional that establishes a relationship with the student, (much less so than the university academic) by providing emotional and intellectual support in the workplace, so that the requirement to fail an unsuccessful student is a particularly daunting process. In their assessment, social work mentors are reluctant to award a fail grade to the student, because failure was seen as a reflection on the mentor’s competence as a social worker or a reflection on their relationship with the student. Likewise, Andrews (2007) found that nurse educators were unwilling to fail students because to do so was seen as a personal failure (Mulholland, Mallik, Moran, Scammell & Turnock, 2005) or they struggled to differentiate their care for the student nurse from the needs of their patients and the profession – ‘their moral caring interfered in their objective evaluation’ of practice (Hrobsky & Kersbergen, 2002, p. 550).

How teachers (or social workers or nurses) feel about themselves is bound up to some extent in their understanding of what is happening in these painful situations, when expertise and confidence is most needed in supporting marginal or failing students (Shapton, 2006). The degree of control or power relates to the awareness that each individual has of the whole process of the preservice program, and their place in the process - from the personal to the professional. How do site-based educators come to know? What access do they have to the knowledge that would allow them some agency in this endeavour? What is the responsibility of the university in this aspect of such professional programs? Though I reiterate here that it is not only in preservice teacher education that these issues are a concern, as the research above, and other work by Sharrad (1992), Andrews and Chilton (2000) and Mulholland, Mallik, Moran et al. (2005) has shown, in the next section I turn to the published literature associated with
access to information on the effect of role awareness as a source of negative emotions for teachers involved in preservice teacher/early career programs.

**Role awareness/ambiguity and learning opportunities**

Workers, irrespective of the place of employment, need clear consistent information regarding their rights, roles and responsibilities and how they can be best performed if they are to achieve the most effective outcomes (Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982).

Few teacher education programs provide formal preparation for site-based teacher educators undertaking the support of preservice teachers (see, *inter alia* Timperley, 2001; Weiss & Weiss, 2001). Teachers need support through professional development opportunities to enable them to be fully prepared for their role with preservice teachers (Hobson, Giannakaki & Chambers, 2009). According to Feiman-Nemser (1998) teachers have limited opportunity to develop the core skills essential for supporting a preservice teacher such as ‘observation and talking with others about teaching’ (p. 65). She argued this is the result of a culture that normalises teaching in private and where opportunities to observe other teachers and engage in systematic conversation are rare. However, available research is unequivocal in claiming that if teachers are not provided with appropriate preparation they suffer from role ambiguity, due to endemic uncertainty regarding their role in the site-based placement, and consequently they may experience significant levels of stress (Eifler & Potthoff, 1998; Faire, 1994; Frost, 1993; Hatton & Harman, 1997; Koerner, 1992; Travers & Cooper, 1996). Teachers may initially rely on workplace myths or sharing stories (Kainan, 2002) to prepare themselves for any new role, but without appropriate support, confusion can arise such that ‘when professional roles are characterised by conflict, change and ambiguity, intense and often negative emotional reactions’ result (Schmidt, 2000, p. 829).

The literature is replete with material suggesting that preservice teaching programs would be enhanced if university staff assisted site-based teacher educators to develop understandings of their role and skills in supporting preservice teachers (Atputhasamy, 2005; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Fairbanks, Freedman & Kahn, 2000; Frost, 1993; Veal & Rikard, 1998; Wang, 2001). According to Orland-Barak (2005), the lack of clear directions and support for site-based teacher educators results in situations of uncertainty as teachers attempt to negotiate their new professional identity. She labelled her work as “lost in translation” in reference to teachers’ attempts to bridge the gap
between teaching and mentoring. It is situations such as these, when university staff provide no instruction to enhance clarity, that site-based teacher educators are positioned as less knowledgeable and therefore less powerful than university supervisors, so that tensions and negative emotions are accentuated.

As recently as 2007, Clark found that current practices in preparing site-based teacher educators were ‘woefully inadequate and failed to address some of the most basic issues associated with the advisory role’ (p. 3). This situation appears to have remained static over some time. In the 1980s, Housego (1987) noted that there were fewer critical incidences in a placement program when site-based teacher educators were provided with support prior to the placement. In the 1990s Zimpher even suggested that when universities failed to prepare site-based teacher educators for these supervising roles, they were exploiting public schools for purposes of teacher education. Travers and Cooper (1996) were two of a number of researchers in the 1990s who asserted that teachers needed to be fully briefed about their responsibilities in relation to preservice teachers (Robinson, 1994). Eifler and Potthoff (1998) also cited literature from the United States where programs were designed for older teacher education students and having embedded deliberate ‘[s]trong, positive and well articulated connections [between] colleges of education, schools, were able to attract teacher candidates (p. 192).

It is not only in traditional site-based teacher education programs that lack of clear understanding results in the production of difficult emotions for the practising teachers. Utley, Basile and Rhodes (2003) found in their study of “master teachers” that these teachers working as site co-ordinators felt devalued, used and frustrated at the loss of trust associated with conflicting expectations between university and school staff. Schmidt (2005) also argued that negative emotions - guilt, anxiety and frustration - arise when goals cannot be achieved because the goals belong to an agenda determined by others.

Ewart and Straw (2005) argued for urgent attention to clarifying the role of site-based teacher educators as ‘teachers of theory’ noting that if the call for reform in education is to be successful, teacher candidates must be supported to develop the capacity to anchor their practice in theory (p. 199). Research such as this was, and still is important, as it challenges the position of the theory/practice, university/school (binary) relationship,
and positions site-based teacher educators as knowledgeable in the same way as university staff. It could be argued that the teachers’ knowledge actually surpasses that of university staff because of their particular contextual classroom knowledge. As Wang (2001) argued, mentoring is very much tied up in the context, and it is knowledge of the context that typically resides with the teachers.

In 1992, Koerner asserted that site-based teacher educators were under the impression that the university was ‘indifferent to their needs, schedules and priorities … [ and they were] not listened to and often feel demeaned’ (p. 52). When teachers are kept informed of university expectations or outcomes, they are more able to respond to students’ needs appropriately. While that research may appear dated, in many ways the situation has not changed, as the others working in this area have indicated (Miles, Everton & Bonnett, 1994; Veal & Rikard, 1996; Weiss & Weiss, 2001). More recently, Zuljan and Vogrinc’s (2007) study recognised the importance of providing mentors with emotional support, particularly in relation to their own and others’ expectations of them.

When teachers are forced to operate in a vacuum and thus fail to achieve the outcomes they desire, they tend to apportion blame to themselves, even though the lack of direction is not necessarily of their making (Winograd, 2003). For example, teachers experience feelings of isolation (Elliott & Calderhead, 1996) and alienation (Travers & Cooper, 1996) when they are not aware of what is occurring in the campus-based part of the teacher education course. Tensions arise when there is misunderstanding and mentors need support to enable them to explicitly articulate their beliefs about teaching to avoid misinterpretation by their preservice colleague. Beck and Kosnick (2000) called for university staff to work with site-based educators to develop shared conceptions of teaching and learning that could inform the development of university-based programs, and be modelled by university and school-based staff (see also, Riccomini & Fish, 2005; Smedley, 2001). Similarly, and more recently Bradbury and Koballa (2008) suggested that university staff need to play a stronger leadership role in supporting site-based teacher educators to make sense of the differing aspects of the possible differing roles that they may be required to undertake when working with a preservice teacher – analysing the causes of harmony and dissonance. That suggestion however, keeps the power with the university staff and consequently raises the question whether it should in fact be the case that teachers are given greater opportunity to support university staff make sense of the school context.
The issue of knowledge, control and power is complex: Whose knowledge? What is valued? Hawkey (1998) for example, noted that some teachers were concerned because they felt they did not know what they were doing, not as a result of inadequate preparation, but because they worked intuitively and could not readily articulate what it was they did. Further, Elliott and Calderhead (1996) suggested that it is the values and beliefs of the teacher which ultimately affect their capacity to effectively implement new knowledge that may be gained in preparation for the role of school-based teacher educator. Teachers who have confidence in their own ability to perform tasks essential to their role (efficacy) take on challenging roles, try harder to achieve them and develop coping mechanisms for managing their emotional state (Ross, Rolheiser & Hogaboam-Gray, 1998). However, I would argue that findings such as these appear to “blame the victim” and permit the university and school systems to abrogate themselves of the responsibility for developing and implementing well-resourced programs. Sharing equally the responsibility for successful programs is a goal that all participants might espouse but the literature indicates that it is currently not the situation in many university-school “relationships”.

**Relationships and status between members of the triad, colleagues and significant others.**

The status of each person in the learning context, and their relationships will impact on the success or otherwise of the practicum. Success of the placement is often attributed to the relationship between the site-based teacher educator and preservice teacher (Santoro, 1999; Siebert et al., 2006) and the former’s efforts to maintain a positive relationship with the latter (Rikard, 1996; Veal & Rikard, 1998). Other researchers, such as Powell and McGowan (1996) explicitly noted that relationships, such as in school/university partnerships around preservice teacher education are strongest when no members are excluded and that views of all participants are considered and addressed. However, Frost (1993) asserted that teachers actually find it difficult to criticise a program (or its outcomes) because they perceive it to have already been validated by a more important body such as the university. Further, Graham (2006) claimed that teachers often felt intimidated and inferior to university staff and were positioned as being responsible for problems that arose in relation to the preservice teacher. Consequently, these teachers were reluctant to maintain important communication links with the university staff.
Research indicates that effective communication is fundamental to quality site-based programs. Darling-Hammond (1996) argued that teachers who were able to access teacher networks and have enriched professional roles felt more efficacious in their roles, while Atputhasamy (2005), Ducharme and Ducharme (1993) and Kahn (2001) stressed for dialogue between higher education and schools if participants intended to provide a coherent, meaningful university-school-based teacher education program. Sinclair, Dowson and Thistleton-Martin (2006), writing in the context of universities finding increasing difficulty in placing preservice teachers in school settings, contended that, for pragmatic reasons only, improved communication of expectations for all partners would enhance the number of teachers willing to participate in preservice programs, because of their greater sense of belonging.

A sense of belonging is an important aspect of relationship building. Sudzina and Coolican’s (1994) work suggested that good communication could ease the sense of isolation felt by school staff – isolation not only felt in relation to the university. Not all school-based colleagues are supportive of the role of teacher mentor/site-based teacher educator, so support networks are essential to sustain the teachers who do choose to participate. Bullough and Draper (2004a) found mentors were anxious about what their colleagues thought of them and their work, including fears of jealousy in the face of work success, leaving them feeling isolated and undervalued. I have argued above that the literature suggests site-based teacher educators fear blame and criticism from colleagues for perceived inadequacy when preservice teachers have problems. Travers and Cooper (1996) asserted that teachers may be disinclined to ask for support when such difficulties arise. As mentioned previously, schools often reflect a culture of isolation, which still exists in site-based programs. Maynard (1996) suggested that working behind closed doors was a recognised part of primary school culture, and that this had come to be seen as part of their professional autonomy. Nias (1996) also noted that it is ‘a fear of criticism [that is a sign] of the individual teacher’s professional and normative isolation and, as a consequence, of their reliance for validation, approval and self-esteem on the opinions of those with whom they come into contact’ (p. 303). It would appear from the literature that ‘it will take some time before there is a noticeable change from an isolationist culture of many teachers to one in which they are comfortable with sharing observation and feedback roles with their neophyte colleagues’ (McNally & Martin, 1998, p. 49).
It is worth noting that a very important relationship in this context is that which exists between the teacher and the class. According to Ewart and Straw (2005) teachers feel a sense of loss when they have to give up or share their class with a preservice teacher. Indeed, Koerner (1992) found that having a preservice teacher in the classroom changed the teachers’ status and the teacher’s sense of self as central to the classroom, particularly when they felt that this was upsetting a good relationship that the teacher had developed with students in the class (Veal & Rikard, 1998). Similarly, Nias (1996) noted that problems arose for teachers when other individuals – colleagues, parents, or inspectors – crossed or threatened the tight boundaries that had been drawn around the classroom and the students within it. Teachers indicated that they felt anxious, impatient, distressed, depressed and angry when they were distracted from their core business (p. 300).

Of course, the other significant often forgotten element in these relationships is the place of the parent. Bennett, Jones and Maude (1994) highlighted teachers’ anxieties in relation to possible parent perceptions during a practicum – that their child’s class was being taught by an unqualified teacher who was also struggling in the classroom. These researchers argued that the stress for the teacher is further exacerbated because the parents can exercise their power to take their child from the school if they are dissatisfied with the teaching, leaving the teacher in a very difficult situation.

Site-based teacher educators’ emotional experiences are tied up in relationships that are established, or not, in a teacher education triad. While university staff might see their students’ needs as of upmost importance, teachers may not see it that way, nor might parents. Much “relationship building” and maintenance is associated with issues of power, which I deal with in the next section.

\textit{Power}^{21}

As I indicated earlier in this chapter, emotions, power and culture are intertwined and no less so in complex institutions such as schools and universities. Human emotions can be understood as responses to the power and/or status (Kempler, 1995) and according to Lasky (2000), culture and power are inseparable components of school life, so that emotions and power are similarly intertwined. Individual and collective emotions,

\footnotetext{21}{My understanding of ‘power’ in a post-structuralist theoretical framework is expanded for the reader in Chapter 3.}
therefore ‘obtain cultural meaning because of their role in culturally available scripts for communicating and interacting’ (p. 845). While power is inherently in all relationships, I have chosen to separate power as a specific area of the research relating to causes of difficult emotions for site-based teacher educators. As I have noted previously, research suggests that teachers are remarkably isolated and strikingly powerless in the hierarchy of educational bureaucracy even though they are the central figure of authority and control in their classroom (Kreisberg, 1992, p. 9, cited in Stanulis & Russell 2000). Associated with feelings of isolation are feelings of vulnerability (Keltcherman, 1996, 2005). According to Orland-Barak (2005) mentors experience strong feelings of vulnerability, incompetence and “strangeness” when they are positioned in, and need to manage, power relations between supervisors, experienced teacher and principals involved in mentoring programs. Simultaneously they must balance the competing discourses of practice associated with mentoring: assessing, caring, supporting, and critiquing.

Limited power and associated negative emotions are related to assumptions about what is acceptable and what is to be marginalised, what is included and what is omitted or ignored in decision-making processes. There has been increasing attention to the issue of “unequal” power in the preservice teacher education triad and dyad. For example, Veal and Rikard (1998) claimed that site-based teacher educators are often excluded from many of the decision making processes in preservice programs as a result of unequal power relationships in the traditional preservice teacher education triad. Bullough, Draper, Erickson, et al. (2004c, p. 499) found that there were also unequal power relationships between members of university staff and clinical supervisors in what they labelled ‘boundary encounters’. Graham (1993, 1997, 1999) has made significant contributions to the field of preservice teacher education research over many years and has addressed issues of power and control as her work has progressed. In her study with preservice teachers and site-based teacher educators in 1993, Graham noted that maintaining the dyadic relationship was demanding on both participants. She proposed giving teachers an opportunity to develop an understanding of the issues of power, control and gender that structured relationships in the teacher education setting to reduce some of the difficulties that arose. Teital (1998) noted that colleges and universities in the USA tended to dominate university-school partnerships, which increased the chances of dissatisfaction by school-based participants in terms of reciprocity, contribution and intended outcomes.
When teachers and university staff did work in “equitable” ways that genuinely recognised each participant’s contribution, there was much less tension (read as negative emotional feelings) and fewer feelings of powerlessness of the teachers (Wilson, 1995). Similarly, Smith (2007) found that “tensions” arise when there are unequal power relations, and that often preservice teachers and site-based teacher educators are not ‘in a position to reconcile the pedagogical and philosophical differences that separate school and university practitioners’ (p. 100). Consequently, both found themselves in a situation that were not conducive to learning. It is worth noting that while Smith identified issues of power, she chose not to use the term “emotions” or “feelings”. Again they were “silenced”. Similarly, Swanson (1995) asserted that in order for collaborative relationships to develop, partnership members have to overcome a history of differential status and perceived exploitation. Educational research in the field of motivation consistently found that teachers felt deprived of the opportunity to participate in decision-making processes (see, inter alia Bacharach, Bamberger, Conley, & Bauer, 1990; Chase, 1991; Taylor & Bogotch, 1992). Conscious collaboration relies on the establishment of professionally supportive relationships in which site-based teacher educators, university staff and preservice teachers can acknowledge their own values and the differing perspectives they bring to the partnership (Stanulis & Russell, 2000). When individuals have the power to express their concerns, without fear of being seen as a failure, there is a concomitant reduction in the level of anxiety of staff (Sharrad, 1992). Further Barbalet (1996) asserted that knowledge is related to confidence and site-based teacher educators who lack knowledge and thus confidence will not “take action” to speak out, such that emotions like shyness and shame enforce social conformity.

However, in spite of this rich tradition of research, which could have guided reform in teacher education practice over several decades, Zeichner (2002) suggested that university staff and school-based teacher educators are still ‘mutually ignorant of each other’s work and the principles that underpin it’ (p. 61). He also argued that, typically, preservice teacher education programs undervalue the importance of practitioner knowledge in the process of learning to teach. Importantly, for my study, being dismissed or devalued by significant others involved in or even peripheral to teacher education, has significant implications for any site-based teacher educator’s emotional well-being.
Power which is embedded and expressed in surveillance becomes “naturalised” in schools (and universities) through human relations. Teachers are aware of each other’s behaviour around the school and in the staffroom, despite working in isolation in their classrooms. Even if this is not admitted publicly, teachers make judgements about their colleagues. When site-based teacher educators open their classes to “public” scrutiny by admitting a preservice teacher into their classroom(s), they add another layer of surveillance. Teachers undertaking the role of mentor find it particularly daunting and often feel that it is fraudulent for them to be identified as an exemplary teacher. Being observed and judged negatively by neophytes can be troubling for site-based teacher educators (Bullough & Draper, 2004a). Little (1996) asserted that conflicts or differing views, such as may occur with a problematic preservice teacher, have the potential to expose teachers’ differences or uncertainties more publicly than would typically occur inside an unsuccessful classroom activity.

Relations of power help construct the way (site-based) teachers see themselves positioned in the school-university relationship and in the next section I take up another aspect of this relationship, turning to research that is also about power (to the extent that the resourcing of site-based teacher education reflects the “place” or power of teacher education programs to attract funding). Site-based educators recognise that site-based experience, which they believe to be important, is under-resourced. This indicates to teachers something about the lack of importance that (site-based) teacher education commands within the university.

**Resourcing**

It has been well-established that teachers’ work has intensified and that there is often limited time to effectively support a preservice teacher without adequate resourcing (Downes, 1996; Kerr, 1995; Simpson, Hastings & Hill, 2007). Relationship building (Hatton & Harman, 1997) and shared understanding (Kahan, 2002) are just two of the casualties in under-resourced programs. As established above, positive relationships are an essential part of effective site-based programs and, according to Hatton and Harman (1997) stress and negative feelings such as guilt, occur when teachers are unable to support a preservice teacher at a level that offers genuine potential for growth. In order to develop shared understandings, teachers need time to meet with university staff and preservice teachers to clarify concerns and ongoing issues (Hobson et al., 2009). Kahan
(2002) suggested that effective professional relationships are reflected in participants’ clear and complementary sense of their roles and functions and that this requires a strong commitment of time. Similarly, increased contact between school-based and university staff brings ‘increased opportunities for communication, for eliminating overlap and ambiguity, for counteracting ambivalence and for diluting unresolved issues of power’ (Smedley, 2001, p. 195).

Productive partnerships require time and workload allocations in already intensified working environments (Teitel, 1998; Wilson, 2006). However, the silence in the literature in relation to teachers receiving workload allowances/allocations for supporting preservice teachers would indicate that it occurs infrequently, if at all. When teachers are feeling exhausted, stressed and vulnerable, they need even more support from university staff (Bullough & Draper, 2004a). Further, according to Mander (1997) and Duquette (1998) it is the responsibility of the university to be visible and supportive when such difficulties arise. However, research by Gibbs and Montoya (1994) indicated that while university supervisors may potentially offer support to teachers, typically they are not provided with sufficient time to establish professional relationships or demonstrate that the contribution of the teacher is valued, an issue also raised more recently by Wilson (2006).

In England in the 1990s, a change in government policy resulted in a significant component of preservice teacher education being undertaken in schools (Whitty, 1994). Bennett, Jones and Maude (1994) argued such a model required a greater role for universities in terms of professional development opportunities for teachers, collaborative planning and the development of shared understandings of learning to be a teacher; that it should not be allowed to become teacher training “on the cheap”. As site-based teacher educators feel guilty when they cannot provide optimal levels of support to preservice colleagues, they need time and opportunity for open discussion. Kerr (1995) declared that teachers could only offer a ‘technicist’ notion rather than reflective model if they were not provided with time to provide effective support to the preservice teacher in their classroom. Teachers also needed time to engage in critical reflection themselves in the context of a collaborative and supportive framework (Frost, 1993, p.142). Hawkey’s (1998) research indicated that consultative supervision is a specific technique that could be employed when dealing with preservice teachers, as it is a possible means of addressing the emotional defences, anxiety and pressures that occur...
in mentoring situations – but teachers need to be resourced (time and money) to enable them to access such professional learning.

Up to this point, this chapter has addressed the complex array of research about site-based teacher educators and university staff in preservice teacher education in relation to emotion, power and relationships. Clearly, site-based teacher education is a site where emotions can be stretched to breaking point. Where power does not reside evenly with participants, power and emotion intertwine to significantly impact on teacher identities.

But what work has not yet been done? What are the silences – and what might be the next priority areas for research in terms of emotional discourse and discourse on emotions?

**SILENCES IN THE LITERATURE**

This final section of the literature review looks at a cross section of literature on teacher education that purports to address issues related to relationships, dissonance, collaboration and teacher workload but that fails to mention in many cases emotions and/or site-based teacher educators. In 1998, Sachs and Blackmore noted that the boundary between personal and professional lives of educational leaders is blurred and there is a great silence in the literature about the emotional dimension of working lives (p. 269). A decade later it appears that this is still the case. Ferrier-Kerr’s (2003) paper reported the outcomes of a study on the importance of collaborative relationships in preservice teacher education but did not mention emotions or affect explicitly. The only indication of emotion was a reference to the “underside” of collaboration when citing another author’s work and noting that ‘inherent in collaboration are different perspectives and beliefs which may lead to dissonance’ (p. 6). It is almost as if emotions would not be a significant issue in a study focusing on relationships and collaboration. In a 2005 publication, Orland-Barak suggested that the emotional and moral characteristics of mentoring had not, to date, been identified in the literature. She is not the only researcher to say this.

There appears to be a significant under-representation in the literature, in terms of attention to the emotional experiences of site-based teacher educators, given the important role these teachers hold in preservice teacher education. In 1998, Hargreaves
attempting to understand what shapes the emotional lives of teachers, failed to mention issues such as preservice teacher education as another aspect of a teacher’s working life (1998a). Murray-Harvey, Silins and Saebel undertook a cross-cultural investigation of preservice teacher concerns, which was published in 1999. They indicated that to maximise the benefits of site-based placements for academics and preservice teachers, program managers must address the needs of preservice teachers. However, they made no mention of *site-based teacher educators’ needs* and/or concerns (1999). Stanulis and Russell’s (2000) research mentioned briefly that mentors often engaged in ‘painful disclosures’ when they were learning about themselves as mentors. However, the authors did not explore this as an issue even though their study focused on trust and communication. Interestingly, the literature is also replete with articles describing incidents that involve difficult emotional experiences. Nevertheless, most remain uncontested and under-discussed (Stanulis & Russell, 2000). This would appear to be another type of “silencing” of emotions.

It is worth noting that the significant literature review on emotions in teaching undertaken by Sutton and Wheatley in 2003 failed to note or recognise the silence about emotions in literature related to the work of site-based teacher educators. Further, when addressing the issue of learning to teach they failed to address the role of these teacher educators. Similarly, Hawkey’s (1997) literature review failed to mention emotions even though the review had a major focus on relationships and interpersonal issues in site-based teacher education. What was particularly noticeable in these two studies, too, was the absence of the university in site-based teacher education. Sinclair, Dowson, and Thistleton-Martin’s (2006) study explored site-based teacher educators’ reasons for agreeing (or choosing not) to undertake the task of supporting preservice teachers. There is no mention in the findings of issues related to problematic preservice teachers and/or difficult emotional experiences associated with these events. This could indicate either a silence on the part of teachers or a silence on the part of the researchers. Either case is a concern.

Wideen, Mayer-Smith, and Moon (1998) noted that site-based teacher educators are frequently missing in research related to teacher preparation while Bradbury and Koballa have recently (2008) noted the silence in the literature specifically in relation to power relations in site-based teacher education. As mentioned previously, teachers often request feedback on their professional contribution to the site-based programs.
However, what is also missing in the published literature is evidence that university staff ever ask site-based teacher educators to provide feedback to university staff with respect to the quality or otherwise of the site-based component of their programs – the planning, implementation, resourcing and evaluation from teachers’ perspectives. Does this failure indicate that university staff do not value the contributions teachers could make to the evaluation of their programs or a lack of concern for the actual quality of work being undertaken by preservice teachers in their placement? Or is it an indication that evaluative procedures are not so robust that they require input from all participants?

Difficult emotions have received little attention even though researchers such as Montgomery and Rupp (2005) suggest that uncovering and understanding negative emotions related to external stressors will lead to a higher degree of teacher satisfaction and increased teacher retention. It could be argued that the silencing of emotions has constructed a situation where researchers are unable as much as unwilling to tackle them because teachers and researchers consider that emotions such as shame and anxiety, in this case, associated with a difficult preservice teacher are culturally inappropriate to discuss or disclose. Consequently, teachers and researchers together fail to communicate to a wider audience the “genuinely felt” emotions that are produced in the context of student teacher failure or resistance: ‘emotional experience is notoriously difficult to investigate ... [and] ... emotional experience is hard to articulate’ (Hargreaves, 2005, p. 968). How we break down such barriers is another issue, but recognising that challenges and associated emotion displays are not inherently negative, is a start.

CONCLUSION

My aim in this extensive review of the literature on emotion research in preservice teacher education is to demonstrate that it is highly complex, bound to an array of different theoretical frameworks across numerous discipline fields. This review endeavoured to capture the most relevant of those nuances, as they concern education and the diversity of coverage it has received over the past thirty years. Without undertaking a full historical exposition I have given the reader a sense of the “silencing” of emotions as a field of research in relation to the binary constructs of irrational/rational, feminine/masculine.
While I have grouped the research into broad categories as systematically as possible, I have also attempted to synthesise and critique it to identify themes but importantly foreground the silences, gaps and inconsistencies. Consequently, the research project reported here responds to some of the gaps in relation to emotions and the construction of teacher subjectivities in preservice teacher education in Australian universities and schools. I anticipate that exploring the emotional episodes of teachers working with preservice teachers who experienced difficulties will provide some understanding of the importance of discursive frames and power/knowledge in the construction of these teachers’ subjective positions.

In the chapter that follows I will describe my choice of research methods, from my initial conception of the project, right through the reflexive turn and outlining the dilemmas that posed. The reflexive turn resulted from the interviews and my “readings” of the transcripts, which consequently led me back to the literature in the field of emotion and teacher education research. Doing research often involves changes; rarely is it seamless, but as indicated by the interconnections between the research covered in this literature review, the process is always recursive and overlapping, with continuities, and discontinuities, uncertainties and silences, that we seek to explore, understand and use in the always unfinished work of teacher education.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

“If you don’t mind going places without a map, follow me” but we’re taking very small steps. (Behar 1996, p. 33)

OUTLINE

This chapter outlines the intersecting stages of a research project that was designed to capture and make sense of the narratives of site based teacher educators supporting preservice teachers on their practice teaching placements. In this instance, the teachers who agreed to be participants in this study had supported preservice teachers whose placements in schools were deemed by the teachers to be problematic.

The first section follows what could be argued is a more traditional approach to a qualitative study. I outline my initial conceptual framework. I explain in detail my theoretical framework, choice of participants, data gathering and analysis techniques. I then use two case studies to clarify the manner in which the research evolved and to illustrate my need to employ a different approach and consequently a different analytic lens, to allow the research to capture the multi-layered nature of the experiences of these teachers. It will become clear to the reader that this was a particularly reflexive process that enabled me to successfully interpret in more complex ways, the narratives of the teachers and hence enhance the richness of the meaning making.

INTRODUCTION

The task of conceiving, delineating and conducting a research project is never easy. For doctoral students it is probably even more complex as they attempt to meet the needs of the research project, as well as those of the academy. I was conscious from the outset that the research should achieve interpretive richness to generate qualitatively new understandings of the situation in which my participants found themselves. I hoped the project could challenge some of the assumptions that I had about initial teacher education and specifically address some fundamental questions in relation to teachers’ experiences with problematic preservice teachers. Examining emotional experiences is a risky endeavour because human emotions are displayed in behaviour that can be seen, heard, smelt, felt and they are in the mind and heart, but are also and always in the body.
Denzin (1984) conceded that experiencing emotion was a social, interactional, linguistic and physiological process but he argued that research must go beyond these domains and study emotions from within, as a ‘lived, interactional process that has the self of the person’ as central (p. 32) – ‘[e]motions are embodied experiences’ (p. 108). As outlined in the first chapter, this study evolved from my attempt to make sense, within a policy framework, of an intensely emotional episode that I experienced myself as a result of a particular preservice teacher’s unsuccessful school-based professional experience program. This incident had such an emotional impact on my sense of control and safety that I abandoned my original PhD topic and decided to build on the work related to school-based teacher educators’ stories, which I had undertaken earlier (Hastings, 1999). That event was not typical of site-based programs, but I suspect that my “emotional” response was typical of that experienced by many site-based teacher educators when a preservice teacher is openly defiant, argues with them in public, or questions their professional competence. The emotion is felt as a rapidly beating heart, sweaty armpits, a churning stomach. It is difficult for anyone but the individual to understand wholly or feel the physiological manifestations of such interactions (Denzin, 1984). Understanding the nature and effect of an emotional response to the work of supervising a failing preservice teacher is a matter of understanding the teacher as a person who is experiencing herself differently from the teacher who is usually positioned as in control and in charge of her professional work.

It seemed obvious to me that a qualitative approach would be the most suitable for this study, as it afforded me the opportunity to enter the field with some understanding of the situation while not needing to be constrained by any predetermined categories of analysis. It also offered the degree of flexibility that I felt would be needed - to be able to move backwards and forwards from the data to the field, and to recognise that my thinking may well change and that I could ‘feel my way’. Ultimately, the defining factor for most aspects of the study was determined by my intention to capture the perceptions of site-based teacher educators.

**DESIGN**

This study is a case study of a contemporary phenomenon taking place in the real life complexity of its social context - preservice teacher education episodes where the preservice teacher struggles. It is mostly argued in the academy that case study work is
seldom generalisable; in this situation I am not looking for, nor interested in
generalisability. My inquiry is focused on an under-explored area of research in teacher
education which I believe is both empirically and pragmatically important for sustaining
quality preservice teacher education programs in schools and early childhood services. I
contend that teacher educators can learn much from asking for and listening to the
stories of teachers (Clandinin et al., 2009), so I chose to undertake the study as a
narrative project, where the data gathered was a product of the interaction between the
interviewer and interviewee and other contexts. It was my hope that the interview
process would be a productive experience for both myself and the teacher participants.
Narratives are important sense-making devices such that individuals often use them to
explore problems that concern them and their attempts to make sense of such concerns
(Gee, 1999, p. 134). According to Wortham (2001) narratives affect the lives of the
teller such that by telling, the narrator can bring to life the type of self they describe.

The use of narratives is well supported in the research literature (Kelchtermans, 2005).
Proponents assert that narratives allow them to study and reveal how individuals
experience their world by giving researchers access to their identities, as well as their
culture and social world (Lieblich, et al., 1998; Oliver, 1998). Schools are complex
social and discursive sites and teachers within and outside of them operate from a
number of subject positions (Lye, 1997). Teachers participate in and produce a variety
of discourses, such that talking through beliefs, ideas or ideologies with others has the
potential to increase self-understanding (Alsup, 2005) as well as make clear teachers’
intentions and beliefs (Fenstermacher, 1997). Nias (1989b) suggested that it is teachers’
persistent self-referentialism in their narratives that makes it possible to construct a
generalised picture of their experience, such that she found that aspects of teachers’
selves repeatedly emerge as central to their experience, even though each self is
different (Clandinin et al., 2009).

In a manner typical of narrative discourse inquiry, I undertook a close listening to the
 tapes and reading of transcripts of the interviews. This required me to listen dialogically
to three voices – those of the participants, the “voice” in unison with the theoretical
framework and to my own voice, as I reflexively monitored the interpretation (Bakhtin,
1981). In this instance, the iterative process occurred between the researcher/reader, the
participant’s narrative and its meanings (Lieblich et al., 1998). Even then, the account I
have produced can never be a transparent truth, but rather will always be a story
constructed by me in an interpretation of data that is always personal, partial and dynamic (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003).

When deciding what frameworks should guide the conduct of this project, I was influenced by my own epistemologies such that my theory of knowledge guided decisions about how the teachers’ experiences could be studied (Groenewald, 2004). In the first chapter I outlined the critical incident that was a major impetus for embarking on this particular study for my PhD. That particular incident followed numerous occasions when I felt the need to support colleagues in schools who were, in turn, supporting teacher education students from my own institution who had experienced difficulties on placement.

I began with the intention of employing a “qualitative feminist framework” in a liberal humanist sense (Tong, 2000). Using a feminist framework meant that I would ‘look at the world from a woman’s perspective, honouring the common experiences and histories of women in society’ (Bierema & Cseh, 2003, p. 8) using lenses that attend to the ‘structural inequalities that frame the lives of women’ (p. 8) and I wanted to honour the authentic voices of site-based teacher educators – a group that I have argued in Chapter 2 is silenced in the literature on teacher education. I wanted to hear the stories of their lived experiences. As I also indicated in the previous chapter, it is the voices of academics and preservice teachers that are represented in the literature (Bloomfield, 2004; Goldenberg & Waddell, 1990; Ortlipp, 2003). I felt teachers’ stories needed to be told too (Siebert et al., 2006). ‘The project of freeing the voice [of the teachers] and the politics of emancipation which this carries’ has been an important characteristic of research in teacher education (MacLure, 2003, p. 100) and feminist research more generally. Further, I felt that collecting teachers’ stories and retelling them enabled me to develop my understandings about the phenomena as well as breaking through what I perceived was a “culture of silence” (Freire, 2000) in relation to this issue. Accordingly, my research focussed on the site-based teachers’ recollections of incidences with preservice teachers who experienced difficulties on their placement.

Before I commenced this study I was aware to some degree of the complex emotional focus at play in the experiences encountered by these teachers – from my own personal experience as well as from conversations I had in my role as Director of Professional Experience. Researching emotions can provide a challenge to traditional forms of
inquiry as they ‘can be quick to occur and quick to change’ (Schutz & DeCuir, 2002, p. 125). Clearly it was not possible to engage in observations of teachers working with preservice teachers to gather the kind of data suitable for this project, predominantly because the focus of the research could not be “predicted” to occur in any context. I could not know beforehand which teachers would be working with an “unsuccessful” preservice teacher, to be there to observe the moment(s). I needed to capture the teachers’ perceptions, their memories and particularly their feelings, as they relived and recreated those emotionally-laden events through narrative reconstructions after they had occurred. I wanted to describe the situations - to make public the emotional dimension of those events. Accordingly, I chose to undertake one to one interviews to collect the material for the research.

The choice of theoretical framework for interpreting and analysing the data thus obtained was less obvious to me, given the plethora of possibilities available. Ultimately, I settled on a phenomenological approach, as phenomenology can encompass a descriptive study of people’s experience from their perspective (Titchen & Hobson, 2005). It enables a study of practical know-how using everyday language as the key to understanding the meanings, practices and social contexts where I and my participants share background experiences. Phenomenology is most appropriate for studying complex phenomena that are confined by temporal and physical boundaries, and about which little is known with certainty (Lancy, 1993). According to Denscombe (2003), ‘phenomenology has an affinity with humanistic perspectives on research that are keen to afford normal people and their everyday reasoning higher status in research’ (p. 99). These two aspects resonated with my need and desire to understand this phenomenon, especially in the preservice component of teacher education, in order to improve my own professional knowledge and that of teacher educators more generally.

Key concepts of a phenomenological approach are embedded in individual experiences. Embodiment - that phenomena are experienced through the body – makes such an approach particularly useful when exploring the emotional aspects of teachers’ lives (Jasper, 1994, p. 310). It is also associated with research that places special emphasis on individual views and personal experiences that are known through the senses – seen, heard, touched, smelt and tasted (Denscombe, 2003). A phenomenological approach recognised my role in ‘using my knowledge, sensors, emotions, intuitions, imaginations to understand the nuances, subtleties and meanings embedded in texts’ (Titchen &
Hobson, 2005, p. 126). Further, an appealing aspect of this approach was the possibility of accommodating multiple realities and the acceptance of more than one “right” explanation. I was particularly interested in the individual stories of the teachers but also interested in teasing out features that appear to be consistent across the teachers’ experiences, if any existed. What I hoped to achieve was not a single “truth” - something “generalisable” - but rather a sense of what was happening for these teachers and writing it in such a way that it was recognisable to others. Recognisability might then lead to questioning of institutional practices and opening public discussion. With a strong sense of what I hoped to achieve, I set about the task of finding teachers willing to participate in this narrative event.

PARTICIPANTS
As indicated previously, this study emerged from my own experience with a student who failed the school-based component of his teacher education program. Following this critical incident in my own workplace, I designed the study to engage the support of colleagues in universities throughout the east coast of Australia. I have, in my capacity as a Director of Professional Experience for many years, built up a collaborative network of colleagues in similar positions in other universities. I asked my colleagues to distribute invitations to school-based teacher educators associated with their own university programs, who had recently been involved with preservice teachers who had experienced difficulty on the practicum. Using colleagues to make the connection enabled me to adopt a stance independent of my own context. Further, I hoped that my “distance” from the host university would enhance the sense of “voluntarism” among my research participants. This might not have been the case had I approached teachers directly or if I had invited teachers working with preservice teachers from my own university to participate.

The selection of participants in my study relied on my colleagues in other institutions to take a lead role as potential gatekeepers. Clearly I had to trust the integrity of my peers to neither deliberately choose participants whose stories they wanted me to hear or inadvertently not include others. I had outlined the intent of my study to my colleagues, but chose not to give any other guidance on who they should or should not choose. Certainly, I was mindful that people who volunteered to participate may well have had some form of a hidden agenda and so chose the opportunity to be involved in my
research for just that reason. However, the fact that they needed to tell their story was important so I was ready to listen. While each participant was asked to recall the “recent” experience with the unsuccessful student, I was conscious that their stories, however “fresh”, would be a reconstruction and that the purpose and audience would affect the story told. Further, ‘it is impossible to say what is genuine or permanent in people’s memories … what people remember and forget may tell something about them as individual persons’ (Uitto & Estola, 2009, p. 519). I was well aware that the teachers’ accounts may not be completely transparent but there is a ‘relationship between people’s ambiguous representations and their experiences’ (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000, p. 3). According to Watson (2006), the story as told is a ‘powerful metaphor for a life’ (p. 511) such that the inventiveness of the story tells much about how the individual interprets the events and choices in their life.

Each university colleague was sent 10 “information packs” to distribute to possible participants. Each pack contained invitations with information that outlined my intended project and proformas for the individual teacher to provide contact details. The acceptance form required the potential participants to provide specific details such as school name and address, as well as modes of preferred contact, including emails, phone numbers and canvassed the most convenient times to contact. I included a stamped envelope addressed to me, in which volunteers could return their acceptance if they wished to participate.

Twenty three teachers from seven different universities across eastern Australia initially indicated that they were willing to participate. Another teacher heard about the research via her school’s network and requested to be included in the program. Given her particular proactive stance, I was keen to include her in the group, even though she had not been approached by her university. Also, at that time I was unsure if I would get sufficient volunteers to have a viable project. It was heartening to achieve such a positive response given the sensitive nature of the research. I contacted all twenty three teachers in order to develop an interview schedule. Consequently I settled on fifteen teachers from six different universities. The final selection of participants was based on a combination of each volunteer’s response to my follow-up contact. Those conversations involved negotiating a final schedule of possible interview times, locations and an attempt to manage the size of the project – both numerically and geographically. I was unable to visit the group of teachers associated with one
university because of time constraints. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), this number is sufficient to achieve “saturation”, enabling me to achieve a sense of intimate familiarity with the field of study (Charmaz, 2000). Of the fifteen participants, twelve were female and seven taught in primary schools. Determination of the final fifteen participants did not involve any consideration of balancing the number of participants based on sector (primary or secondary) gender, age, or experience as teacher and/or school-based teacher educator. I did attempt to organise an interview with a teacher in the early childcare sector, but that proved impossible. Given the personal and sensitive focus of the research, I only interviewed teachers who responded to the follow-up email that I sent after receiving their contact details. I did not want to chase people or appear desperate so that they felt obliged to assist me. Staff from universities who had distributed the information packages were not informed about the teachers who subsequently contacted me. Their role was one of identification of potential participants.

It is worth noting at this point that eleven of the seventeen preservice teachers were post-graduates, ten were mature-aged (not recent school leavers or university graduates) and as indicated above, half were male - which of course, does not reflect the typical gender balance of students enrolled in preservice teacher education programs. Interestingly, also, was the fact that only four of the failing students who formed the background to the study, were what might be labelled as “traditional” (enrolling straight from school into an undergraduate degree or straight from an undergraduate degree into a post-graduate initial teacher education program). The issue of the traditional preservice teacher will be further explored later in this thesis. The remainder of the preservice teachers were typically career-changing or re-accrediting older individuals – “non-traditional” preservice teachers (Hastings, 2009).

To provide some contextual background to the study, it is useful for the reader to have some sense of the participants in this study. Most, were experienced teachers and experienced site-based teacher educators (Emma, Sylvia, Lyndall, Renee, Natalie, Sarah, Therese, Annette, Elizabeth, Larry and Steve). Only Emily and Loretta were young and relatively inexperienced teachers with limited experience as site-based

---

22 One could assume that male teachers may be less likely to want to talk about the emotional aspects of an unsuccessful placement than female teachers, thus there was a significantly lower acceptance rate for males, reflecting the dominant characterisation of males as less likely to talk about their emotions generally.

23 Two of the teachers had recently had two failing preservice teachers, which is why there are more preservice teachers named later than these teachers.
teacher educators, while Caleb and Alison, though in their mid-twenties, had supported a number of preservice teachers prior to working with situation being explored here\(^\text{24}\).

I conducted all the interviews in a six week period, so that I had sufficient time for reflection between interviews but kept them close enough in time, so that there was a degree of connectedness. Each participant chose the location of the interview so that they would feel as comfortable as possible. Typically it was undertaken in their workplace and almost always they were able to negotiate a quiet location on the premises at a time that suited not only themselves, but their colleagues as well.

**THE INTERVIEW**

Interviews are appropriate for research which explores emotions, experiences and feelings (Denscombe, 2003) and are appropriate for research informed by phenomenological perspectives. While they “fit”, it is well recognised that they are not unproblematic. Interviews are not neutral tools for data gathering but an active interaction between researcher and researched, which results in a contextually-based outcome (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 645). I was not a neutral participant and my reasons for engaging in the research were significantly related to my own personal circumstances and those of my colleagues within the school and university sector (Scheurich, 1997). I needed always to be mindful that I filtered each interview experience through my own set of ‘unique autobiographical experiences’ as well as at the analysis phase (de Marrais & Tisdale, 2002, p. 117).

The interviews for this project could have been undertaken in a way in which I sat and dispassionately listened to the stories of the participants, but they were not. I wanted our interaction to be a genuine sharing opportunity between two colleagues who had an interest in a common issue. Given the sensitive nature of the interview, I felt it essential that I establish some degree of rapport as soon as possible with participants and I was particularly interested in attempting to keep it as a ‘conversational’ interview with a genuine exchange of information that allowed meanings to emerge (MacLure, 2003; Undeheim, 2006). This was because I was aware that the context of the interview ‘has an impact on how and when particular emotions are expressed or controlled’ (Uitto & Estola, 2009, p. 518). I was fully aware that by asking these teachers to recall events

\(^{24}\) See Appendix for detailed overview of the participants
that roused emotions I was asking them to engage in another emotional event, as reflection is not solely a cognitive process but ‘is an emotional experience in itself’ (Sparrow, 2009, p. 568). Within a feminist framework, the role of the researcher is less powerful when the researcher merely sits and listens, giving nothing of herself, and yet expecting so much from the participants. Williams (1998) asserted that such a stance not only contravenes the basic principles of feminist knowledge creation, but also leads to poor research by not acknowledging how good communications with respondents can enhance the depth and richness of the feelings they are prepared to reveal (p. 130). Writers, such as Lather (1991) and Reinharz (1992) also encourage research to aim for non-hierarchical relationships within the interview.

Issues of anonymity and confidentiality were discussed at the outset of each interview. As is common practice, each participant was given the opportunity to choose a pseudonym in an attempt to provide anonymity. One teacher chose not to be anonymous and asked that her name be used, as she felt that it was her story, that she wanted it to be told and she did not feel the need to remain anonymous. From the very beginning of the data gathering process, I wanted to make clear to the participants my reasons for engaging in this research. I had explained the process of the research to the participants during the initial negotiations about the time and place of the interviews and I revisited those issues prior to commencing the interview.

Although I had phone contact with the teachers in order to organise the interviews, I had not met any of them prior to the interview. They were “strangers to me” even though I (mistakenly) felt at the time that their stories would be familiar to me. In an attempt to assist each participant to feel comfortable in the conversation, I outlined in greater detail the events which led to this particular study. I also stressed it was more than research for my degree. I hoped the findings would assist me to improve the quality of my support to site-based teacher educators in my role as Director of Professional Experience. As a means of connecting with the participants, I exposed my own “wounds” in relation to personal/professional experiences associated with preservice teachers, as I hoped this would demonstrate an understanding of the emotional costs associated with the task of mentoring preservice teachers who experienced difficulties on their school placement. My personal tale as an academic working with such preservice teachers was one of anxiety, fear and frustration.
Many of the participants expressed genuine surprise that I wanted to hear their stories. The fact that I had chosen to make them the focus of my study, and that I was genuinely interested appeared to facilitate the “connection” with the teachers. I believe that investing some of my own personal identity assisted me to establish a positive relationship with the participants (MacLure, 1993; Oakley, 1990). Kincheloe (1991) asserted it is essential for the researcher to lay open to the participant their own experiences – ‘to reveal their allegiances, to admit their solidarities, their value structures and the ways such orientations affect their inquiries’ (p. 38). I was also aware that I was potentially causing harm in asking participants to relive experiences that were emotionally difficult and I attempted to limit the emotional risks as much as possible.

At times I felt quite close, emotionally, to the people I was interviewing. The stories they recounted resonated with my own experiences, so I was sensitive but not overwhelmed or emotionally “entangled” (de Marrais & Tisdale, 2002). According to de Marrais and Tisdale (2002) it is quite common for researchers to feel a strong bond with participants, particularly when the researcher has had a similar experience in her own life. There is the potential to acquire understanding through empathy (Walker, 1985) and I made no attempt to distance myself from my participants in terms of my experiences and they were able to get a sense of me personally as a (middle-aged) Anglo woman, working as a university academic and PhD student, as well as my experience as a site-based teacher educator. I acknowledge that such closeness is not standard interview practice and may be criticised for lack of objectivity or reliability in some sections of the academy, but I argue the necessity and value of such closeness because of the possibility that reliving these difficult emotional experiences could have been quite painful for the teachers.

Phenomenology is concerned with the lived experiences of participants but argues that the researcher cannot be detached from her own subjectivities and she should not pretend to be so as she engages with the study. The acknowledgement of subjectivity is essential for success with this approach and is reflected in the techniques used to access and interpret the data. As Williams (1998, p. 131) explains, ‘reflexively acknowledging the role of subjectivity … contributes towards making the relationship between the researcher and researched more transparent and thereby to the feminist notion of strong objectivity’. There tends to be consensus amongst feminist researchers that any research findings, which are alleged to be universally applicable or generalisable to other groups
in other contexts because they are untainted by researcher’s perceptions, are misrepresented (Scherif, 1987). However, rejecting notions of objective truth must not be confused with rejecting experience, materiality or the body, *per se* (Hoskins, 2005). Attending to the issue of subjectivity was particularly crucial to me, given the close relationship of my own personal experiences to the research focus. As a researcher with personal knowledge of the situation in which these teachers found themselves, I was anticipating that I would be able to tap into those parts of the teachers’ stories that often go unnoticed or are not talked about, and which often appear transparent or invisible to the teachers (Titchen & Hobson, 2005).

According to Undeheim ‘a good researcher participates in the reflection and leads [the participants] further when they feel they do not have more to say’ (2006, p. 35). Often sensitive issues require some degree of coaxing (Denscombe, 2003) and I felt that the rapport that I had been able to establish with the teachers, who appeared quite supportive, gave me “permission” to overtly encourage them to explore their feelings. However, it would be remiss not to admit that, at times, I did feel guilty when I urged some participants to “dredge up” some unpleasant memories, inflicting almost “violence” on them – the telling of the story evoked further emotions in the teller (Uitto & Estola, 2009). There were times when I felt terrible – those situations where the interview elicited tears as teachers remembered the stressful situation. But I clearly did not feel bad enough to stop, as I pushed on hoping to capture the essence of their feelings. Perhaps, on reflection, I was allowing my (selfish) need to capture those moments to override my desire not to do harm.

Throughout the interview I also maintained connections with the participants by sharing anonymously other teacher’s recounts as a means of support and to let them know that there were other teachers who had similar experiences. Sharing the stories also addressed a need for reflexivity (Hand, 2003). There were times in the interview process when I felt the need to lead the interview process, not in a compromising manner, but rather in a process of re-iterating teachers’ comments for clarification purposes, as well as to reassure the speaker that I had clearly understood their intended meaning. Being a ‘knowable stranger’ (Reinharz, 1992) enabled me to connect with the participants as I understood what they were saying, having experienced similar emotions as a teacher and a university supervisor, in a way that a researcher more distant from such experiences possibly could not. Some researchers, for example Denscombe (2003),
might argue that the interviewer should suspend personal values and avoid revealing emotions through facial expressions or gestures. If I had adopted such a stance I felt that I would have found it difficult to maintain connections with my participants. I had to ‘acknowledge the psychological and emotional dynamics of the interview as they shape both the interview text and its analysis’ (MacLure, 2003, p. 87). While some might argue that the interview is there merely to gather data for a research project, I would assert that while not necessarily being therapeutic, the opportunity for ‘storying’ in such emotional situations may be cathartic or empowering and has the capacity to interrupt a participant’s sense of isolation and assist them to make sense of their own experience (Weiss, 1994; Zembylas, 2003a).

The limited amount of published literature related to the issue of teachers’ perceptions of the emotional experiences associated with a difficult preservice teacher provided some fundamental areas of interest for the interview (Bullough & Draper, 2004b; Carver & Katz, 2004; Lukabyo, 1986; Musanti, 2002). However, there were a number of other issues I hoped to consider in the interviews – issues related to control and power, support, coping strategies and emotional labour seemed to be pertinent to this study, but did not limit the interview process (Hochschild, 1979, 1990). I chose almost a grand tour question as the starting point to enable the teachers the opportunity to simply tell their story, while I adopted a pose of listener (Barbour & Schostak, 2005). Such a stance enabled me to reflect on their words and hopefully enhance the sense of conversation while reducing any presumed power imbalance. The semi-structured guide enabled me to start with a clear but short list of issues that I hoped to be able to touch on, but also allowed flexibility in terms of how I would approach the second part of the interview, which typically involved more interaction between myself and the teacher. Such was my interest in their stories, it was sometimes difficult to listen carefully while remembering to jot down notes on points to stimulate elaborations later in the interview. The semi-structured nature of the interview also allowed the participants to raise any issues that they felt were important or elaborate on points of interest (Denscombe, 2003). As I progressed through the list of participants to be interviewed, a number of new issues emerged which I included in the questions for later interviews.

I chose to tape-record all the interviews, unaware at the time that I would rely so heavily on the transcriptions. It would not have been possible to undertake any form of discourse analysis without the rich text that the tapes and subsequent transcriptions
provided. The transcription of the tapes undoubtedly brought me closer to the data, and as I transcribed each interview in turn I was able to readily make connections to material from previous interviews. Regardless of how accurately I transcribed the tapes, all transcription is a translation and ‘there is no simple and transparent way in which to render speech into writing’ (Watson, 2006, p. 513). As my unarticulated theoretical knowledge grew through the research process (Davies, 1989) I was able to hear different stories on the numerous occasions that I revisited the transcripts. While the participants did not appear to see the tape recorder as an intrusion, in one particular interview, as discussed later in this chapter, the teacher at times would turn away from me and away from the recorder. At the time I interpreted this response as a simple lack of understanding of the need to face the microphone. I certainly did not imagine that it might have been a negative reaction to the taping processes.

I interviewed each participant once and each interview took between one and a half to two hours. I transcribed every interview verbatim, keeping every pause, laugh, groan, ah or um, intact. Where applicable, I embedded “editor’s” comments in bold italics in relation to facial expression that I had commented on in my field notes or remembered from the actual interview. I returned each transcript to the participants to ensure that it was a correct record – that I had not misheard anything. I also asked if there were any other issues that they wished to raise, that they may have thought about after the interview concluded. Feedback received was only related to the structure of the narratives, which were often disjointed, as the teachers jumped from one incident to the next, then back again. Many narratives that attempt to make deep sense of very real concerns are not logically consistent because the speaker is focussing on the theme of their utterance not the structure or flow (Gee, 1999). Typically, the teachers expressed a mixture of amusement and slight embarrassment at the “flow” of the text, but nobody made any additional comments at that point.

MAKING MEANING

In relation to data, interpretation does not commence with the transcription. Prior to the interview I had already made decisions about what I would ask of whom. There is always some level of interpretation prior to transcribing that occurs during the interaction with the participants, and, as noted earlier, the participants also make interpretations ‘in relation to relevant aspects of life and in connection with the
Accordingly any empirical material “collected” is always a partial and a provisional construction. The teacher’s stories and subsequent transcriptions are reconstructions of events, sometimes up to six months after the event. So with the possibility of partiality, there must also be a recognition that the reconstruction may not adequately describe the experience, which is ‘always more immediate, more enigmatic, more complex, more ambiguous than any description can do justice to’ (van Manen, 1997, p. 54). The narratives are a consequence of the interaction between the participant’s identities, my researcher identity and the power relations inherent in such a situation. By analysing the stories, we can gain some sense of how each of us actively constructed our professional identities ‘in an ongoing, effortful and dynamic process’ (Watson, 2006, p. 512) and while there may be limitations to such analysis, this ‘does not cancel meaning, does not remove the possibility of learning something new, of gaining insight’ (MacLure, 2003, p. 83).

To undertake preliminary analysis of the transcripts, paying attention to the language use of the participants and given the number of the participants and the length of each interview, I chose to use nVivo25 as a means of keeping track of the emerging themes. In previous research (Hastings, 1999) I had used multiple coloured highlighter pens to manually illuminate the themes as they emerged in sections of transcriptions. I remembered how difficult it was to scour the hundreds of pages of transcripts to find sections of text in a particular colour, from multiple transcripts, that revealed examples of each of my themes. nVivo allowed me to label sections of text that could later be more readily retrieved when necessary, while still allowing me to retain connectedness to the data after the transcription phase. I did not use nVivo as a tool for coding/identification of particular words; only for labelling and retrieval purposes.

Initially, I used a simple qualitative iterative approach to interrogate the data for major themes. Patterns emerged from the data that enabled me to ‘[render] intelligible those repetitions in social life which may be invisible or perceived in purely isolated and personal terms by the individual’ (Frye, 1990, p. 135). School-based teacher educators recalled their experiences with problematic preservice teachers and the feelings

---

25 nVivo is computer-based software that is designed to assist qualitative researchers organise and analyse large quantities of non-numerical, unstructured data. It was developed by QSR. See Appendix for examples of the analysis.
associated with this work. Clearly, this analysis can only claim to be a ‘true’ representation of their world view in that time and space. With that in mind I turned my attention to the words, expressions and facial gestures that presented themselves in the interview and in the reading of the transcripts. As often as possible, I undertook the initial reading of the transcript soon after completion of the interview. While reading I was then able to reflect upon the embodied emotions that were expressed in facial contortions and gesticulations. Tone of voice, pauses and the like, added richness to the data collected and I revisited these through the tapes. Needless to say, listening and transcribing were time-consuming, laborious processes. However, they allowed me to use quite fine-grained coding of different kinds of emotions: a range of “roles”, coping strategies, university involvement including strategies and sources of support. It was here that I noted the absence (not yet labelled in my head power/control) of the university and the presence of the discourses of schools and schooling. However, while I was aware that there were some deeper issues “happening” within the text I was unsure what they meant so I labelled them ‘ah ha’ moments – what MacLure (2003) called ‘lucky finds … that fascinate the researcher’ (p. 172) – or as Garratt (1998) called them ‘serendipitous moments’, that can potentially change ‘the entire complexion of the development of ideas in relation to the research’ (p. 219).

The literature tells us that schools are complex social sites and teachers within and outside them operate from a number of different subject positions (Lye, 1997, p. 1). They function and interact with others in the school in a number of different roles, for instance, as teacher, staff member, employee, colleague, friend, school-based teacher educator, and parent. My first phase of analysis, and the initial findings this produced, identified a range of emotions experienced by school-based teacher educators. The teachers described situations that resulted in feelings of anger, shame, hurt, fear, frustration, anxiety, and abandonment, to name but a few. The teachers’ narratives illustrated enormous variability in the types of emotions each experienced individually and across the group, in both similar and diverse situations. For example, some teachers described feelings of guilt when a preservice teacher failed to achieve satisfactory outcomes on the placement, while others expressed feelings of guilt only in relation to their pupils’ missed learning, as a result of the poor pedagogical practices of their preservice teacher. Some spoke about being somewhat detached in the manner in which they dealt with the failing student, while others described feeling physically ill at the prospect of having to tell the student that they were not going to pass the program. A
number described spending sleepless nights blaming themselves for the lack of success of their “charge”. Chapter 4 will provide the reader with a detailed interpretation of all the interviews. The following section attempts to make clear the need for a different theoretical framework for my study, which became evident as I became more aware of aspects of schools and school-university relationships that were also impacting on the teachers’ emotional experiences.

THE CASES
There are no simple or unambiguous rules associated with the interpretative phase, but the researcher’s intuition and ability to identify and highlight unanticipated issues are crucial. It was intuition that led me to the point where I needed to look even more reflexively at what I was doing. I have selected the following two cases to demonstrate some of the fundamental issues that were identified using a phenomenological approach and as a means of explaining to the reader what forced me to search for a different analytic tool that would enable me to provide a more comprehensive and deeper reading of the narratives. The interviews with two participants, Annette and Therese, were undertaken first and last respectively, so that by the time I commenced the analysis of Therese’s interview – even at a surface level – the research had progressed. As is often the case in any research project that adopts a reflexive stance, the study had taken on a new life part way through, and the juxtaposition of these two “extremities” of data collection may, I think, serve best to illustrate the change in direction. I had the good fortune to come to know at the time of undertaking my “readings”, rather than after it was completed, that there were more issues shaping my research than I originally realised (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003).

ANNETTE’S STORY

My First Reading
On the first reading of Annette’s story, it appeared familiar, known and understood to me – ‘in our everyday world … meaning is intersubjective, publicly available, linguistically constituted, and deeply familiar. … we understand in and through the experience of being involved … in events (Kerdeman, 1998, p. 246). Annette is an experienced classroom teacher, with significant experience in the role of school-based teacher educator. At the time of the interview she was working with a composite class
of Stage 2 and Stage 3\textsuperscript{26} children, all of whom had been assessed as having moderate to severe emotional and learning difficulty-impairment. The class was located in a special education unit in a large regional primary school. Annette had found out about my research project through a chance conversation with a colleague and contacted me with her request to be included as a participant. Given that my program was just commencing and I was unsure of the number of participants I would ultimately be able to attract, I can recall that I was extremely grateful for her offer and gladly accepted. In our preparatory conversations she indicated a preference for the interview to be held at the university in my office. I felt such a suggestion was encouraging, as it meant she was willing to make both professional and personal arrangements in order to attend the campus.

The following passages are my analysis of her story using the realist lens of a phenomenological framework. As I indicated previously, the interview was designed to get an overall feel for the emotional dimension of Annette’s experiences while working with a preservice teacher, as well as exploring specific issues related to her level of experience, sources of support and opportunities for input into the initial teacher education process. Clearly, that was what was evident on the first readings; the emotions she described and the information she provided in relation to interactions with the university, both prior to and during the placement, provided confirmation of what I might have anticipated before the interview.

I recall Annette arrived on time and appeared enthusiastic about the opportunity to participate. Having explained the project and my reasons for choosing the topic, we proceeded with the interview. Annette recounted in detail her recent experiences with her ‘mature aged’ preservice teacher, Susan\textsuperscript{27}. Annette recalled that she was initially enthusiastic about welcoming Susan into her classroom as she had shown initiative when coming for her pre-placement interview. However, as the program progressed, Annette became more and more concerned about the apparent lack of ability and initiative displayed by Susan. Annette remembered that Susan was unable to complete the most fundamental tasks, such as conducting a scripted reading lesson each day. Annette decided that Susan was incapable of managing the more difficult Stage 2

\textsuperscript{26} These “stages” represent the upper years of primary school education – so the pupils range in age from around 9-12 years of age.

\textsuperscript{27} Susan had worked with Annette two years prior to the interview.
students, so decided to limit her teaching opportunities to the Stage 3 students, who were in Annette’s estimation less problematic.

However, that decision did not lead to significant improvements in Susan’s demonstrated competence as a teacher, nor in her “engagement” in the placement. Annette reported experiencing frustration at the lack of initiative shown by Susan and a sense of increasing protectiveness of the students in relation to a regression in their learning and behaviour. She recalled suggesting a range of strategies for Susan to implement in relation to management, organisation and presentation.

Annette spoke repeatedly about Susan’s personal circumstances, which Susan used as a form of “crutch” – the word used by Annette – inferring an excuse for her inability to meet Annette’s expectations. Annette recalled that on many occasions Susan described her difficult personal situation from which she needed to be able to extricate herself. Annette did not outline the specifics to me but gave the impression that it was an unpleasant family arrangement. In order to achieve release from the family circumstance, Susan needed to gain employment at the end of the following year and this could only be achieved by getting “targeted graduate status” as a high-achieving graduate. Susan’s family circumstances prevented her from arriving at school early enough to prepare for the day, which was a further frustration for Annette as it impeded Susan’s capacity to commit her energies to the placement. Annette indicated that she expected Susan to manage her personal circumstances in order to complete a successful placement. Susan’s lack of preparedness, partly due to her late arrival each day, meant that Annette was regularly required to gather resources for Susan midway through her lessons – something that Annette clearly had not expected to do.

Annette had certain expectations of what Susan could, and possibly ‘should’ be capable of doing on the placement as a third year student. She knew from the printed material provided by the university that Susan was expected to contribute to the school in some particular area of strength. However, according to Annette, Susan was not able to identify any particular skill/initiative that she felt she could bring to the program. Annette indicated surprise that Susan appeared to believe that she was there to basically
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28 Graduates who achieve “targeted status” have an increased likelihood of receiving a permanent appointment in the NSW Department of Education & Training, which is the largest major employer in the school sector in Australia.
watch how Annette worked in the classroom and replicate her behaviour. Annette recalled Susan’s words ‘this (sic) is her words virtually verbatim … I will learn from you; I will do in your class what I see your class does when I watch you. What’s in this room, I will use’.

Annette recalled how other members of staff expressed surprise at Susan’s apparent lack of social skills, manifest in her failure to interact with staff other than by attending mandatory staff meetings. Previous preservice teachers who had been allocated to Annette’s school had typically ‘made their presence felt’, either by their ‘youthful enthusiasm’ or the ‘wonderful things they brought in the school’. Annette was aware that Susan was expected, in terms of the overall assessment requirements, to become involved in the broader school community – something which, according to Annette, Susan was unable to do.

Annette described how she was reluctant to allow Susan free rein in the classroom or even to leave Susan and the university-appointed supervisor alone in the classroom without her being present. On one occasion when Annette had contemplated doing this she finally decided she wasn’t ‘game enough’ because she felt that Susan would not be able to maintain control in the class. Further, Annette indicated that she had no expectation that the university supervisor would understand the difficulties associated with such a class, hinting that she was not confident that the supervisor’s presence would have assisted Susan with the issue of management. While Annette did recall that the university supervisor had listened to her comments about Susan’s progress, she was unsure in what way this feedback was conveyed to Susan. A significant disappointment for Annette was related to her inability to allow Susan to work independently. Annette had hoped she would have time (made available by Susan’s presence) to undertake some individual work with students who had been newly allocated to the Special Education unit and conduct prescribed pupil assessment which was necessary for sustaining funding levels for the unit: ‘By [a preservice teachers’] 5th semester I’m expecting support and the kids’ learning will be enhanced. That’s what I expect by 5th semester’. Similarly, she experienced anxiety and disappointment in relation to the impact that Susan’s poor teaching would have on her pupils’ learning over the six-week period. Annette recalled that she was:

*getting very worried about how this teacher would go if I left [the room] and that is why I didn't go because any regression of behaviour*
would be counter-productive to the kids’ learning ... but again, that disappointment that there was no enhancement of learning. In fact, the kids’ learning slowed down when she was there because she was never able to take over the pace of the class; to work out the pace.

My initial research question (outlined in Chapter 1) included an attempt to find what sources of support teachers were able to access when encountering difficult situations such as this. I asked Annette where, if ever, she sought assistance – if she ever felt the need to seek support from colleagues, family or the university throughout the period of this program. Annette indicated that she received some support from her own classroom teacher’s aide in relation to assessment of Susan’s competence in the classroom. Annette recalled how her concern that she, as a very experienced teacher, was expecting too much of Susan, and so had called upon the teacher’s aide for another opinion. The aide, who was ‘brutally honest’, apparently shared Annette’s concerns and indicated that Susan was ‘very weak’ in relation to classroom management. In terms of university support, Annette did not expect specific pedagogical support from university staff. She indicated she was conscious of the expertise needed to undertake the work she was doing and was accepting of the fact that university staff could not offer certain kinds of support to her or Susan, particularly with respect to strategies to deal with students with severe emotional and behavioural difficulties. She stated:

I recognise that’s actually going to be hard for the [university] liaison staff member to be able to say much to the student to be able to help them. They would be able to observe when they have maintained control and they’d know when they haven’t maintained control but unless they’ve had experience with children with EDBD29 kids it’s going to be incredibly difficult for them to suggest ideas.

In relation to other sources of support, Annette indicated that she did not feel the need to seek support from family at any time, whether in relation to this (or any other) work-related issue. She did not mention any other member of the teaching staff as a source of support.

I was particularly interested in the types and levels of preparation for the role of site-based teacher educator that Annette had been provided, whether in relation to this particular student or on previous occasions. As was the case for all fifteen teachers in this study, it gradually emerged that none had been provided with formal preparation other than the typical workshop provided by the university on a voluntary basis in the

29 ED/BD refers to students who are diagnosed as Emotionally Disturbed/Behaviour Disturbed
teachers’ own time, outside school hours. Annette’s student’s university had not provided even that level of “voluntary” preparation program, so she basically relied on her knowledge, built up over years as a site-based teacher educator to develop the “know how” to successfully undertake the role.

Annette’s recollections of Susan’s last day, which proved to be emotionally stressful, were very vivid. Annette presented Susan with her final assessment (Satisfactory - the lowest possible passing grade) ‘just to read and consider over lunchtime and in the afternoon’. However as Annette remembered, Susan was extremely angry when she received the report and stated that she deserved a better grade. At the time, Susan reiterated her difficult personal circumstances using these, according to Annette, as a form of ‘leverage’ to encourage Annette to amend the grade. Annette described the events of the day, detailing her teaching through the afternoon, completing bus duty and then returning to find that Susan had left without any ‘parting conversation’ and had packed up the ‘whole kit and caboodle’. At this point Annette was clearly angry when recounting what was, according to her, an unacceptable response – ‘there’s [usually] a nice little gift, like a cake that finds its way on to the morning tea table. Or a little thank you note is written to that effect’. Annette believed that at the time, she had not only provided significant professional support to Susan, but had awarded a grade which she felt was probably overly generous.

Throughout the interview, Annette referred to teachers’ desire to find positives in their student’s learning and how this related to her work with Susan, noting that she was:

*always looking for small improvements and in fact such a position works against being able to give a really good objective judgment at the end of the prac. Because on the one hand all day long you’re encouraging, supporting, recognising small steps forward, ... but when it comes to the practicum you’ve got to be a lot tougher than that and I think that is what I learnt.*

Annette explained some of her reasoning for awarding a “passing” grade, given that she was not actually satisfied with Susan’s performance. She was mindful that Susan had received no specific preparation for the placement in a Special Education unit and was hopeful that she would cope in a “straight” classroom, given that many teachers would find working in a class for children diagnosed as emotionally disturbed quite challenging. However, Annette also remembered feeling shocked and surprised when she found out the following year (i.e. at the end of Susan’s final year) that Susan had
received an appointment as a full-time teacher, but was also not surprised to hear from colleagues that Susan had then struggled with the demands of a full-time class. However, she spoke positively about the fact that Susan had chosen not to work in a special education classroom – ‘perhaps I was successful in turning her off that area. I did show her a really bad cohort … it was not an easy group’ but one that she could manage [her emphasis].

Her story ended with the following coda: some time after the placement, Annette received a second, blank copy of the practicum assessment document that had been sent from the university with a request for her to consider redoing it and awarding Susan a different grade. Annette described her strong feelings of anger at such a request. She believed that the university, as well as Susan, who had requested a regrading, had ‘missed the point’ in relation to the criticisms, because they ‘were couched in positive language’. Annette repeatedly referred to her assessment of Susan (as well as her own her students) as ‘looking for positives’ and ‘catching the children doing something correctly’. Her comments about “missing the point” suggested that she expected the university staff and Susan to read what was not written – to interpret her silences in the report as an indication that Susan had not achieved as much as might have been expected. She ultimately dismissed the request, chose not to amend the assessment and she put the request letter in the garbage bin.

As my reading of the interviews became more fine-grained I saw much more in the words and in the silences than I could have anticipated. I was very conscious of the different but fundamental discourses in which the teachers were operating in their classrooms – carer, supporter, assessor, gatekeeper etc., as well the range of different emotions experienced by the teachers. However, I was certainly not expecting to “hear” the language of control, isolation, marginalising, power and “schooling”. As I move on now to present my re-reading of Annette’s interview story, I begin with some background contextualisation.

**My Re-reading**

It was in the very early phase of the analysis/interpretation – when I had completed some transcriptions as well as most of the interviews. I was preparing a paper for a conference when I noticed language and textual styles that I had not previously noticed
and not expected. The paper was to be an outline of my study with brief comments in relation to emerging issues. As indicated previously, the study was intended to be a narrative description of the emotional experiences of site-based teacher educators and I was searching for examples of text to embed in my paper as examples illuminating the teachers’ stories. It was only a tentative second “reading” and I listened to the audio tapes at the same time. Given the time it takes to undertake one round of reading and coding, it might be expected that the initial interactions with the narrative would be interrupted and segmented. Accordingly, it is to be expected that a more fruitful and deeper analysis will occur on the second or even third reading of such narratives as these (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003). I was again focusing on words, sentences, feelings, coming through the text that could help make sense of the emotional nature of these teachers’ experiences, and always mindful that it was my reading of the text, my own interpretation. However, I had a gnawing feeling that the realist/humanist interpretation was insufficient, tentative, and unsatisfactory. The phenomenological analysis did not make clear the teachers’ lived experiences in relation to the preservice teacher, their colleagues and importantly for me, the university. As the analysis progressed it became clear that there were discursive issues at play of which I had not previously been aware (especially in a theoretical sense) and which could not be understood by simple narrative analysis. I was aware the teachers were operating in different “roles” within the one context – teacher as carer/nurturer, assessor/gatekeeper, and colleague – “roles” that at times intersected but at times were competing. I was also becoming more conscious of the teachers’ position in the preservice program – or rather their position as outsiders in the program.

It was in the second genuinely close “reading” of Annette’s transcripts that I noted the use of particular expressions which in some way alerted me to something else going on. The first ‘ah, ha’ – epiphany – moment came when re-reading the section of text in relation to the children’s behaviour within and beyond her classroom. Annette had stated:

> that would impact on them in the playground and back in their home-based class. So basically I thought “Well I am not prepared to allow this to become negative because if they become out of control they go

I am aware that the “snippets” I have chosen to present my interpretations are not “value neutral” – “these are part of a ceremonial practice that I am using to “conjure up” a real person out of their narrative” (MacLure, 2003, p. 160).
“back to their home-based classes like tornadoes and the teachers have to deal with it”. And they would know that something had happened, either in the unit or on the way back to class. You can tell straight away.

What I felt was significant was the expression: ‘they would know that something had happened, either in the unit or on the way back to class’. This “they” was referring to her colleagues. My interpretation of this text was that it indicated Annette’s need to be seen by her colleagues to be conducting a well-managed class – to be in control. This also carried with it an assertion that if something went wrong when Susan was teaching the class, it would reflect negatively on Annette as well. Similarly, Annette indicated in her comments that she understood why university staff would not be able to assist Susan because the knowledge required to teach in her unit was quite specialised and almost spoken of as “secret knowledge” that she believed they did not possess.

Annette was clearly aware that her colleagues had some negative perceptions of Susan. She noted:

... I felt that there was no attempt to even interact socially with the other staff at the school and people started to comment after about – people were saying, “Is that your student? What’s her name? What’s she doing here, what’s she doing there? What’s her role here?” Whereas normally, with a student on practicum, it becomes very obvious to all teachers very very quickly, because their presence is felt throughout the school. But this was not the case and that was commented on.

It was evident to me that I needed to understand why Annette was concerned with her colleagues’ opinions, as if Susan’s lack of social skills was also a reflection on her. It became imperative that I needed to use a different analytic technique to make sense of what I thought I was “hearing”, to identify specific discourses present within the data. I reflected back to the initial purpose of the research which was to try to give a voice to the teachers who experience emotional upheaval when working with problematic preservice teachers. I knew that there was never going to be one story, nor would I discover “the truth” about what happened for Annette and Susan, or “what happens” in these situations; the complexity of the possible interpretations is increasingly apparent. However, I also knew that, whatever lens I employed I had to do justice to the teachers’ stories by thoroughly exploring the depths of those stories.
When I became aware of meanings that I had not anticipated, I was encouraged to read more widely in the work of poststructuralist authors such as Butler (2006), Youdell (2004) and Britzman (2003). It was through discussion of these readings with my colleagues that I was supported to continue to read differently – to think differently. And inevitably my “second reading” allowed me to consider more than just experience. It enabled me to talk about the teachers’ access, or lack thereof, to other discourses that construct the field of initial teacher education. These discourses are associated with such important considerations such as maintaining relationships, conflict and related silencing of emotions, expectations, and knowledge/power. At this point I realised that I could not present the stories as they were – as theoretically under-examined. To have presented them as final and irreducible would have denied the possibility of further critical examination and debate. I certainly did not want to be seen as ‘insufficiently theorised and too unsystematic to compete for academic journal space’ (Fishman & McCarthy, 2000, p. 63).

An ethnographic approach, such as phenomenology, attempts to give voice to those that may have been previously shut out, even partially, as the participants recount cultural knowledge produced within the culture. Further, phenomenologists tend to be less interested in the role that social structures, institutions and importantly power play in the emotional experiences of individuals (Lupton, 1998) while I was increasingly interested in the role of institutions and power. However, I realised certain humanist assumptions became difficult to “sustain” with the application of more helpful theory. Lee (2000) refers to such assumptions as naïve realism, and thus associated representations of ‘a self capable of transcending history or a self that can somehow recover […] authenticity from the unwieldy effects of discursive regimes of power and truth’ became impossible with the application of theory (Britzman, 2000, p. 35).

Reflexive viewing allows for new understandings of a given situation and emphasises the importance of looking at events/texts in different ways. It also is about enhancing the quality of the research project to generate more interesting, well judged and qualified results (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000). According to Macbeth (2001) ‘reflexivity recommends an inquiry into the very possibilities of our unreflective knowledge and practices, and in this way, … bringing more of an unsettled field into view’ (p. 37). I wanted to and needed to make sense of the teachers’ felt lack of knowledge about, and incomplete preparation, for the site-based program, the apparent
feelings of lack of recognition by the universities of the teachers’ contribution and the consistent message that, as teachers, they had to control their feelings. As Annette stated, ‘you just don’t lose control’. Similarly, I needed support to make sense of teachers’ expectations of the preservice teacher as a general model or standard against which aberrant performing preservice teachers, such as Susan, could be identified. Consequently, I needed a tool of analysis and/or a theoretical framework that allowed me to achieve that purpose, that goal, at a depth beyond a phenomenological viewing.

This project was always focused on the emotional dimension of preservice teacher education as seen from the perspective of classroom teachers (a topic also underrepresented in the research literature) and limited by my knowledge of the context within which these teachers were operating. Consequently, my interpretative strategies affected the study’s potential to reveal possible different interpretations, making my task one of maintaining a highly reflexive stance, open to ‘unruly, ambivalent or unexpected empirical material’ (Alvesson Sköldberg, 2000, p. 249). These authors suggested that reflexivity is achieved when the researcher is able to: interact with the material then interpret what is read followed by critical interpretation and reflection on text production and language use in an interactive process. I wanted to ensure a deep consideration of the situation and I felt that could be achieved by adjusting my perspective and my analytic tools. I was heartened by Johnson-Bailey’s (2004) comment that it is not uncommon for researchers to enter the field ‘sure of one’s perspective and emerging from the field with shredded philosophies’ (p. 130). As Johnson-Bailey also noted, ‘[s]tandpoints can shift and power can intervene to problematise data collection and post-field analysis’ (p. 130). Accordingly, I felt that it appropriate to look at the data with a fresh set of lenses.

As my deeper exploration of the text continued, the potential of using discourse analysis as a textual analytic technique became apparent. Discourse analysis is fundamentally based on the notion that any social interaction on a communication level involves both semiotics (sign systems) and politics/power/status. Further, such analysis recognises that most interactions are not completely original in that they are repetitions of previous texts with some variations. Consequently, it is possible when studying texts, to identify the patterns within them and, as a result, to illustrate ‘the way in which situations produce and reproduce institutions, and are in turn sustained by them’ (Gee, 1999, p. 84). Any piece of language is composed of a set of grammatical cues or clues that help
the reader/listener build a “representations” of the text. It seemed then it would be most appropriate to undertake a finer-grained reading to look for such textual patterns.

This “reading” was informed by a poststructuralist framework, following the work of Foucault, as seen in the writings of feminists Walkerdine (1989), Davies (1992) and Youdell (2006) amongst others. Such an approach is concerned with the ways in which discourses construct particular knowledges or “truths” in relation to power and the regulatory function of discourse. This theoretical framework also provided the tools to address questions about the identities of the participants as the data revealed multiple subject positions available to, and taken up by, each participant. This was a more satisfactory way to explain the “roles” and their intersecting/competing nature - it allowed me to read ‘against the grain’, as suggested by Davies, who claimed that we need to:

create new stories that are elaborations of existing stories that mark their problematic nature. We need not only to see the problems in rational, didactic terms (though we need that too) but to see freshly the images and metaphors and story lines we have grown up with and to learn to read them against the grain (Davies, 1992, p. 74).

My second reading therefore used poststructuralist thinking as a tool of analysis as well as a foundation for theory building. According to Marshall (1992), a post-structural analysis is a ‘way of analysing and asking questions by anyone in any field about anything “textual” both in the narrow conventional sense of written text and in a much broader sense of any discourse, practices, institutions’ (cited in Usher & Edwards, 1994, p. 18). As an analytic tool, poststructuralist discourse analysis enabled me to move beyond the level of the words of the interview “texts” to a level of greater productivity than the “taken-for-granted” meaning.

While a phenomenological approach may have promised some holistic account, my second reading, informed by poststructuralist theories, is still a partial and provisional truth of the familiar story of preservice teaching. Britzman (2000) argued that ‘poststructuralist theories disrupt any desire for a seamless narrative, a cohesive identity, a mimetic representation … where every telling is constrained, partial, and determined by the discourses and histories that prefigure, even as they might promise, representation’ (p. 32). Clearly, I made specific choices about what was of interest to me from the beginning of this project, so it follows that theories and explanations associated with the project, are what Britzman terms ‘interest-relative’ (p. 79). Further, I
was focussing on textual forms that I considered indicative of issues associated with relationships, silencing, control/agency and the absence thereof – text such as ‘I expected’, and I had not considered, for example, expressions such as ‘you know’.

Feminist poststructuralist analysis, then, is a mode of knowledge production which uses poststructuralist theories of language, subjectivity, social processes and institutions to critique apparently natural or commonsense categories i.e. teacher as caring and nurturing while contesting the notion of the individual as some stable, unitary, rational author of her/his own choices and ideas (Rose, 1996, 1999). At the level of the individual, this theory is able to offer an explanation of where our experience and meaning come from and offers the potential to understand existing power relations as well as to identify areas and strategies for change (Weedon, 1987). According to Zembylas (2003b) a feminist poststructuralist approach also allows the researcher to examine the ‘role of culture, power and ideology in creating emotion discourses; [such studies] highlight how teachers are displayed in this process by adopting or resisting these dominant discourses’ (p. 109). Thus, it was a highly appropriate approach given the focus of the study reported here.

I suggest that a theory which enabled me to understand and account for the ‘competing subjective realities and demonstrate the social interests for whom they work’, was required in this study (Weedon, 1987, p. 8). From a poststructuralist perspective, the teacher subject can be understood as decentred - open to change and possibly repositioned by unexpected or unpredicted events that work to produce her sense of self, her subjectivity, in terms that her body finds uncomfortable, distressing, and dangerous.

The changed lenses enabled the study to concern itself with identifying the range of often competing discourses of teachers’ lived experiences and understanding how these teachers’ emotions were generated from and played out in the discursive practices of their workplaces. Poststructuralism as a theoretical tool facilitated an examination of the relationship between experience and the constitutive and regulatory effects of social power within the contexts of a site-based initial teacher education program - school, university, home, and beyond. Those analytic approaches that are consistent with poststructuralist and feminist epistemologies focus on the ways discourses construct particular versions of reality and hence constitute our subjectivities and experiences. Key concepts in this theoretical framework are discourse, discursive practices, related
power and subjectivity. The following section outlines the importance of consideration of these issues as part of a poststructuralist analysis of the teachers’ narratives.

DISCOURSE

According to Hall (2001), ‘[t]he concept of discourse is not about whether things exist but about where the meaning comes from’, so an analysis of discourse can illuminate meaning (p. 73). A theoretical framework that is informed by poststructuralism attends to notions of multiple and contextual “truths”, with the site of inquiry being discourse and the production of objects. This study considers two types of discourse. One is discourse as practice, or discursive practices, including words, actions and images as well as embodied practices, ideas, looks and feelings, the analysis of which involves the examination of stretches of talk. The second type of discourse is what Gee (1999) refers to as big ‘D’ discourse which attends to specific ways of speaking that have become institutionalised such that it constitutes people and their actions in certain ways (Davies & Harre, 1991/92). According to Sinclair (1996), ‘discourses are combinations of words and phrases, which, taken together, organize into our sphere of attention, certain values, concepts and ideas. Discourses thus create meaning or “truths” for those speaking, listening and reading’ (p. 231). The more they remain uncontested, the less coercion is needed to maintain them – they become the “common sense” of society (Janks & Ivanic, 1992). Accordingly, examining discourse enables us to understand the process by which language usage is implicit in determining what we know and do not know.

When individuals and groups come together in social situations, certain rules come into play – rules or controls that are not written down or spoken of, but which reinforce for subjects what they should say and do in order to act in “normal” and acceptable ways within this discourse. It is through this process that some forms of subjectivity become normalised. It is those discourses, absorbed into society and influencing what is deemed as truth or commonsense, that are the powerful discourses. The ‘rules of discourse govern what is said and what remains unsaid; they identify who can speak with authority and who must listen’ (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 34).

Within universities, schools, and families for example, there are sets of traditions and the regimes of truth that are acceptable, having been built up over periods of time.
Schools produce discourses, values and guidelines for what is to be noticed, held as distinctive and seen as acceptable. According to Foucault:

Each society has its regimes of truth … the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true. How, within each site/context subjects come to understand how they “ought to conduct” themselves (1990, p. 26).

Accordingly, regimes of truth come to shape how preservice teachers as well as new teachers come to know and understand what forms of conduct are normal and right in the context of schools and schooling. If we understand more about how these truths operate to affect what is acceptable practice, we may know more about the power that operates through these regimes and structures that keep them in privileged positions (Taylor, 2007). Cherryholmes (1988) suggested that teachers, for example, typically do not know where their discourse originates - they just “pick it up” as part of the socialising process (p. 34). Teachers, like most individuals, believe they are in control of the discourse that they speak, but according to Gee (1999) they are often unaware of the history of the discourse so they are not fully aware of what they mean when they act and talk.

A poststructuralist reading sees language as one of the fundamental components in the analysis of social situations, and the resultant structures of power and individual consciousness that are produced within them. Poststructuralists argue that language produces social reality rather than simply describing it. Consequently, expressions such as ‘student teacher’ or ‘cooperating teacher’ produce and configure these individuals – they are spoken about, spoken to and spoken into existence. Language offers us a range of ways of interpreting our lives that imply different versions of experience. According to Alvesson and Skoldberg, different forms of the subject (subjectivity) are constituted or activated, depending on language, representation and discursive context (2000, p. 164). Naming the subject in the research, as some unitary, permanent individual is not possible, according to poststructuralist traditions. The term ‘teacher’ is signified or fixed in this research, but the meaning is changing – is deferred – as it is totally dependent on the changing discursive contexts and the power relations inherently involved (Weedon, 1987, p. 25). Recognition of this multiplicity of meanings also suggests that any interpretation is temporary and open to challenge.

The strength of this theoretical position is its productivity, in Foucault’s sense, in that there is potential to bring about change. If we understand the role of language as the
maker of meaning then changing language has the potential to bring about social change. Cherryholmes suggested that:

meaning must not be thought of as structurally grounded but as post structurally shifting, leading to different usages, uncovering discursive fractures, and constituting new applications of words or utterances … seemingly stable meanings give way because words, utterances and discourses can be applied differently in different contexts (1988, p. 67).

Teachers who take on the task of supporting a preservice teacher are often classified as a “co-operating teacher”. A different label, such as ‘site-based teacher educator’ positions the teacher quite differently in the school-university relationship – a more valued and equal partner in the endeavour – rather than a person who is “co-opted” or is “co-operating” rather than “educating”. The label can be a means of marginalisation as the label permits the more powerful/more knowledgeable to show the other the right way to do something, or maintain control of a program. In the same manner as language usage is adopted uncritically so, too, individuals appropriate certain discursive practices that are so well accepted that they are not disputed or even questioned.

Emotions are not private reactive responses to events but are socially organised and managed through, among other things, social conventions, public scrutiny, legal norms, according to Zembylas (2005a) – they are discursively constructed. For Zembylas, poststructuralist theory ‘acknowledges the constitutive effects of emotions as “discursive practices” and as such, a discursive understanding of emotion in teaching provides a useful theoretical tool in analysing the place of emotion in the constitution of teacher identity’ (p. 936). Further, it offers a useful and productive framework for understanding the mechanisms of power and the possibilities of change (Weedon, 1987). The participants’ narratives become a site for possible theory construction as their stories exemplify the theories of poststructuralism – theories of ‘non-unitary subjectivity, of power as circulatory and agency as contradictory’ (Munro, 1998, p. 27). Poststructuralist theories raise concerns about what it is that structures practices and why certain practices are normalised and become deemed as traditions, while others are dismissed or discounted (Britzman, 2000). Consequently, an appealing aspect of poststructuralist considerations is the shift in attention to the role of institutions, in these cases universities, schools and schooling, in the production of power that regulates and constitutes the teacher subject (Britzman, 2000, p. 28).
SUBJECTIVITIES

Subjectivity concerns an individual’s conceptualisation and experience (both conscious and unconscious) of themselves in relation to the world as constructed within the discourses they engage in as an individual. The discourses produce norms and standards that the individual uses to shape, guide and judge her/his conduct as a particular type of subject. According to Ortlipp (2005) this is how ‘individuals normalise themselves as they watch their behaviour, their thoughts and speech and judge themselves against norms produced by the discourse’ (p. 57). This is not to say that an individual is simply a pawn of the discourses, such that an individual has no choice. While writers such as Weedon (1987) argued there is always choice, it must be acknowledged that often the choices may be limited, such that some positions are more likely to be taken up and that some are more privileged than others.

The multiple voices in the narratives here can be associated with different subject positions and their subjectivities. An examination of the teachers’ narratives gives us an insight into their subjectivities at any given moment, and depends on the different discursive fields from which the language emanates. A teacher may be seen as more or less powerful in relation to the knowledge and authority she has in her life at any particular time – as carer, leader, supervisor, administrator and colleague in her work environment, mother, partner and consumer say, in other environments. At times teachers find themselves taking up less powerful positions in relation to their interactions with the preservice teacher, their colleagues and the university. Wright (2006) asserted that ‘as individuals are moving and constantly negotiating positions across discursive regimes, the meanings surrounding these positions are constantly shifting’ (p. 121). The crucial point to note here is that when an individual ‘takes up’ any of these subject positions, she typically believes she is the author of the discourse she is speaking. According to Weedon (1987) ‘it is the imaginary quality of the individual’s identification with a subject position which gives it so much psychological and emotional force’ (p. 31). However, research that illuminates the power of such discursive regimes offers the potential to resist and change what is said and thought within the discourse community.

The term “subject position” is not the same as subjectivity as the latter is a compilation of a range of differing and intersecting subject positions such as teacher, colleague, assessor, mentor, and mother. Discourses make available different subject positions by
regulating normative ideals and any consideration of subjectivity must attend to such multiplicities, as well as the embodied and emotional aspects that are part of the fashioning of subject positions. McLeod and Yates (2006) noted that ‘these “non-rational” aspects of subjectivity are often poorly captured in exclusively narrative and discourse-based accounts of subjectivity’ (p. 87).

POWER

Discourses have the ability to render some subject positions powerful and others less powerful. It is often in the interest of those powerfully positioned in particular discursive regimes to attempt to maintain dominant practices and meanings, and refuse critique. However, the social implications of any discourse will not be achieved without individuals taking up associated subject positions and thus reproducing the social practices and social power which underpin them; individuals both construct and reproduce discursive practices. (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 97). In instances when teachers “control their emotions” because that is what they are expected to do as part of their professional identity, we see evidence of an acceptance and conformity to a validated discourse by these teachers.

According to Foucault (1980) individuals are the vehicles of power not the point of application. If subjectivity is about using knowledge of how to be a particular human being, then subjectivity is related to power in its formation of power-knowledge. Ortlipp (2005) synthesises this usefully when she states ‘[p]ower only exists in actions. Power within discourse can only have an effect through the actions of individuals. Power is exercised as individuals take up subject positions available within the particular discourses … and act on these’ (p. 59). When Foucault talked about power, he talked about ‘power to’ rather than ‘power over’. He also talked about productive power as being circulatory, so that at different moments in time an individual’s power to do something, achieve something, may be changing so that not only those that are considered more able, can exercise power. For example, in initial teacher education, preservice teachers as well as site-based teacher educators and university staff at different times may be more or less powerful. It is worth noting that the exercise of power can also be resisted. Foucault (2000) argued that it is only because there is the possibility of resistance, however limited that resistance might be, that there are
relations of power. How individuals understand the possibility of resistance and when resistance is possible are different issues.

A poststructuralist analysis assists the development of understandings of subjectivities, power-knowledge and their relationship to discursive practices. Subsequent readings of the text, informed by a poststructuralist lens that illuminated the dominant discourses of schools, teaching and the associated power relations, allowed me to more richly understand what was going on in each situation – not necessarily explain but certainly understand (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The poststructuralist analysis in my second reading enabled an examination of the emotions at play but the focus was more to do with emotions as enactments of ‘cultural formations … that play a critical part in the construction of teacher identity, subjectivity, and power relations’ (Zembylas, 2005b, p. xix). The following section makes more explicit to the reader how deeper meaning-making occurred.

**Re-reading Annette**

As mentioned in the previous section, I was increasingly aware of issues of power, control, discursive practices and teacher identity through subsequent readings of the Annette’s, as well as other the teachers’, stories. Upon reflection I remembered that Annette had contacted me and requested the opportunity to be involved in the project – she felt she had something to offer. As I indicated previously, I welcomed the offer and negotiated for Annette to attend an interview in my office.

My second reading lens brought to my attention details such as her impeccable attire, her promptness, the apparent orderliness of the text. Her whole embodiment was of somebody appearing to be in control. I return here to the quotation I highlighted earlier: *And they would know that something had happened, either in the unit or on the way back to class – you can tell straight away*. The ‘they’ to whom Annette refers to her colleagues, who operate in a discursive frame where the ‘good teacher’ is in control and controlling of her students. In order to remain in control, she also maintained control of the opportunities for the preservice teacher. For Annette, her subjectivity as a good teacher is clearly important to her – her sense of self is closely aligned to her success in her school and classroom.
Annette indicated in her recount that she had certain expectations of what Susan would be able to do. Such expectations are constructed historically and biographically through her experiences with previous preservice teachers. Not only did she have expectations of Susan as a student, similarly she appeared to have (no) expectations of the University. Annette’s statement that it would be hard for the university liaison staff member to able to help Susan – ‘incredibly difficult for them to suggest ideas’, could be interpreted as an assertion that only she is capable of providing support, which she does do. Such language leads the listener to believe that only those teachers working in such contexts have access to that particular knowledge. The fact that the university had sent a preservice teacher to a special education setting without any specialised preparation for such a specialised context goes unchallenged and “taken for granted” – normalised. Even the university’s request to change the grade, which resulted in feelings of anger and further resentment towards Susan, went unchallenged and Annette simply ignored the request. There was no apparent attempt on Annette’s part to rebuke the university staff for what could be construed as a professional insult. However, we can read this refusal to respond as Annette’s means of exercising power as described earlier as she resisted the university as well as Susan. In effect, she had a win over the university and Susan, who had colluded in their attempts to have the grade adjusted. Tracy (2000) suggested that whenever there is domination, there is also some form of resistance. The resistance may not necessarily be overt (as in this case) but could be through quite minor and creative means that contribute in the construction of the individual’s identity.

On one hand Annette sees herself as powerful/knowledgeable in terms of her classroom expertise while on the other she permits the university to exert the power, to pull the strings in relation to the overall preservice program. Even as I progressed through the writing of this project other considerations came into play. I asked myself was Annette silent on this particular issue because she saw me as a member of the university community and felt unable to comment. I wonder had she been interviewed by someone without such a connection to a university, would she have been more critical or more open in terms of her interpretation of the university’s attitude to her assessment and more generally her place within teacher education.

Annette indicated she had certain expectations of herself as well as of Susan. She stated that for herself and Susan, the family should not become an “excuse” for not being fully committed to the school/teaching endeavour. Susan had given Annette a fulsome
account of her ‘difficult personal circumstances’, which Annette felt was akin to emotional blackmail. Further, Annette interpreted Susan’s reference to her personal circumstances (as difficult as they may have been) as ‘an excuse’ and ‘crutch’ for not engaging with the placement to the extent that Annette expected - which was to arrive at school by a quarter past eight in the morning. That is what (good) teachers do. Annette suggested that Susan had:

... family of her own and a large family of her own, and she used that as a crutch. She used that as an excuse ... I thought, my feelings were when you’re a teacher, you have to overcome these things, you have to manage these things. You have to be able to do the job no matter what you situation is and she didn’t seem to have this philosophy. If I’m going to be a teacher I have to do the job properly.

Annette’s recount appeared to indicate that she could not understand Susan’s family situation as a burden and that she was not sensitive to the needs of Susan, a mature-aged student. When she did assert that she knew what it was like for students, she spoke as if the preservice teacher is a singular, unitary subject position and that part time work equates to caring for a family in difficult circumstances:

... I mean everybody knows it’s a stressful, busy, exhausting time. We all know that for students, we’re aware of that. But I’ve had young students who have two jobs and they work and wait in restaurants till 10 or 11 at night and then come the next morning and they can do it.

Further, Annette’s comments indicated that she felt Susan should just be able to manage, irrespective of the personal circumstances when she suggested that Susan should ‘... take responsibility for the fact that you may have to go through some negative lessons before you can get to some positive ones instead of,... you know^31, relying [on others]’.

Annette indicated that she sought “support” from her teacher’s aide when assessing Susan’s competence in the classroom. The question of why Annette did not seek the support from a qualified teacher colleague is compelling. Is it because she did not want to open her class to the gaze of her peers, ensuring that they then “would (not) know” if something was wrong in her unit? This idealised model of the teacher in control is played out by Annette on many levels. As indicated previously, Annette stated that she did not ever seek support from her own family members. She effectively maintained a personal/professional division. Susan crossed this line, when she revealed to Annette her personal circumstances, but was not able to extend that personal dimension by

^31 You know was used frequently by many participants - as a means of connecting with me, as the listener
interacting with other members of the school staff. While Annette felt it most appropriate to maintain a separation of personal and professional, there were times when she diverted from this position. For example, when Susan was struggling with the children’s learning and management, Annette suggested to Susan that she should “actually role-play [with her own children] the way she might react to certain behaviours with them [IM children]. Just to practice, you know, reacting to people talking to you in an offensive way’.

In relation to assessment, Annette found the task of balancing the ‘always looking for positives’ aspect of her construction of “innate” teacher’ at odds with her identity as a ‘gatekeeper’ to the profession when she assessed Susan’s performance. However, she had rationalised that dissonance by seeing ‘the teacher’ as a predetermined given, that she can do nothing about. She indicated that awarding a passing grade to Susan was in hindsight an incorrect decision, and stated:

...We’re not set up to be objective at all in our rating of students. We’re actually set up in our very nature is to be lenient, and I was definitely lenient for a “satisfactory” [grade]...

Annette has internalised images of “the good teacher”, built up over years of teaching, supporting preservice teachers and “balancing” her work/family life. She has also developed a normalised model of what a good preservice teacher “should be”. The negative emotional experiences appear heightened when her own and others’ actions conflicted/cut across such constructed understandings, especially when they judged such actions against the desired norms and find themself somehow deficient or “wanting”.

In a typical study of this nature it is a “requirement” of the researcher to outline the methodological decisions that underpin the study prior to presenting the data and findings. Given the manner in which this study has developed, it would not have been appropriate to ignore the very important first phase related to the emerging and changing methodology. Accordingly, I have attempted to demonstrate how the method has evolved by using some of the data and different interpretations that are possible, while simultaneously explaining what drove me to make the methodological changes. I have illustrated, by using just a small selection of data, the possibilities that an analysis of D/discourses informed by a post-structuralist framework can achieve. The following section will continue the discussion and illumination of my method (and some of the
interpretations) using a completely different interview as the focus, in order to demonstrate the alternate analytic in operation.

THERESE’S STORY

My First Reading

Therese, an experienced teacher and site-based teacher educator, was the last teacher I interviewed as part of the initial data collection. I had arranged to meet at her school in her non-teaching time. When I arrived I met Therese in the staffroom and was escorted by her to a small alcove-like area in the corridor immediately outside an internal boys’ toilet. The area, which was a space about 3 metres by 2 metres, was created by using large cupboards and desks to block off a section of the hallway. It was a cold day and the only heating was a small electric fan located on the floor of this “room”. There was a large collection of student art work and teaching resources covering the floor, leaving limited free space to sit or even move around. Therese explained that her current teaching position in the school was that of the RFF\textsuperscript{32} teacher, and she was teaching creative arts as the main component of her role. As with all the other interviews, I explained to Therese the background of the research, my personal experiences and my extreme interest in her story. As the interview progressed, Therese’s body language indicated to me that the experience and the retelling were particularly difficult. Therese turned side on to the tape recorder with a very closed posture (so unlike that of Annette, who upon reflection I note was upright, facing square on to me, feet flat on the floor and knees together). As her posture changed, the clarity and volume of Therese’s voice also decreased. I interpreted this response as a demonstration of ‘withdrawing’. On a number of occasions, I had to ask Therese to turn back to face the recorder to ensure a good quality recording. Even at this stage, when I was becoming more aware of the embodied nature of emotions, it did not occur to me that her body language was indeed a form of text. It was not until much later that the different analytic lens revealed such details. The meaning is clearly not found only in the decoding of the written text. I was aware of the need to include an understanding of the relevance and how it fits in with specific social conversation - how it is contextually bound.

\textsuperscript{32}RFF - Release from face to face teacher which requires the teacher to cover for other teachers when they are given release from teaching to enable them to undertake planning or marking etc. This was not the position she had held the previous year when she was working with Neil.
As the interview progressed, so too did the noise in the corridor, as young boys made use of the toilets and the hallway in general. There are some parts of the tape recording which are almost inaudible due to the extraneous noises. At the time, I remember I was somewhat annoyed because Therese had not provided a quieter environment for the interview, when every other participant had been able to do so. It did not occur to me then that Therese may have tried to find a quieter space and was unable to do so because of how she was positioned within the school. Alternatively, she may rightly have chosen not to privilege me or my position by organising another location. Another possibility is that she was unfamiliar with the genre of interviews and it had not occurred to her that we would need a more private and quieter space. It was presumptuous of me to assume that she could find a space, or would have done so, or even knew of the need to find a quiet space.

The following section presents my interpretation of the narrative that outlined the experiences of Therese. Her emotions, to me, were clearly audible in her story and it is evident the experience of working with that particular preservice teacher had been emotionally demanding. In her school and personal life she has taken up a range of different identities and subject positions, and her attempts to manage the associated, intersecting and at times competing discourses have had (and continue to have, I would suggest) a significant impact on her personally and professionally.

**The Context**

Therese is a woman about fifty years of age – an experienced classroom teacher, who had previously supported preservice teachers, with few, if any, notable problems or tensions. In relation to this study she worked with a young first year undergraduate primary education student, who I have named Neil. Neil was placed at Therese’s school for a four week block practicum, typical of many undergraduate preservice teacher education programs in Australia. The university had provided documentation outlining its expectations and had appointed a university supervisor, who was scheduled to make two visits to the school to assist Therese and Neil, as well as undertake assessment procedures.

Therese chose to become involved in my study because she had judged that Neil had not met the requirements of the school-based program and the experience of supporting him had been stressful. The interview was conducted approximately six months after the end
of the placement. Therese described the circumstances surrounding her time with Neil as ‘very difficult’ and ‘particularly unpleasant’ – ‘unlike anything I had known before’. I have included complete sections of text below in order to give the reader a sense of the emotional impact that the relationship with Neil had on Therese during a period of two weeks. Therese recalled experiencing guilt, anger, frustration, shame, regret, fear, relief, sadness and a sense of isolation during and after her time working with Neil.

According to Therese, the material she received from the university, outlining the program and expectations, was clear and appropriate. From the outset however, Neil did not adhere to the program, designed and required by the university. Further, he did not accept directions given by Therese in relation to the both the university’s and Therese’s expectations. She described how he undertook to do everything his own way. He refused to complete the ‘situational analysis’, which was due by the end of the first week, even though that was a specific requirement of the program. According to his program, Neil was expected to teach two full days towards the end of the four week practicum, after he had completed team-teaching activities and collaborative planning days with Therese in the first three weeks. Therese recounted how Neil had consistently argued that he could teach the two days in the second week ‘to get them out of the way’; how he then ‘planned’ to teach for a whole day but the plan had focussed on one reading activity only. Therese related how at that point – in the second week – she decided not to allow Neil’s teaching/learning experiences to proceed because of his lack of appropriate preparation.

Therese described her responses to his behaviour and how she felt when Neil appeared unwilling to listen to her and accept advice when he was planning a teaching session. He appeared disdainful of her support, refusing to acknowledge her skills as a teacher or to incorporate her suggestions into his lesson plan, even when, according to Therese, the plan was not appropriate for the students with whom he was to work. When he was given simple directives, such as attending playground duty, he simply ignored her. When he was asked to assist with a reading group in the library, he merely took his class to the library and left them with the librarian and returned to the staffroom where Therese was working. It was behaviours such as these that resulted in Therese’s determination that Neil was at risk of failing the practicum. The decision to contact the university in relation to Neil’s progress resulted in a series of events that caused further emotional distress for Therese.
The following section is based on an interweaving of the discourses (regulatory and productive) in which Therese is positioned, the emotions she talks about and an interpretation of her sense of control in each situation.

**Discourses, Emotion & Agency**

Clearly the categorisations and labelling of each grouping are arbitrary in that they are markers attributable to me, as the author and other readers may have clustered sections of the narrative in different ways. Their significance, however resides in the manner in which they allow me to sketch out the complexity of the intersecting and competing discursive frames in which Therese, as a school-based teacher educator is operating.

*Teacher, adult, school-based teacher educator, carer.* Therese felt Neil’s overall attitude resulted from a lack of commitment to the practicum, in general. She believed that Neil questioned everything she did or everything that she asked of him. Therese found his behaviour ‘arrogant’ and his attitude (as a young person) towards an older person ‘was appalling’.

> **Therese:** He just would not listen - he just would totally ignore what you had to say. *He was so great* (her emphasis) *that he didn’t feel that he had to be answerable to anyone.*

In some respects Therese saw Neil as a child (because of his age) and was amazed both by his behaviour towards her as an adult and also his failure to recognise her position as teacher – as a figure of authority and as a supportive colleague. She felt she lost her sense of authority in those circumstances.

> **W:** [You said] he was like a recalcitrant child? He was running the show because he just refused to conform to things?

> **Therese:** Yeah. I was gob smacked. I really didn’t know how to deal with it, because it hadn’t occurred to me that somebody that young could be so bloody arrogant.

Therese recalled how things deteriorated to the point where the Principal intervened. Therese had not requested his intervention. However, he made the decision that something needed to be done to assist Therese, so he contacted the university. Apparently, Therese was shaking when she was talking to him. She also alluded to the

---

33 This was a term that Therese had used earlier in the interview.
fact that her written report about Neil’s behaviour was also very “scratchy” because she
was so upset:

_Therese:_ I just ran out of ‘control’? And I thought this is hopeless. I
can’t stay with him if he’s behaving like this. It’s not fair on him,
because he’s not learning anything. And it’s not fair on me. All the
money in the world’s not worth it. So, you know, it was for his own
sake, too. But at the start I just had it, because it was actually worse
than dealing with a child. It was his stubbornness -it was absolutely
(voice fades out)
_W:_ And you’ve never experienced it before?
_Therese:_ No. No! (her emphasis). I have experienced laziness with
one other but not, you know, like he just would not... And I tried to be
as pleasant as possible and not make it a dreadful experience but there
was certainly no response from him in that term. Yeah, I was...[pause ]
Angry.. – I was angry.

As a female teacher, Therese, like many other teachers is socially constructed as
supportive and nurturing. She felt Neil did not see her as teacher (in any capacity) and
did not apparently need any nurturing, because she believed he did not respond to this
aspect of the role of teacher. My interpretation of his response is that he is resisting his
positioning in the discursive practice of professional experience. Consequently, her
perception of her own agency in those discourses was diminished by Neil’s behaviour.

However, as difficult as the situation was with Neil, Therese felt that she had control in
her classroom even though he upset her confidence in other ways. Accordingly, she
assumed a sense of agency and power in her own class, where she saw herself as being
in control.

_W:_ Did he rock your confidence in the classroom?
_Therese:_ No, Not in the classroom. I think just as a teacher he rocked
my confidence – nothing - he wouldn’t be able to interfere with my
classroom.

_Parent and carer:_ Therese perceived Neil as a child (because of his apparent lack of
maturity) and compared him with her own children, who were about the same age.
Therese signified “children” as people who respond to advice and directions, but Neil
did not do so - much to her frustration. She also felt her own children showed respect to
older people, but Neil’s failure to do that in relation to her was another behaviour that
was at odds with Therese’s construction of what a “child” should do. Consequently, her
perception of herself as professional/adult/parent was clearly affected by his “refusal”.
Therese discussed Neil’s placement with her children and she recalls:
Therese: They just say – don’t put up with it Mum.
W: So do they listen and then say “don’t put up with it” or you don’t actually get a chance to talk to them?
Therese: They listen. You know. Yeah, they make observations and things.
W: So they’re someone you can talk to?
Therese: Yeah, My eldest isn’t that old. He’d be a couple of years younger than [Neil] and I thought if he ever spoke to an adult like that, I’d kill him... I’d kill him. You know. I just find that the closeness in age – I just couldn’t see any comparisons between the 2 boys. So, yeah ...

In the gendered discursive frame of ‘parent’ – as supporter and nurturer, Therese positions Neil as child. Neil refused Therese that position and refused his own subject positioning of child (afforded him by Therese). Similarly, he refused ‘student’ to Therese’s subject position as teacher, so there are tensions in relation to this dissonance. He challenged her professionally and personally, challenging the dominant narrative of teacher educator.

Colleague: Therese described situations where she relied on her colleagues for support in dealing with Neil. She shared her feelings and recounted his actions to staff in order to ‘vent her spleen’ but also to protect herself from possible repercussions:

Therese: Yeah well the way I dealt with it - I’d go and the lady who teaches next to me, an [Assistant Principal]. So I’d go and spit my bile out at, you know, her. Basically I would spit my bile out at other staff members. Basically everyone knew and I’m like that. If I get angry, I want to tell everybody.
W: So that’s how you deal with it?
Therese: Yes. I get all aggro and then I can deal with it. But also it was a covering thing for myself, because even if he said anything about me I had the back up here at school to say “No”. I was just talking to Frank um, another colleague. He said “Oh it wasn’t your fault. You know, he just wasn’t right for it”.

However, allowing her colleagues to share her situation ultimately resulted in strong negative emotions for Therese. According to Therese, some of her colleagues believed she did not address issues in relation to Neil’s behaviour in an appropriate manner, by not ‘pulling him into line’ – the parenting role. Therese recalled that she understood and accepted the discourse of assessor and supervisor – the expected role of a site-based educator – but her story suggests confusion and to some extent conflict, between the discourses of supervisor/assessor and supporter/mentor. However, her inability to take
up the intersecting discursive practices in a manner that was acceptable to colleagues was a source of hurt and anxiety. She wanted to maintain the respect of colleagues by successfully ‘dealing with’ Neil but was unable to convey to them that she was attempting to achieve the expected outcome. She was very aware of her inability to remedy the situation and the related sense of powerlessness. Comments by colleagues resulted in Therese feeling demeaned in their eyes:

W: Anything else about how you coped? Anything else you want to say about the staff?
Therese: When other teachers came in and said (whispy voice)- “How do you put up with him being so rude?” I felt demeaned in a way.
W: From what they said?
Therese: Yes, from what they said. You know. That I was putting up with him when he was being so rude.
W: Do you know why you put up with him?
Therese: I would say things to him but then it went right over his head. It was just really bizarre...
W: You said you felt demeaned but you felt – ‘I’m trying to deal with it’.... Did that have an effect on your feelings? – in what way?
Therese: Yes it did. I felt like, very frustrated how it was coming across to them...

The “good teacher”, the “competent teacher” is expected to manage all that is put in front of them – just keep going – no matter how difficult the circumstances. However, as Therese indicated, she eventually reached a stage when she felt that she could no longer work with Neil and she attempted to avoid him whenever possible. She hid on her way home from the school so that he couldn’t walk with her – he followed me everywhere. I need my space. Loss of privacy was an issue for her.

In an effort to overcome the criticism of colleagues, and to work within the discursive norms of her experience as a site-based teacher educator in supporting a preservice teacher, Therese attempted to be assertive and ‘pull him into line’. Her story indicated that she was trying to fit in to some of the discursive frames in which she was being positioned, particularly by her colleagues and partly by her family – people whom she might have expected to be supportive rather than critical of her efforts. However, her attempts to be assertive with Neil proved unsuccessful; her colleagues thought she should be more assertive, asking her why she did not pull him into line. She recounted how, under pressure from these different directions, she ultimately lost control, possibly as a response to a mounting sense of frustration:
W: So did you ever raise your voice with him ‘like with a recalcitrant child’?
Therese: Yes I did, you know, at one stage. Then I felt ashamed of myself. I didn’t expect to go off. I got very curt, you know um and made it quite obvious that I wasn’t a happy camper but still, as you say, it didn’t deter him.
W: You said you felt ashamed?
Therese: Yes!(her emphasis)
W: Why? Because you lost control or…?
Therese: Yes. Because really he was a kid, wasn’t he. I mean you always do whenever you go off at anything. You do tend to feel a bit ashamed when you’ve calmed down. So yeah. I did. I felt I embarrassed myself, I mean because I think underneath it all I didn’t think that he was worth getting aggro about. You know what I mean?
W: So did other people hear you um losing control and did that bother you?
Therese: No. It was in the classroom basically. One time too many he either looked away or didn’t, didn’t agree to do something I had asked, or whatever…[long pause] . Yes, I’m supposed to be the professional, you know. So he managed to unseat me there, too by his sheer persistent behaviour. Yes so I lowered myself. That’s what I was embarrassed and ashamed about. I had lowered myself.

As a consequence of her response to Neil’s behaviour, Therese experienced further intense emotional feelings – shame as she felt she had responded to Neil in an unprofessional manner – because she perceived him to be a child in her eyes. She would not have treated a child like this. She was positioned outside the bounds of the discursive norm because Neil transgressed the boundaries, taking Therese with him in spite of herself.

It is evident from Therese’s narrative that her relationship with her colleagues was an important aspect of her professional life and, according to her, she went to extreme lengths to be accepted as a professional colleague. When they criticise her for not ‘pulling him into line’ she tried to explain his behaviour:

W: You felt demeaned but you felt “I’m trying to deal with it” ... Did it affect how you thought you were being perceived by your colleagues?
Therese: Yes it did. Yes it did. I felt like, very frustrated how it was coming across...

When Neil chose to dismiss the work required of a teacher, she drew her colleagues into a discussion when they were all together in the staffroom, while the students were in the library. Therese remembered saying to the group:
“Come on everybody; let’s tell Neil what we actually do. The 5 million things” because he thought everything was dead easy. He had no idea of what actually went on. He didn’t want to know … And so we all shot the things down for him and basically said, we all said, “Sit down and write these down.”

Therese used “we” to connect her action to those of her colleagues. Another example of where her actions were criticised by her colleagues related to the decision by the Principal to contact the university. Therese indicated that the site-based professional experience co-ordinator34 had chastised her when the Principal contacted the university directly, rather than following established procedures, which involved the co-ordinator:

Therese: Yes. I’d spoken to the boss several times and then finally [Admin assistant] rang the university. But then [PE co-ordinator] who deals with the [university] students was “put out”. But I thought – “that wasn’t deliberate”. I just needed someone to ring up.

W: So that caused a different kind of um tension?

Therese: (pause) Just a little. Yeah and then um [PE co-ord] whose husband is a university lecturer at [different] university and he said that what we’d done was wrong and what the university has done was wrong. That annoyed her also.

W: So she was upset that they’d removed the student.

Therese: Yes. She thought that we were leaving ourself (sic) liable for trouble.

So not only was Therese criticised for stepping outside the school guidelines (when in fact it was the Principal who made that decision), the teacher also took her to task in relation to guidelines set out by the school and university. The only defence that Therese could draw upon is that wasn’t deliberate. I just needed someone to ring up.

One could interpret this as almost a plea for forgiveness – for having needed support.

When examining the professional aspects of this story, the additional expectations of the university increase the complexity of Therese’s situation. In her capacity as site-based teacher educator, Therese believed she was expected by the university to be firm and evaluative and even a little ‘nasty’ (her choice of word) with him when operating as assessor, which she saw as being at odds with the gendered discourse of supportive nurturing teacher. She took up the subject position in the professional experience process as assessor as is “expected” and she was an experienced professional employed by the university to make qualitative judgements in relation to Neil’s teaching, and broader professional role. By taking up the discourse, she became a producer of the

34 PE co-ordinator is a teacher, who typically negotiates placements and matters pertaining to professional experience in their school/site.
discourse. The role of assessor becomes “natural” for a teacher in a situation such as this, while simultaneously being at odds (competing or at least intersecting) with the carer/nurturer role of teacher.

The following section of text and extract from the interview shows in one sequence, the manner in which Therese is positioned within the complex event of site-based professional experience.

In a further attempt to take control of the situation in her capacity as school-based teacher educator, Therese, as indicated earlier, sought advice from the Principal, who called the university to request support for her:

*W: So how are you feeling [...] that point in time when you were waiting for the university to come for the supervisory visit and he’s not doing what you want?*

*Therese: I was really quite um I was angry. I was angry with him, because I thought there is nothing more I can do. So I went to the boss and he decided to contact the university but I didn’t expect him to get shafted the way he was. Because why we rang up was to get him some help. That made me feel really dreadful.*

When the university-appointed supervisor arrived, he terminated the practicum because of the apparent effect Neil was having on Therese’s emotional well-being. Her “embodied” distress in shaking and anger was interpreted by the principal as ‘not coping’ so he called the university – a response that could be interpreted as some form of masculine need to take control and “protect” her by positioning her as weaker and needing protection. She recalled that she had not expected the practicum to be terminated and noted that the supervisor did not ask her opinion or seek her input. She was positioned by others as outside of this process and her sense of agency removed:

*W: The fact that he got ‘shafted’ made you feel really dreadful?*

*Therese: Yeah, Yeah, because he I wasn’t actually allowed to say anything to him about the lecturer being there. And of course when he found out, you know, [Neil] said he didn’t think things were very bad. And I thought, “Well, what did you think? But I hadn’t expected that. I had expected someone to step in and simply tell him to get his act together. So..*

As a school-based teacher educator, her contribution is essential to the process of site-based teacher education, yet she was marginalised in this stage of the assessment process. Her story indicated that she felt that she was positioned as outsider, somebody whose views were not recognised, not included and thus apparently, not valued.
Nurturing is naturalised for teachers and she came to see Neil as an ‘underdog’ once it became apparent that the practicum was to be terminated. Therese recalled complex feelings of guilt mixed with regret and relief, when the university decided to terminate the practicum, even though it had been beyond her control. The following sequence of our interview illuminates the emotion discourse available to Therese. It would appear that Therese has attributed power to Neil (power to which I would argue, he is not entitled) and she takes up the position of carer most strongly:

W: So you felt bad for him then?
Therese: I felt bad for him. Yeah, but I knew that the tables would turn and I’d be the bad guy when he started to be defensive about the prac....

This section of text could also be read as an indication that Therese is attempting to protect herself, as she positions herself as a victim – while at different times others (such as the Principal) positioned her as a victim.

And later in the same sequence:

W: So you’re professionally affronted; you’re personally affronted; you’re to some degree scared – um other emotions through this time?
Therese: I felt sorry for him. I’m a bit like that. I can be angry with someone but if they go down I’m immediately all for the underdog, but relief that he had actually gone and I didn’t have to keep going [whispery voice]

The guilt was felt in concert with fear for her personal safety and professional standing, and then relief when Neil was removed from the school:

W: So you felt bad that he was being shafted but you were also worried that he would feel badly about you?
Therese: Yes. Yeah Um I felt pretty bad because he was all teary and what not. He did go in and say goodbye to the kids, which I thought was courageous of him. And then I was worried walking home in case he decided to seek retribution [nervous laugh].
W: So you were quite personally afraid of him?
Therese: No only at that stage. You know – You never know how people are going to react. There’s always that thing in the back of your mind that they might decide to have a go at you or whatever and that sort of occurred to me. ... Then I thought he might go around and defame my name and saying she was a stupid bitch. ‘She didn’t do this for me and she didn’t do that’, or what not, which is unfair. I tried with him and that’s why I got so upset when they shafted him. But I was quite relieved as well because I thought I don’t have to deal with this person anymore.
W: So there was a sense of relief?
Therese: *Mmm. There was in a way*

Therese indicated that the episode with Neil would force her to adjust how she would work with preservice teachers in the future. When I asked her what she had learnt about herself from the practicum she said that she would hesitate before ever having another student. Therese also stated that she would be:

*Therese: Harder. Yes, I’d be less likely to be not assertive, but friendly. You know – crack a smile. That’s terrible isn’t it? Your whole personality changes because of what other people do to you.*

W: *That is a serious effect.*

*Therese: It is a serious effect [her emphasis]*

Therese appears to lack agency because she appears to lack the capacity to resist – to some extent she colludes in her own demise by “allowing” others to do what they do.

Without a doubt, my deeper understanding and sensitised interpretation of Therese’s situation was only made possible by my growing conceptualisation of the power of discursive constructions. My capacity to make sense of what was happening for the fifteen teachers in the study was enriched by my exposure and uptake of theory underpinned by post-structural theory.

**CONCLUSION**

The previous sections provide an indication of the complex nature of the task that confronts a school-based teacher educator who accepts a preservice teacher into her classroom. A teacher finds herself having to address both the personal and professional demands of her “charge” while navigating her way through the complex and often competing discourses that make up the life work of a teacher. While not resolving the dissonance between Therese’s beliefs about how each of these people ‘should behave’, interrogating this story from a feminist poststructuralist viewpoint assists making sense of Therese’s situation. ‘Poststructuralism offers a useful, productive framework for understanding the mechanisms of power in our society and the possibilities of change ... [It helps us] understand the mechanisms whereby women and men adopt particular discursive positions as representative of their interests’ (Weedon, 1987, p.12). Poststructuralism affirms there can be no unified view of any discourse; each person seeks to have agency within the discourses within which they operate and no two perspectives will necessarily be the same.
What I have endeavoured to do in the preceding section was to clarify why I felt that change of approach from phenomenological to one that was informed by a Foucauldian poststructuralist theoretical framework. I believe that my original thinking was that of a less reflexive analyst, who had ‘naively read knowledge and meaning off the world, [whereas the] reflexive analyst locates knowledge in agency’ (Macbeth, 2001, p. 40). The following chapter will explore in detail the indicative issues that emerged through my second (and third and fourth) readings of the teachers’ narratives. While I have not wholly abandoned a phenomenological framing, the reader will see that a feminist poststructuralist framing is more prominent. The reader will be exposed to a range of discursive frames within which teachers are working, in the subjective positions as teacher and teacher educator. The issue that I want to emphasise is the impact that the discursive practices have in accentuating the negative emotional experiences of the teachers involved. It is only through a poststructuralist lens am I able to show how the subjectivities of the teachers and emotion discourses are both produced and reproduced in the discursive contexts in which the teachers operate.
CHAPTER 4
DISCOURSES

Words empty out with age. Dying and rise again, accordingly invested with new meanings and always equipped with a second-hand memory. (Minh-ha, 1989).

Woman, native, other writing posts coloniality and feminisms

OUTLINE
This chapter builds on the analysis introduced in the previous chapter. My interpretations of Annette’s and Therese’s stories provided the background to my interpretation of the thirteen other teachers’ narratives. While my original intention was to give voice to participants, I see this project progress from the realist assumption of authenticity to an awareness of the constructed nature of any indicative representation such as a case study, i.e. it is not about the participants, it is about the issues. In Britzman’s (2000) terms, the study became an attempt to represent their actuality with the recognition that it is a partial and provisional representation governed by my own experiences, as a researcher in time and place. The three major sections of this chapter represent my attempts to illustrate how the teachers’ emotional experiences are shaped and accentuated in the schools and universities in which preservice teacher education is played out, ever mindful of the inherent friction that exists in such institutions, as each individual therein is also a member of a range of collectives (Davies, 1990). In chapter 5 I will explore my interpretations of how these emotions are socially and discursively constructed, but focus here on the voices of the teachers; through a selection of those sections that I read as clearly illuminating the discourse of emotions.

INTRODUCTION
The joint purposes of my study are to give voice to the often silenced voices of site-based teacher educators and illuminate the issue of the emotional cost to teachers of problematic professional placements. By framing the research in terms of discursive practices and the construction of subjectivities, I can complete a deeper analysis as a way of meaning-making beyond the cases of teacher/preservice teacher interaction. What the teachers chose to tell me about their experiences illustrates what they saw as
meaningful – what they saw as meaningful tells us much about them and their lived experiences, in the sense that their stories ‘told on them’ (Phelan et al., 2006, p. 164). However, it is essential that we do not obscure the very important issue of the purpose for our speaking. What are the effects of the speech on the discursive frame (Hennessy, 1995, p. 144)? I argue that these teachers chose to speak to me because they felt what they had to say was important. The construction of teacher identities occurs through the negotiation of multiple subject positions and discourses. As Gee (1990) described, discourse is like an “identity kit”, complete with instructions on how to act and talk in ways that other members of the community will recognise (p. 142). These teachers recognise what they want to do and what they want to be and they identify with certain expectations, practices and beliefs, which are clear in their narratives. They are not always describing themselves but their narratives reflect their identification with the ideal. ‘These teachers are actively involved in deciding which story – which self – to convey’ (Søreide, 2006, p. 539).

Importantly, my use of a feminist poststructuralist approach directed my attention to the intersubjective, to the non-neutral relationship between what is said and how it is interpreted by the listener, as well as how it will be read by others. It is worth noting at this point the doubleness of intersubjectivity here, in that my need to construct a deep analysis played into the discursive practices of the Academy - the regime of truth of “what counts” as academic work. While I am considering the relationship between myself and the teachers, I am also considering the relationship between myself and the Academy. I am speaking to my academic field in the same way these teachers spoke to me and, as it is for them, my own account can be seen to be telling on me, too. It will become more evident through this chapter how such doubleness (Luke, 2004) plays out in my interpretations of the texts. The interpretation of texts ‘depends on the multiplicity of subjectivities that accompany their readers ... and the analysis is the consequence of the specific biographical, ideological and professional concerns of [me, as] the author’ (Weiner, 1994, p. 82).

As indicated in the previous chapter, the reported findings from this study can only be my interpretation of the ‘text’ of the teachers’ stories (Williams, 1998). According to MacLure:

the ‘accounts are always fabrications ... weaving something new yet assembled out of fragments and recollections of other fabrications such as the interview
Such reflexive awareness on my behalf does not in any way guarantee a clear(er) window into the inner life of the individual, because as Denzin and Lincoln (2000) observed, ‘the gaze will always be filtered through the lenses of language, gender, social class, race and ethnicity’ (p. 19). It must be emphasised that I am analysing the discourses realised in the participants’ words, not them as people. My analysis is not about these teachers as individuals but as subjects positioned in particular ways in the discourses of teacher education generally and site-based teacher education more specifically. This is an important consideration and it has caused me quite a deal of anxiety in that what I present here as an analytic account is not what was originally sought. My research participants may not have given consent for this analysis because I was unable to know at the start that it would be used. In this representational/interpretive dilemma I am positioned as powerful, as the omnipotent narrator with the power to shape the world the way I see it.

In many ways I am not comfortable with the way I find myself positioned – I have become a subject of the research. I see myself as an active player in the whole process and framing the analysis this way sees me create an uneven relationship with the participants – the doubleness of my polarised desire for/in the research. As MacLure so eloquently stated:

>[t]he search for ontological security ... does not produce the comforts of certainty and authenticity, but produces oscillations instead – between scientific and personal authority; between mastery and surrender; between nostalgia for the authentic voice of the subject and the desire for certainty that leads researchers to override it ... (2003, p. 168)

Given that understanding, I now present my interpretation of my data. Using the narratives of my teacher participants, I engaged in meaning-making from, and of, their lived experiences from the texts they provided in response to my questions. They provided the words with their intentions and I will explore their words with my intentions, my beliefs and my understandings. As indicated previously, this interpretation is partial and provisional. The majority of the interviews were focussed on teachers’ recounts of individual experiences and from these interviews I attempted to identify the discursive practices at play in these social interactions and related emotional experiences. Almost every teacher’s story is one of intense negative emotions and I
hope to make clear here the source and implications of such negative emotional episodes. Typically, the teachers described their experience as highly emotionally-charged and at times their stories indicated extreme hurt and “violence”. Without a doubt these teachers have access to emotion discourse – they use words to describe their feelings and experiences – both intense and modified – as they each struggled with a difficult preservice teacher. The teachers chose words such as *hurt; frustrated, concerned, anxious, guilty, ashamed* and recalled strong emotional experiences when they described events involving university staff, preservice teachers and colleagues.

What is less obvious is teachers’ understanding of the discourse of emotion. How is this different from emotion(al) discourse? Emotion discourse is the use of language that describes/illuminates emotional experiences, whereas understanding ‘discourse on emotions’ refers to an understanding of the discursive nature of emotions as socially constructed – not residing biologically within the individual, but more of an embodied response. As outlined in Chapter 2, discourse on emotion relates to issues such as the “silencing” (both personally, professionally and within the academy, the gendered nature, the alleged irrationality, the individualising) of emotions, rather than seeing them as socially and culturally constructed through the inherent interplay of power/knowledge.

I present material that supports my argument that the emotional experiences of these site-based teacher educators are shaped by the discursive practices of the schools, schooling (and homes) in which the teachers work and interact with colleagues, their own students as well as with preservice teachers. As I indicated previously, such discursive practices produce normative behaviours that individuals use to shape, guide and ultimately judge their own behaviour, thoughts and speech.

From my multiple readings of the teachers’ narratives and rather than foregrounding the specific types of emotions, my interpretations are built around three significant discursive frames, which are meta-discourses that emerge from the data. I have loosely categorised these as: *The Good Teacher, Knowledge/Power,* and *Accountability*. Each of these is played out as competing discursive practices within and between schools and universities. I have labelled each section in terms of these emerging interpretations but the reader will hear echoes of all the sections intermingled. It is not possible to provide a strong sense of the speaker’s narrative by cutting all the texts into small snippets, to
isolate the specific words. The following sections will make clear to the reader the taken-for-granted nature of these discursive practices – both within schools and universities – that produce situations of unequal power between teachers in schools, between teachers and university staff, between preservice teachers and their site-based teacher educator. The text illuminates the marginalised positioning – the “othering” of teachers (and preservice teachers) involved in preservice teacher education.

DISCURSIVE PRACTICES AND THE SHAPING OF EMOTIONS

Situations where teachers learn from one another, as in a preservice triad, which includes preservice teacher, site-based teacher educator and university supervisor, commonly involve moments of discomfort and anxiety (Hargreaves, 1998b). Teachers need to feel they work in a supportive environment as they manage stress associated with opening up their classroom and professional beliefs to observation and critique. This is what happens in a professional experience program in a school, when such perusal involves at least two other people, who typically are not close colleagues. In this triad, power circulates among members of the triad as well as other individuals such as the school students, teacher colleagues and other preservice teachers. Simultaneously, each one has the potential to resist; to refuse the positioning and take up other discourses that may be available.

Emotions are socially constructed and individuals experience a range of emotions, both positive and negative when engaged in the complex social environment of a school and site-based teacher education. Zembylas (2003a) suggested that ‘the emotions that teachers experience and express … are not just matters of personal disposition but are constructed in social relationships and systems of values in their families, cultures and school situations’. In this way emotions play an important role in the development of teacher identity, with emotional highs and lows clearly impacting at any given point in time. This study focussed on the negative (emotional) experiences that are typically associated with a problematic practicum and the discursive practices that weave in and around them.

The following sections explore each of the three meta-discourses through my interpretation of the teachers’ voices. It will be clear to the reader that there are other ways these data could have been grouped and labelled. The “good teacher” discourse
could clearly have included some material related to the expectations that the teachers have of the preservice teachers, and this is an issue that I explore in the following chapter, where I discuss in more detail my interpretations. What I think is most important is that the teachers’ stories are read so that they explicitly connect to the discursive practices of schools and universities, rather than the specific labelling that I have given to each section.

THE “GOOD” (SITE-BASED) TEACHER (EDUCATOR) DISCOURSE
According to Garratt (1998), the process for becoming a good teacher ‘is partly prescribed by the code of the institution and prevailing culture, but also partly inscribed by the subject exercising power on him/herself through the practices of the self’ (p. 227). In the “good teacher discourse” teachers enable learners to succeed, such that when a student fails to succeed, the teacher often experiences a strong sense of guilt – they judge themselves as “not good”. The media presents images of the good teacher through films, which as noted by Moore (2004), often represent impossibility in authentic settings, but teachers often feel expected to achieve such unrealistic benchmarks. Teachers are also expected to work in isolation, juggling the demands of school, home and themselves, without expressing strong emotional feelings – not in public, anyway.

The personal/professional barrier
Teachers’ narratives appear to indicate that there is a barrier – a personal /professional barrier between school and home – so that the two are to remain disconnected. Emotions, for example, belong at home and can be “expressed” at home but not at school. Clearly Annette, introduced in the previous chapter, was adamant that Susan should not be able to use her domestic situation as a crutch – she asserted that she herself did not need support from home and that home did not intrude on her professional life. Other teachers’ stories show that they hid their felt emotions until they went home, where they spilt out. Lyndall, for example, referred to that process as “de-Bobbing”. She remarked that:

I gave him an awful lot of my time. I felt drained. I’d go home every night and I’d fill the spa and I’d get a gin [laughs] and drink it in the spa. And um, ‘I’d just de-Bob. I’m just de-Bobbing. Go away family. I’m just de-Bobbing [laughs].
Alison struggled when her preservice teacher, April, behaved in a confrontational manner towards her. She then asked supportive colleagues to observe some of April’s lessons and attempted to deal with the pressure at home also, because:

... I really had to struggle. I struggled at times to not get emotional - to not take it personally. I would never take it personally in front of her, but at times I’d go home and go, “Oh my God” and have to spend time and time at night going over how can I say this - what is the best way I’m going to say this? And, um, trying to give her as much support as I can.

Alison could recall vividly a previous mature-aged preservice teacher (Margaret) whose circumstances resulted in levels of stress that Alison also had to manage at home, alone. That particular student’s husband was suffering from terminal cancer and she wanted to complete her degree in order to earn money. Alison remembered the occasion when she had been encouraging the preservice teacher to complete required tasks and could not understand what were the impediments for doing so. She then found out about the husband’s illness, which was one of the causes of the preservice teacher’s apparent lack of commitment.

W: And she blurted it out about her husband? How did you feel then? Alison: Like crawling under a table [laughs] I felt awkward because I I guess myself I haven’t had to deal with a situation like that so I honestly didn’t know what to say to her. All I said was, “I’m really sorry. I know that’s a difficult time as well for both you and I can understand why you know, school is the least of your priorities at the moment”.

[...]

Alison: So taking it home - I was just thinking what a terrible situation that she’s in and reflecting on my own situation, personal life and then I guess, it took up some mind space of what else can I be doing. So I’d go home and go over to during the night before I’d go to finally get to sleep.
There was about a week there when I felt that I just wasn’t sleeping because I would be up to 11 o’clock, 12 o’clock you know, in bed over in my mind going ticking, ticking, ticking. What else can I do?

Caring/Nurturing

Caring is a privileged discourse in teaching and schooling. It is an expectation of the ‘good teacher’ and is an aspect of teachers’ work as such is normalised – a given. Almost all the teachers spoke of looking for positives in terms of the feedback that they were providing to their preservice teachers. Annette stated it several times in her interview:
Ok so you’re always encasing your suggestions in the most positive terms you possibly can because you’re building teacher’s self esteem ["""] so you try and help your teachers as much as possible deal with behaviour that, that can come at you....
when I looked through all my criticisms, [they] were couched in such positive language that all my reflections on her lessons etc as I tend to use all the time with kids,...

I think too, that Annette’s situation is doubly problematic because, as a teacher of students with special needs (emotional, behavioural, learning), according to Katz, Alfi and Assor (2004) ‘a major part of their role as Special Education teachers is to protect pupils from experiencing failure and frustration’ (p. 29).

Like Annette, Larry was hoping for improvement in his student, Brian’s, performance:

so I actually tried to keep it more positive at the start rather than negative, because I would’ve had just pages full of negative stuff. So I tried not to give too much away, but I tried to keep when he did something very small, give him a positive...

Therese indicated that she had learnt from her experience with Neil that she (like many others) would be more assertive. However, she felt that she would have to change her demeanour in future.

W: So you think that you’d be harder?
Therese: Harder. Yes, I’d be less likely to be not assertive, but friendly. You know crack a smile. That’s terrible isn’t it? Your whole personality changes because of what other people do to you.

Several teachers in this study could not bring themselves to be so critical of their preservice teachers as to award a failing grade, or in many cases use language that was overtly critical for fear of hurting their preservice teacher’s feelings. The teachers were so bound to the caring/nurturing discourse that, as well as needing to avoid confrontation, they chose a “softer” option – no failures and/or no criticisms. The teachers appeared to be unable to refuse the nurturing/caring teacher discourse (nor did they want to - they saw it as natural) but many also suggested that avoiding the difficult issues was a weak and cowardly response – using the language of “weakness” as a form of self-criticism. The typically feminised notion of “nice” was enacted with the preservice teacher, but upon reflection was found wanting in the teachers’ own assessment, as they privileged the masculine notion of toughness35 in critiquing their

35 There are specific examples of their narratives elsewhere in this study – Annette, Therese, Elizabeth, Loretta, Karin, Melissa etc – where I have noted the privileging of the masculine (toughness) over the typically feminine (weak).
own behaviour. They avoided confronting both preservice teacher and university staff
during the placement, because this appeared a more appropriate, easier, immediate
option. However, upon reflection after the event and during the interview, these
decisions engendered more feelings of guilt and shame, as evidenced by the examples of
Annette, Elizabeth and Renee.

Elizabeth was a teacher who had not wanted to fail her student, but when she presented
the report to the principal in her school, he refused to sign it because all of Elizabeth’s
written comments indicated that Harriet had not in fact met the expected outcomes of
the placement. Elizabeth did not disagree with the principal’s decision but felt highly
critical of her own inability to fail Harriet outright and also to face her after the decision
had been made. She did not see Harriet at all after the principal signed a “failing” report.

Elizabeth: I just didn’t know how I would react to sit opposite her
again saying well look and I then I didn’t know what I was going to
say to her, because if I then said to her “Well look I would’ve passed
you with a lot of ifs and buts, then I was weakening the whole position.
So I was glad not to have to face her.
W: So what did you learn about yourself through this process.
Elizabeth: I think I learnt that - you know that I was doing the right
thing to, in most regards. And I think that the university thought I was
doing the right thing. And that I behaved in a professional manner, to
her. I think that the university perceived that. So I felt that I learnt that
about myself.
I also I learnt that I’m probably not very good in straight
confrontation where it has to come down to me sitting there saying to
her, “you are...”[see below].”
It’s one thing to say you’re not doing it. But once it got to the thing
with the Principal, I really wasn’t very happy about confronting her
then. And I didn’t, maybe that one, I thought was a bit of cowardice,
“Elizabeth. You should’ve been prepared to face her”... [voice trails
off]
W: It’s difficult when you think back through those five weeks you had
to go into bat for her
Elizabeth: All the time you know...
W: But when the crunch came, you just
Elizabeth: I just [laughs] I don’t know now and I didn’t want to face
her and that was it.

Teachers who label themselves as “weak”, while taking up the discourse of schooling
that privileges nurturing and caring, also see their behaviour as less valued than the
more masculine ideal of toughness – the teachers are almost “othering” themselves. In
this situation Elizabeth appeared trapped between knowing what is professionally
appropriate and not wanting to confront the student; she left that to the Principal. Even
in her conversation with me, Elizabeth still could not “name” the failing of Harriet (see ** above). For some teachers the issue of “avoiding conflict” is less obvious than in this case. For example, during the placement that Annette described in her interview, she indicated that she was aware of Susan’s inadequacies but could not bring herself to assertively tell Susan this at the time. When I asked about what support had been provided by university, Annette reported that she felt that the university supervisors were “fairly gentle” with Susan and that she personally needed to be firmer:

**Annette:** There was no change really. I would’ve liked not quite a gung ho approach but she really [pause] I would have liked to have said, if I was [pause] was a little bit more aggressive. I could’ve said “it’s time to pick your game up because if you continue the way you’re going you’ll barely meet satisfactory in this prac”, Um … but…

**W:** You just couldn’t bring yourself to do that?

**Annette:** No, which is really weak and I’ve got to be better, I’ve got to be better at doing that.

When the final assessment was due, Annette gave her student, Susan, the lowest passing grade possible. However, in hindsight she felt that she had succumbed to the pressure that had been exerted by Susan in relation to her need to extricate herself from a difficult domestic situation. It could be argued that Annette’s own desire to not be seen as having failed to support the Susan to achieve a passing grade was further impetus for awarding a satisfactory grade.

**Annette:** Yeah […] I was. I look back on it and I think it was like I’m not happy with the way I dealt with that prac

**W:** Did you learn from it?

**Annette:** Yes, I did learn from it – I learnt that I should have been tougher.

In addition, Annette had hoped that Susan would not be appointed to a Special Education unit because of the specific skills required by a teacher for a unit such as the one in which Annette worked – skills that, according to Annette, Susan did not possess. Annette explained:

I gave her a Satisfactory – so was I responding to this pressure? I had this pressure the whole prac about how she desperately – on this really basic human needs level – how she needed to get out of this terrible, terrible situation. I had been getting that the whole way through and I wonder whether I was thinking in my head that I hope her first teaching situation are not with special needs children especially the behaviour disorder nature because I felt that she wasn’t yet strong enough with kiddies like that. I was hoping that she would be employed and get teaching experience on a straight class with a general spread or more normal sort of behaviour in front of her –
nobody too challenging to deal with because I knew just the logistics getting around the workload was more than enough for Susan let alone challenging behaviours.

Natalie’s story provides another example of the conflicting nature of assessment and support. She conceded that she also needed to be firmer. However, as a result of her encounter with Nigel, Natalie has decided not to accept any more preservice teachers on placement because she felt that she could never be genuinely tough:

Natalie: … I said No. I even said then I should not have made it that mid one [option to repeat the prac]. I should’ve actually said Fail.
W: Did you learn anything about yourself from that?
Natalie: About grading them?
W: Yes.
Natalie: Um yes, don’t be so kind and soft, which I probably would do it again, because I can’t be really hard. That’s why I said to [Faculty Head] that I don’t want to take any more student teachers at this stage, because I don’t know what I’d do and I don’t want to do the wrong thing by them. So um yeah I’ve learnt that maybe you must be a little bit more down the line and just say it as it is. Not say, “Ok, well yes I can’t really pass him” but I’m not sort of going to be really, really, really honest about it, you know.

The vignettes above give some idea of the emotional dimension of assessment issues associated with a failing student and the way in which the discourse of the teacher situates teachers in such events. The following section explores issues related to communication between the universities and teachers involved in these difficult situations.

Working in isolation

As I indicated in the previous chapter Annette is a teacher who liked to keep what happened in her classroom to herself. She did not want the students’ poor behaviour in her class to flow into other areas of the school. Consequently she apparently limited the opportunities of the preservice teacher. This is an example of a teacher “choosing” to work in isolation and maintaining the “privacy” of the classroom. Following are further examples from the teachers’ stories.

Lyndall noted that while Bob was a very personable character he lacked expertise in many areas, one of which was mathematics, which Bob consistently refused to teach. On one particular occasion, she recalled how Bob had told her that he had spent a great
deal of time with a colleague (outside school) who had designed the maths lesson for
him. What I found interesting about this particular recount was that Lyndall disapproved
of Bob seeking assistance of this nature. She stated that Bob should have not told her
that he received assistance. Rather he should have pretended that he did it alone:

... I was thinking well Number 1 you're a bit stupid telling me that
your friend did it for you - you should've taken credit for it and said,
“l’ve really worked hard on this”. A bit of um bit of um, Yeah, bluffing
the supervisor would’ve been a good idea here.

I wondered if her response would have been the same had Bob received assistance from
a member of the school staff or university staff. Normative behaviour in schools is
associated with what Labaree (2000) calls ‘structural isolation … where teachers have
found themselves plying their trade within four walls of a self-contained classroom’
with the related consequence being a vision ‘that learning to teach is a private ordeal’
(p. 230). Given this is a discourse in which she operated on a daily basis, I would
suggest that her assessment of Bob’s conduct was not unusual.

Elizabeth’s story was one of a teacher having to “defend” her preservice teacher,
Harriet, as if Harriet was her responsibility and hers alone. She did not indicate a sense
that her preservice teacher was the responsibility of the whole faculty. Harriet had
struggled to demonstrate her competence in the classroom as well as in interactions with
other staff. She had created friction with other teaching staff when she criticised the
very successful rock music program in the school. Elizabeth had to continually
intercede on Harriet’s behalf even though she disagreed with Harriet’s stance on the
music program. Elizabeth felt trapped between her desire to support Harriet and her
need to support her colleagues and their programs:

**Elizabeth:** And then within the staffroom it became awkward because
um you know, the head- she thought that head of the department had a
witch hunt on her. The big problem I felt was that I was stuck in the
middle of it because I couldn’t very well go against him and say “give
her a go and let it go” and I couldn’t back her because I could see that
really she was doing stupid things.

W: You said you’re caught in the middle and you’re dreading coming
because you’re not quite sure. So can you describe how you’re
feeling?

**Elizabeth:** Yes you36 felt agitated all the time and you just felt as
though. Like on the Wednesday when she didn’t come, I’d think, “Oh
I’m free. I’m free today. I don’t have to be thinking about dealing with
her and dealing with the situations that she was getting herself into.”

---

36 ‘You’ rather than ‘I’ could be interpreted as distancing herself from her own behaviour
Working in isolation does not imply that these teachers were either immune from scrutiny or had absolute confidence in their own capacity. The teachers in this study were often working alone and were required to make decisions that were continually open to contestation or dispute and when that did occur, then the teachers’ moral and professional integrity were under question. It is thus not surprising that the teachers were particularly concerned that they were seen to be doing a “good job” by the preservice teacher as well as by the university. According to the teachers, it was important for them to receive positive feedback from their colleagues or at the very least to be told they were doing the right thing or there was nothing else that could have been done in the circumstances. When the teacher was not able to support the preservice teacher to a successful outcome, they were inclined to develop a sense of doubt, anxiety, guilt and even shame. The issue of needing feedback is addressed in more detail later in this chapter.

**Silencing Emotions**

This next section attends to the occasions described by the teachers as moments that I have interpreted as “silencing” or “managing” their emotions in response to particular discursive practices at play. In all the episodes presented below the reader will hear the teachers describe how they avoided emotional confrontations, managed the expression of their felt emotions, connected the professional to the personal as they explain their attempts to cope with the emotional demands of the preservice experience, typically in private and often from a marginalised or outsider position. However, as noted earlier the teachers did express emotions that “punished” themselves, criticised themselves – but they did not freely display the emotions that were a response to others’ actions.

In this study all the teachers expressed the same sentiment that it was appropriate to “manage their emotional expression” as a professional response. This aspect of professionalism is so much a part of the good teacher discourse that it is privileged and partially fixed. This construction dominated the teachers’ stories and in so doing, it subordinated other responses, such as expressing to me their felt anger, their frustration. Such consent to institutional rules, as if they were immutable, indicated to me that the individual teachers were subordinating themselves to be seen as normal and acceptable
The teachers in this study were able to manage the expression of their emotions; however that does not mean that they were not felt. The teachers’ narratives indicated that they experienced many varied and intensely different emotions, such as guilt, shame, hurt, anxiety, which they then proceeded to silence. This next section explores portions of the interview text that indicated this powerful discursive practice that resulted in such marginalising of emotions.

In every interview I attempted to gather a sense of how the teachers understood the “management of their emotional expressions”. Only four teachers indicated that they had ever openly expressed their emotions in relation to professional experience issue and typically it was an expression of anger. Therese, whom the reader first met in the third chapter, experienced feelings of shame and then felt demeaned by her angry response to Neil’s behaviour. Every participant in this study, including those four teachers indicated that they believed that it was not appropriate to express their emotions in these contexts. Their comments are typified by Loretta who stated that:

*Well I feel that as an adult and there’s … as someone who’s suppose to be responsible to that person; to guide them, you have to control your emotions. You can’t react. That’s just not professional. So you’ve got to maintain that professional side of, of teaching, but still guide them and you know, not hurt their feelings.*

The teachers indicated in their interviews that they attempted to hide the fact that they were upset by and for their preservice teacher. Alison stated that she *would never take it personally in front of her*; Lyndall said that she was *trying to be positive all the time. Repressed all these feelings and I was really getting sick of it.* In those situations where the teacher did express their feelings, typically the situation deteriorated. Sarah asserted that *in those situations, you can’t afford to because if you’ve got something like that going on and you lose it just escalates it;* while Bryce recalled that he *was angry and upset [so he] just withdrew out of the conversation.* He silenced his feelings. Several of the teachers in this study suggested that the fact that there were children present was a modifying factor. For example, Emily reminded me that *there’s kids there, so you always have to aware that they listen to everything that’s going on.*

The following section uses teacher’s narratives to make the connection between the teacher’s desire to put things in a nice way, “always looking for positives”, as well as a means of avoiding conflict and associated negative emotions.
Mary’s placement in Sylvia’s classroom was her second practicum. However, according to Sylvia, Mary found the unstructured, student centred situation very difficult and she appeared to be unable to relate to the students and their needs. Sylvia described how Mary continually broke down in tears when she became overwhelmed with the requirements of the placement. Consequently, Sylvia recalled how difficult it became to engage in meaningful conversations in relation to Mary’s progress and areas for further development:

**Sylvia:** I tried really, really hard to be really, really patient. I probably treated her as you would one of your children - they do similar sort of things. Um without treating her not like an adult ... So I had to work really, really hard at welcoming her every day when she came in. You know, trying to keep her really happy. I over-tried, I tried to overdo the positive stuff.

[...]

And I’d think, I’d say, “How you going, Mary?” She’d say “Oh, Oh, you know” . And I’d leave her and sit over there and just leave her go. Every day I didn’t know what it was going to be like. Definitely. I’d think, “Oops” How she was going to come that next day, especially if we had an upset the day before.

W: So you’re really having to hide your emotions?

**Sylvia:** Oh yes. Trying to be positive all the time. Repressed all these feelings and I’m really getting sick of this, you know. I felt like saying to her, “Pull yourself together, woman”, you know”. “You’re a mature-aged person. You have a young family. You’re not that young. Surely you can get through this and do this”, you know...

I felt when you said ‘what could be done differently’ I think we could, I could’ve been more honest even though it upset her terribly.

Like many of the participants in this study Emily made every attempt to find the positives in her student, Amanda’s effort. Emily noted that while she looked for positives, she followed that up with suggestions for improvement, to which Amanda responded with “I know” and then took no notice of Emily’s suggestions. Emily described her desire to avoid confrontation by avoiding taking such episodes any further:

**Emily:** I always start off really positive, because I’d hate to shatter their confidence but this confidence was ridiculous. I don’t like that sort of confrontation myself. So that’s why I found it really hard to say to her “No you aren’t listening when you say I know, or whatever!”

W: When you were wanting to say to her, “No, I want you to listen to me,” I hear stress in your voice. How do you manage to maintain your control?
Emily: Well, there’s kids there, so you always have to aware that they listen to everything that’s going on and, um, the way I write - wrote to her in my comments because it’s writing for starters, I’d never put anything that was definitely that wasn’t professional because they’re taking that away.

When Emily expressed her concerns in relation to Amanda’s lack of progress, the university supervisor suggested that Emily’s expectations were too high. Apparently, the university supervisor’s comment came as a result of the supervisor accessing Emily’s own professional experience reports from the university files, which she then used as leverage to criticise Emily’s assessment. However, while Emily was able to counter the comment in relation to her expectations of the preservice teacher, she could not confront the “insulting” nature of the supervisor’s comment; she appeared not to have access to the language and agentic position to confront the university supervisor:

Emily: I was insulted. I thought....
W: Did you have a chance to respond to that?
Emily: I’m one of these people who goes into shock after people say things like that to you. And I thought “Oh my God. I can’t believe she just said that to me”. I guess that’s my own fault. Then I said, “It’s got nothing to do with me. This is all about her”. And I said, “I’m the supervisor”, - something to this effect. “I’m the supervising teacher and they’re the sort of things that you’re asking me to look at here, in this report. And it’s not good enough when Amanda doesn’t turn up to a duty or leaves at 10 past 3”.

In yet another case, Bryce’s “high” expectations had been questioned by the university supervisor and some of his colleagues. Bryce recounted how a meeting was called to discuss the assessment and Bryce described how he dealt with the situation by completely withdrawing from the conversation, which involved school and university staff. His response to their criticisms was to direct them to his written report and “talk” through his body language:

Bryce: We were sitting around this table, exactly and, and just sort of going “well ...- but visually they could see that I was angry and upset because I just withdrew out of the conversation. Anyway the “at risk” report I wrote was like 2 or 3 pages outlining her flaws and where she needs to improve. I said, “Anything you want to know, there it is on paper. You don’t need to be asking me these questions. It’s there. It’s obvious”. And they’d say, “Is there anything, maybe you’re being too hard”. “Nah it’s there”. And they’ve gone, “Oh ..”
[...] I didn’t lose my cool. I go very, in terms of stuff like that, I always withdraw out of the conversation. I was head down on the table, whatever. [I said] “Like it’s all there in the writing. All the documentation’s right”.
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Later in the interview he suggested that he drew support from his confidence in his ability but he reiterated his level of “hidden” anger:

**W:** Where do you find support in such situations?

**Bryce:** I was confident in my ability and I still am. And I knew in myself what I was doing. Um, I believe in my ability and I back that all the time, whether it’s in outdoor ed or anything. I’ll back my ability over anything. That’s the sort of confident person that I am. But Yeah, that didn’t stop me from sort of withdrawing out of that conversation around the table sort of thing. I’ll just go well, “No, I’ve put it there. You guys know what sort of teacher I am”.

Loretta did get annoyed with her student, Lyndsay but did not want to show it. She wanted to maintain a professional demeanour. However, she did indicate that she needed an outlet:

**Loretta:** I felt like I was saying something to a brick wall and not getting a response to it and that, that does annoy you, so I would go home and I’d be telling my husband this, this and this. But at school I wouldn’t show that to her, obviously, but you’ve got to have an outlet. **W:** So you were in control of your emotions by not getting angry with her. How do you know when and how to express your emotions or how to respond when somebody is less than responsive?

**Loretta:** Well I feel that as an adult and as someone who’s suppose to be responsible to that person; to guide them you have to control your emotions. You can’t, um, react. That’s just not professional. So you’ve got to maintain that professional side of, of teaching, um but still guide them and you know, not hurt their feelings.

Alison’s situation was different in that she suggested that she did not feel comfortable in the role of teacher, but preferred to be a colleague. However, the lack of success of her student, April, limited such possibilities and she described the degree of unpleasantness she experienced when she did have to confront April:

**Alison:** She didn’t take on any of the advice that I had given her and hadn’t taken up the thing of going and doing research, like taking on board any of the advice I had given. So I started to have to find other ways to firmly say it. Like, I didn’t like having to be the teacher. I wanted to be a colleague rather than a teacher of preservice teacher. **W:** You mentioned you struggled with your emotions when you were trying to talk to her about what was going on and you said you never lost your cool in front of her. How, how do you manage not to lose your cool?

**Alison:** Well I felt there were times when I was going, I was thinking I could say something far more patronising like, “Do you just not get it”. You know, those kind do things but, like I just was restraining from being patronising and getting frustrated and that what I was considering losing my cool, I guess. So I then would pause and OK and think about it another way.
I am then quite firm with them at times and even my HOD said he was scared of me [laughs] when he overheard a conversation. Um...

W: So how do you feel about it when you’re hanging on to your emotions and maintaining control but you know that you really want to be angry?

Alison: I always am thinking about how would I feel if I was in the same situation, so I guess I was trying to place in their shoes or how would I feel if it was me who wasn’t performing. How would I like to be spoken to? And I guess I was trying to be as respectful at all times as possible, even though sometimes you want to go say “get out of here”. Body language very firm. So um, I try not to be confrontational. I guess that is something that is me. I always try to put things nicely before…. I found it incredibly stressful always thinking I, ... how am I going to say this without it being construed as I wanted it always to be constructive rather than, you know...

Therese’s story has been covered in great detail in the previous chapter but there are some important points worth revisiting in terms of this aspect of the study – particularly how Therese explained the management and the eventual expression of her painful emotions:

Therese: Yes. Oh I did a brilliant job because there were sometimes when I felt like punching him.

W: How do you manage to keep your emotions under control – so you don’t “punch him”? 

Therese: It’s called lots of years of experience and learning. I mean, like kids do things now because society’s changing. Like 10 years ago I would’ve gone off like a fire cracker. Now I just think ‘who’s getting stressed?’ Not the child. It’s me. So you learn to [pause] manage it even if it has taken 27 years - it definitely you have to.

W: So can you tell me how you dealt with that anger?

Therese: Yeah well the way I dealt with it - I’d go and the lady who teaches next to me, an [Assistant Principal]. So I’d go and spit my bile out at, you know, her. Basically I would spit my bile out at other staff members. Basically everyone knew and I’m like that. If I get angry, I want to tell everybody.

W: So that’s how you deal with it?

Therese: Yes. I get all aggro and then I can deal with it.

Therese described when she finally expressed her feelings – possibly as a response to a mounting sense of frustration:

Therese: Yes I did, you know, at one stage. Then I felt ashamed of myself. I didn’t expect to go off. I got very curt, you know, um, and made it quite obvious that I wasn’t a happy camper but still, as you say, it didn’t deter him.

W: You said you felt ashamed?

Therese: Yes!(her emphasis) Because really he was a kid, wasn’t he. I mean you always do whenever you go off at anything. You do tend to
feel a bit ashamed when you’ve calmed down. So Yeah. I did. I felt – I embarrassed myself, I mean because I think underneath it all I didn’t think that he was worth getting aggro about. You know what I mean? W: So did other people hear you getting angry and did that bother you? Therese: No. It was in the classroom basically. One time too many he either looked away or didn’t, didn’t agree to do something I had asked, or whatever...[long pause] . Yes, I’m supposed to be the professional, you know. So he managed to unseat me there, too by his sheer persistent behaviour. Yes so I lowered myself. That’s what I was embarrassed and ashamed about. I had lowered myself.

Annette stated in the interview that the only time she actually gave any negative criticism to Susan was in the final report. When Annette met with Susan to discuss the final report, Susan became so angry that Annette suggested she spend time reading through the entire report and that they should meet at the end of the day. However, by the time Annette had returned from bus duty, Susan had left the school without speaking to her again:

Annette: The only really negative criticism was at the end and she got very angry with me for giving that. Now we hadn’t rehearsed anything else. I thought I needed to give her some space she was so angry. And that’s why I said, “I’ll teach for the afternoon session. You can read that and we can talk some more after bus duty”.

What I suggest is particularly interesting about this comment is Annette’s reference to “rehearsing” such a scenario, which I interpreted to mean that she would prepare herself for such an outcome – being prepared to manage the preservice teacher’s anger. It is worth noting the original interpretation of Annette’s behaviour – as a teacher subject needing to stay in control as a “good teacher”, so it is not unexpected that she would feel the need to be prepared next time.

The following week, the university sent a request for Annette to reconsider the final grade she had awarded to Susan. Annette told me how she chose not to act on her anger when the university requested she reconsider the “satisfactory” grade:

Annette: It was amazing! I said “No I will not want to even reconsider”. Because if I had got very cross at that stage, I would’ve wanted to question the whole “Satisfactory” thing.
W: So you didn’t question the letter? Did you contact the university at all?
Annette: I didn’t. I don’t know if our [placement] co-ordinator did on my behalf - I was probably quite cross.
Annette chose to ignore the request and indicated that she did not question the university’s positioning of her as “malleable” to the university’s suggestions, as could be construed by such a request.

According to Elizabeth, Harriet was a talented musician but demonstrated little understanding of the fundamentals of planning for, and teaching, a group of school students. Harriet had failed to implement the advice Elizabeth provided and consequently did not resolve her difficulties in these areas. Harriet apparently antagonised the Head Teacher because she had verbally dismissed the place of rock music (one of the most successful music programs in the school) and antagonised administrative staff because she chose not to follow school protocols in relation to photocopying and similar procedures. Elizabeth often found that she had to defend Harriet, even though she felt that Harriet had done the wrong thing:

W: So when you feel frustrated, did you ever express these frustrations to Harriet?
Elizabeth: No, I didn’t. I think that I felt all the time that it was my job to stay calm and I, it was my job to try and show her that this is what you do.

During the interview with Steve, I was quite intent on getting some deeper understanding of his assertion that he was ‘unemotional’ and it took quite a lot of “teasing it out” to ascertain what he was saying. Steve explained how he had undertaken training that enabled him to filter out negative feelings, as if they are totally within his control:

Steve: … I changed my whole structure and I do filter negative emotions. I do get emotional or negative on something I can filter and it’s scary. Even my sister said something. Um my older sister died about 5 or 6 years ago and um I was sitting at a table and we were all having a very emotional moment and I said (taking a big breath) just need to breath for a while, I walked away and come back and I’m bouncing again. She said what have you done and I said, “I choose not to be like that right now”.
So personally um I’ve adopted this filtering system. My whole life, I do not have negative emotions. I can get rid of my negative emotions very very quickly.
W: But you- I can understand that, but do you mean you’re feeling them before you’re filtering them
Steve: Oh no, I have emotions - yes, yes
W: That’s a very big thing to be not be emotional
Steve: In my job, yeah I would appear to be very non-emotional. In my real personal life I’m highly emotional very romantic, sensitive. I cry
in movies OK. But see then you just choose how to be. I just adopt that strategy in life and it just makes my life bounce.

W: So when you work with students who are having difficulty, are you saying your façade is very controlled?

Steve: They need some stability. They don’t need somebody else breaking down and going to tears and you know ... They need um “OK, you’re upset; let’s keep trying. It doesn’t really matter, you know. Let’s look at why. Let’s help you through it”. So um, and kids appreciate it. I’m known as the Rock, type thing.

Emma is a senior member of staff at her school and responsible for the organisation of preservice teachers at her school. She has faced the task of failing students a number of times. She teaches at the same school as Alison and not long before I conducted the interviews had failed a preservice teacher, who she recalled was “genuinely lovely”, and who staff knew would be affected by the failing grade. Emma realised that the experience was emotionally difficult for the teachers involved and she provided a debriefing session for them:

Emma: I feel sorry for the person. I feel nervous and how’s this going to go, but I’ve sort of just done it enough times now. But you never get totally desensitised to it but you just get used to it. ... And I don’t sit in bed on weekends, though both of the supervising teachers are relatively young, haven’t had too many preservice teachers and they had sleepless nights and worried themselves sick about this final moment that we had.

[...] In most cases we’ve been able to have our own debriefing, closure session so they seem OK. Then I don’t ask them next year to take a preservice teacher so they get a year off because it is a bit traumatic for them. You can see that particularly these last 2. I was feeling like crying because I thought that they looked so sad. I’m going, “Oh you poor things”.

In Larry’s account, his student Brian appeared to be a preservice teacher who was not confident in front of a class or colleagues. Larry recalled how Brian reacted when the university supervisor came to observe his lessons, which had not been progressing as anticipated. Larry described the verbal abuse directed at him by Brian, which occurred in front of his students and the resultant embarrassment. It is clear from his story that this was a difficult time. He also described the level of restraint that was required to manage his anger, which he stated later in the interview, could be “unleashed” at other times, other contexts and not only outside school. Larry admitted that at times he did express his anger to his students, say in the context of the football field – a masculine
domain – and one in which it seemed, from his narrative, to be acceptable in that context. Further, Larry did concede that if Brian had hit him, he would have retaliated:

W: So what happened when the supervisor arrived at the class?

Larry: He, he actually came across and actually started verbally abusing me um in front of my class.

“You went behind my back how dare you. You know that’s slack” and really started yelling at me in front of my in front of my children. And, and I that was just so bad. I felt I just felt I felt really cranky. I nearly felt we were going to - I at one point the way he was coming across and he like, for this quiet person really come across aggro and aggressive and I really thought, I really thought we might come to blows.

W: mmm

[...] W: You mentioned earlier that you thought he would hit you?

Larry: Yeah, that first time I thought we were going to come to blows I really did. I thought we were gonna, I thought “Hang on; he’s gonna throw he’s gonna throw a punch here”. I thought. “I don’t care. I’ll just be throwing, I’ll throw them back. It won’t worry me like - we’ll be in to it... [Laughs]

When I asked Larry to enunciate how was feeling during/after this episode, he used the term “annoyed”, which seemed to me to be a soft emotion, given the circumstances:

W: So is annoying the strongest word that you’d want to use about that. I have a feeling I mean, I’d be more than “annoyed”.

Larry: I was pissed off. I was ropable about it, actually. I was so bloody pissed off with him I tell you what. If I was ever out with a couple of mates or something I’d tell you what. He would’ve, we would’ve certainly um just spoke to him and seen what happened, you know.

W: You didn’t retaliate when he attacked you in the playground?

Larry: No that’s right. Close, close. But I didn’t because I was just thinking of my own [voice trails off] I was probably just thinking of being there in front of the children, as well. So I sort of kept it back but I probably I was actually waiting for I really felt that he was just going to ... I was waiting for him to push me and I was actually just ready to go. As soon as I was touched that was it, he was gone. And I don’t think that he would’ve got up really. I was going to make sure. I was going to ...

This last sub-section provides the reader with an opportunity to sense the teachers’ need to hide their felt emotions as they play out the discourse of the good site-based teacher educator – as one in control of her/his emotions. The section as a whole has attempted to foreground the normative practices that construct and are constructed through discourses associated with the feminine – caring, supportive, silent – engaging with a discourse that privileges emotional constraint but also as individuals with limited
power. In the next section I go on to explore the narratives in relation to the connections between knowledge and power.

KNOWLEDGE/POWER DISCOURSE

The school-based teacher educators experience emotions in relation to the preservice teacher and university staff for a range of reasons. Undoubtedly one aspect was related to the fact that the preservice teachers are ‘not what was expected’. The participants consistently referred to their respective preservice teacher as ‘not being what I expected’ as if there existed some singular unified notion of a preservice teacher. Britzman’s (1991) work Practice Makes Practice attempted to ‘trace how student teachers became an invention of the educational apparatus … [and] how student teachers became a historical problem of education, how student teachers became constituted as a problem population’ (p. 31). The vignettes provide examples from the interviews that led me to believe the site-based teacher educators possessed a perception of preservice teacher as some “unitary given”, which ultimately exacerbated their feelings – feelings of frustration, anger, guilt and despair when the preservice teachers did not do what was expected of them by the site-based teacher educators.

How to be a “teacher”: expectations of preservice teachers

One of the most consistent and significant aspects of the study for me was the teachers’ comments in relation to the preservice teacher not “being” and/or “doing” what is expected either pedagogically, professionally and/or personally. Typically the teachers in this study appeared to experience greater emotional discomfort in relation to professional and personal issues, than in relation to what I would call pedagogical issues. While still being critical of their preservice teacher’s lack of pedagogical knowledge (effective planning, teaching, assessment and evaluation etc.), the teachers’ stories indicated the emotional pain was magnified when their preservice teacher did not appear to grasp the more professional and personal expectations (commitment – having a go, professional courtesy, – taking advice, professional demeanour – attire, promptness etc.) of being a teacher. Preservice teachers who “got it right” in this discourse appear to know and be able to comply with a set of rules privileged by those within the system. Preservice teachers who know and comply with the rules are likely to be the most successful, but also are likely to cause less stress, frustration and anxiety for
the site-based teacher educators. However, one has to ask the question, how are the preservice teachers to know the rules? Site-based education, in which a preservice teacher is expected to work collaboratively with an experienced teacher, is a ‘complex discursive and interactive space’ (Davies, 2007, p. 32).

The following sections of text are some of the site-based teacher educators’ recollections of aspects of preservice teachers’ behaviours which were at odds with what the teachers constructed as normalised behaviours of a preservice teacher. In each section I only present the reader with a purposeful selection of the types of episodes that are repeated throughout the teachers’ narratives. For instance, Sylvia, like several others indicated that she had some idea (usually based on previous preservice teachers’ capacities) of what to expect of her preservice teacher, Mary, when Mary came to the school. Sylvia stated:

... I would imagine [Mary] would have an idea of how the day runs and how you, how children would respond to different things, like your body mannerisms and that sort of thing. Picked up some strategies for dealing with behaviour management um, Non-verbal sort of stuff. Less controlling from the teacher. I was quite shocked that there wasn’t very much in that area and it was all teacher-controlled.

Natalie’s preservice teacher, Nigel, like many associated with this study, had worked in industry for many years. Natalie indicated that she was surprised at his attitude to “teaching” and the work required. She outlined Nigel’s prior experiences while repeating some of the statements Nigel made about teaching:

... He was in the workforce already and he worked for the Dept of Foreign Affairs and Trade and he didn’t like all the hard work. I mean, I got to hear this straight away and I think I got my back up about this. Because, I mean [laughs] you know he said he wanted to get away from that because he didn’t want to work the long hours and so he wants to get into teaching because it’s an easy job! And I thought well, well (her emphasis)

and later in the same interview

I just got this thing all the time. Like, “I don’t want to do that anymore so therefore I’m coming into this. I just have to do this Dip Ed, you know, because that’s what you need, but I don’t need it. I only have to do this prac only because I have to do it, but I don’t really need that either”. You know, he gave me to understand that he did not want to do anything apart from just teaching the class that he had to teach.

The last statement referred to Nigel not wanting to participate in playground duty, sport, observing other teachers’ classes – what Natalie referred to as the ‘bare minimum’. 
Natalie recalled that, to make matters worse, Nigel often arrived late to school (only when he had to teach a lesson) and then he would leave the school premises during the day to purchase coffee at a nearby mall. Natalie suggested that such action was unacceptable and her tone of voice indicated that as well. Nigel was told by Natalie and the faculty head that, “You’re required to be here from, like normal working hours, just like any other teacher” (my emphasis). Natalie was not the only teacher to report that her preservice teacher often kept irregular school hours – arriving late, leaving early, or not remaining on the premises throughout the day. The fact that teachers remembered these incidents indicated that they were important to them; that they meant something to them. Further, it told me something of their understanding of the discourse of “good (preservice) teacher”.

Nick was one of two preservice teachers discussed by Sarah in her interview. She expressed her concern in relation to his apparent lack of awareness of personal space, especially when dealing with her students. She remembered:

I think, within that time I had to talk to him about respecting people’s personal space, particularly with adolescent boys around the 14 to 15 to 16 year old mark. Because they are very, um, very sensitive because it’s a time when they’re trying to come to terms to with their sexuality... And there was, um then this man came in and he had no concept all about personal space. So my first session of dealing with him, I had to talk to him about being very careful about that.

As was the case with Nigel, Lyndall also recalled Bob acting inappropriately with children, in that:

off and on throughout the time he was here.... um children in the class;... another incident, a little girl came in. She’d fallen over in the drive and her mum bought her in late. And she did- she had skinned knees and skinned elbows and chin and it was really awful and probably shouldn’t have even come. But he kind of wrapped himself around her and gave her really big hug and the mother is kind of looking and I’m going, “Come here” and trying to get him off her in a polite, not confronting way, because I didn’t want to alarm the mother. And I just said, “Bob, you can’t do that”.

Elizabeth’s narrative indicated that she was able to distinguish the difference between the professional knowledge that her preservice teacher, Harriet needed to grasp, from the content knowledge. According to Elizabeth, Harriet was also unaware of the subtleties required by a teacher – issues such as physical contact with students, drinking coffee on duty, interactions with staff. Elizabeth recalled that:
One of her first statements was, you know, that she felt that it would’ve been all right, it’s all right to put your arms around the kids etc etc. We explained to her that this was not very good in a high school situation and that it could lead to problems. She felt that she couldn’t understand how we would take this point of view. So she,... and she found it very difficult to take advice on things like that. So, if you said to her “Look don’t make a cup of coffee at 20 past 11 as you’re not going to have time to drink it, because the bell’s about to go” she would still continue to do it. ... At no time was I ... am, I talking about somebody who didn’t understand the subject. What she didn’t understand was that in a school situation how you behave....

and later in same section of the interview:
Like she had no idea that you had to do a program. She had no idea that you had to do lesson plans - that you had these sorts of things.

Lyndall’s preservice teacher Bob displayed a range of behaviours that indicated a lack of awareness of normative discourse in schools. She recalled that on his very first day she was unable to find him and was told by a colleague “he’s in the staff room having a coffee and a chat”. Later that day, as Lyndall escorted him around the school grounds, she remembered how he made assertions to her that the principal had altered the school records in relation to student numbers in order to increase the staffing levels. Lyndall recounted him saying:

“Oh I suppose [Principal] fudges the books to get as many teachers as possible on board?” And I just sort of looked at him and said, “Well, No” [laughs] “Well, no he doesn’t. That’s not, – that’s not on!”.

Given that there had been some public outcry at the time in relation to school numbers, Lyndall felt that his comments were particularly ill-timed and inappropriate. One could suggest, in Bob’s defence that he was naively (gauchely) attempting to indicate he had some knowledge of staffing numbers and processes in general.

Another area of preservice teachers’ behaviour that caused moments of anxiety for some of the teachers related to their preservice teachers’ apparent lack of personal skills in how they interacted with other members of staff. As mentioned previously Annette, Larry and Therese’s preservice teachers displayed “unusual” behaviour – but they were not the only ones. In one instance, Bob interfered with a colleague’s personal belongings on her desk. The teacher concerned was, according to Lyndall, very angry and Lyndall indicated that she expected that a mature-aged person, such as Bob, should have known the appropriate rules for interacting with colleagues and their materials:
If he was a young person who, I don’t know, who lived at home and had everything done for him, you could kind of excuse it but this was a mature guy, who you know, was very bizarre.

Sarah recounted how Nick, who she described as someone unwilling to take on board the advice she provided, had locked another³⁸ site-based teacher out of her classroom so that he could continue with a lesson that she had advised him not to do and which was becoming unruly. It required the Deputy Principal to force the door open to allow the teacher inside:

He locked the door and then lent against the door so she couldn’t actually use her key to get back in. She was getting quite frantic because ... He was screaming at the kids. Cherie’s standing outside almost in tears. The boys comforting her [her emphasis] and she’s trying to get and she’s knocking on the window and she was...

According to Elizabeth, Harriet did not interact well with other members of staff outside of the Performing Arts faculty where she was working. She described her attempts to assist Harriet with this aspect of her professional life. Elizabeth noted that:

I kept saying to her, “You have to talk to people. You have to say good morning, How are you?” You don’t have to stand and talk but you say, “Good morning, how are you?” and move on and she didn’t seem to understand that. Little things like leaving cups or her stuff and leaving it for somebody else to wash up. Those sorts of things irritated in the staffroom, you see.

Elizabeth is a very well dressed women and she remarked about Harriet’s lack of attention to her attire, which Elizabeth felt was inappropriate. She suggested that Harriet:

... looked ungroomed and therefore she looked as though she had just got up. Well, you know that high school students are very critical of that sort of thing. So she gave the impression that she was different, shall we say. I wouldn’t make that sort of statement but you don’t have to wear different things every day, like some people we know do, but you do have to, I think, show that you have changed and I think that was one of the perceptions that she wasn’t really very personally clean. So that sort of was against her.

Most of the participants in this study considered that the preservice teachers lacked knowledge and skills in relation to fundamental issues of teaching such as planning, management and assessment. Loretta’s comment was very typical:

³⁸ Sarah and a colleague were supporting the same preservice teacher, Nick.
Loretta: I had to have words with her a couple of times just to tell her. She really didn’t understand the profession. She never planned, she never had work set. She never had stimulus. Never, you know.

Many teachers spoke of extreme frustration and exhaustion in relation to the time and effort that they expended in order to provide support to their preservice teacher. Therese struggled to help her preservice teacher, Neil come to terms with the expectations of schools. In our interview she described calling upon her colleagues to list for Neil the range of tasks that a teacher was expected to do, as if cataloguing them might have helped Neil grasp the complexity. She said:

Then it’s what teacher’s do. [her emphasis] And he says “oooh” [grumbling voice] and I actually - we sat there in scripture - “Come on everybody, let’s tell Neil what we actually do. The 5 million things”, because he thought everything was dead easy. He had no idea of what actually went on. He didn’t want to know. He was on a too higher plane [posh voice] to stoop to these sorts of things. And so we all shot the things down for him and basically said we all said, “Sit down and write these down”.

The teachers spoke variously of the enculturating nature of school settings. Without being overtly aware of the discourse of schooling and all normative rules, teachers apparently understand the way schools “should” operate. As a means of describing her school’s expectation of Amanda and other preservice teachers, Emily indicated that her school ‘bought people on board’, through what she called “professionalism”:

But I suppose this school is quite professional in a lot of the things that they do. So, if everyone else around you is doing it, then you kind of jump on the bandwagon and so it’s expected that this is the level that we’re at. And I suppose that then is why the Principal got [Amanda] in and said, “Gee you are so lucky to be at this school.

Further, Loretta conceded that:

it is easier - “less stressful” when the preservice teacher is complying and wants to try and you can see that there’s enthusiasm, especially in a young teacher. That’s different. It gives you, ... it gives me the teacher positive feedback.

These teachers respond to the ways that their preservice teachers should “be” a preservice teacher.

Know your place

There appeared to exist in the discourse of good (preservice) teacher, as enunciated by some of the teachers, a line between being too confident and not confident enough,
when it came to their ability to “fit” into a school context. Sarah indicated she was annoyed because of Nick’s apparent forthrightness in expressing an opinion in relation to how a senior teacher should have dealt with a particular class at a particular time:

This day [senior staff member] came in and sat down. “The kids did this, this and this today.” So [Nick] immediately stepped in and said “This is what you should’ve done, shouldn’t you?” And we all just looked at him and thought, “the first mistake is you opened your mouth; the second one is you didn’t think about it and the third one is, it’s time block 4, late in the afternoon for the kids and we know that’s when they get ratty, especially towards the end”. He didn’t stop to think.

Amanda was a young preservice teacher but Emily found her level of confidence confronting, in much the same manner as Sarah had with Nick. Emily recalled how Amanda:

came across as unbelievably confident. And I find myself to be quite a confident person, too but when you’re in a new situation you tend to, like, want to know “Oh that’s what you do” and you sit back and listen a fair bit and she wasn’t like that at all. No, [it was] “when I did this” and “when I did that” and like people in the staffroom. You should’ve seen the eyes like “who are you?” sort of thing. So she would’ve been about maybe 20 going on 55 sort of thing. You know, she was really quite in-your-face like that.

Other teachers in the study remarked about the unusual behaviour of their preservice teacher when they openly commented on other teacher’s competence. Renee, for instance recalled Helen’s comments after she had observed one of Renee’s colleagues. Apparently, Helen openly criticised the teacher, a behaviour which Renee labelled as a problem. She explained that:

She wasn’t very interested [in observing the class] but I wanted her to go and she was really getting very critical about everyone’s teaching. Coming back to me saying, “They couldn’t teach,” and, “This one couldn’t do this and this one couldn’t do that,” I said, “No, no no no. Stop. Stop right there. Um this isn’t appropriate. You’re not there to judge those teachers. You’re simply there to observe what they’re doing well; what things work. You can take in what they’re not doing but it’s not for you to sit back and criticise.” So I was a bit worried about that.

Elizabeth described how her preservice teacher, Harriet’s behaviour had put Elizabeth at odds with her colleagues. The school is well known for a successful Rock Band program but when Harriet heard the students playing rock music she said:
“How can anybody who is a musician teach rock band?” “But you’ve got to watch what you say to people.” I said, “The fact that somebody has some sort of [program] and you saying this is no good,” I said “is automatically going to get them offside.” And she didn’t understand that. You know. Like it was, her sitting there with her fingers in her ears. You know. And this sort of thing, you know. Well naturally people are going to get upset.

Loretta found Lyndsay’s lack of maturity equally confronting, when she interacted with the students in the kindergarten classroom. When I asked what aspects of Lyndsay’s behaviour caused her concern, she replied:

Yes she was about 19. Um, she was friends with the children. She wasn’t the teacher with the children, either. She thought it was cute the way they were. “It’s just really cute, they’re kids.” But she didn’t understand that as a teacher, you’re not the friend, you’re the teacher, but you do get along with them, of course.

The fine line between professional educator and friend is one that each preservice teacher is expected to negotiate.

Another common theme relating to the discourse of schools and the expectations of the profession was associated with the preservice teacher bringing ‘private’ issues into the school. Alison recalled that April, who was one of two problematic preservice teachers with whom she had recently worked, often used her mobile phone - ‘And quite a lot of time [teachers] observed that she was on the phone to her boyfriend and, you know, and managing her own business of, you know, moving house and that sort of thing. Clearly such behaviour was neither expected nor condoned by Alison or her colleagues. According to the teachers in this study, instances where preservice teachers infringed the personal/professional boundary-crossing typically related to family matters such as health, finances and domestic arrangements as well as personal competencies. It would appear that some teachers did not expect to hear about the preservice teacher’s personal lives but almost all admitted that at some time during the placement that they, themselves had significant others to whom they could turn for support. These teachers did not want to be “needed” personally by the preservice teachers, but as indicated previously in this chapter some had indicated that they needed support from family and peers. For example, Steve’s preservice teacher had significant family responsibilities that impacted on his ability to commit to the placement, Alison and Sylvia’s respective preservice teachers had family or personal health issues, Annette’s was in a difficult
domestic situation and Loretta and Elizabeth’s candidates had to work to pay their way: all of which impacted on their ability to commit to the placement.

This previous section gives the reader a sense of what professional, personal and pedagogic expectations the site-based teacher educators had of the preservice teachers. When the latter did not meet, or chose not to meet the teachers’ expectations, the teachers’ experience heightened levels of emotional distress. The following section builds on the notion of knowledge and power as discursive constructions in relation to the teachers’ interpretations of the universities’ expectations of them in a preservice teacher education triad.

What you should know about “mentoring” - expectations of university

Another interesting aspect of my study is that the teachers appeared ambivalent about having been placed in a situation for which they were under-informed, in terms of information, knowledge and professional learning. When the teachers were unsure of the tasks they were required to complete, often as a result of lack of preparation by the university, they struggled to articulate a new professional identity that could be associated with the role of site-based teacher educator. Further, they experienced more emotional distress as a result of this lack of knowledge and associated understandings. However, they never indicated that the situation in relation to lack of external preparation, knowledge and support was something to complain about – it appeared to be a taken-for-granted circumstance for these teachers.

While many site-based teachers are seen as experts within the classroom they perceived themselves at times to be a novice when working with preservice teachers - perceptions which resulted in a sense of emotional burden and dissonance. Davies (2007) in relation to her work with students, suggested that the take-up of one’s identity as competent and good can be faulty and getting it wrong can be an ‘extremely painful experience’ (p. 34). In her commentary she agreed that teachers can be justifiably angry when placed in position where they were made to feel incompetent – as is potentially possible when site-based teachers are ill-prepared for the often difficult task of supporting a preservice teacher. Bullough & Draper (2004a) found that mentors described the claim of being exemplary teachers somewhat daunting and even fraudulent. However, Zembylas (2003a) argued that the cultural myth of teacher as expert, as highly professional, is part
of a discourse aimed at creating a teacher subject that leaves little room for “abnormal” identities.

There appeared to be an assumption by these universities that teachers, who take on the task of site based teacher educator without any formal preparation, have the skills and knowledge to be able to complete the task. When I asked my participants what professional learning opportunities were made available to them in relation to site-based teacher education, every one of them indicated that there had been no significant, systematic professional learning opportunities initiated by any of the university staff. One university had provided access to a voluntary session that was conducted after school hours in the teacher’s own time. Teachers were not provided with any remuneration or accreditation for attending such courses. Further, there appeared to be an expectation by university staff members that teachers will contribute to school-based teacher education without appropriate support and guidance. This leads into the next section, which addresses issues identified in the teachers’ stories that relate to what I have called “othering”.

OUTSIDERS
As mentioned in the previous chapter, knowledge is a form of power (Foucault, 1980). I argue that the stories of the participants in my study “tell on” themselves as well as university staff, policies and procedures. The teachers’ stories indicate that the staff from the six universities “involved” in this study have been positioned to produce and exercise power through their practices that marginalised the teachers involved in their preservice teacher education programs. This was the result of the interplay between the kinds of knowledge to which both groups had access and the manner in which they were able to deploy that knowledge. The first area I address is that of the level of preparation and opportunities for engagement with the universities that these teachers were afforded in these particular teacher education programs.

While the site-based component of a preservice teacher education program is considered by many to be an essential aspect of the course, the data suggested to me that the teachers who are given the responsibility of supporting the neophytes are not considered as equal or even highly valued partners in the outcomes of this endeavour. The stories I am sharing here are the stories that provide weight to my assertion that the teachers are
positioned as outsiders in preservice teacher education. While I am only sharing some stories in detail, they are representative of common themes revealed by many of the participants. From the beginning of their interactions with the universities, the participants in this study were typically not able to draw on the university in terms of preparation before the preservice teacher arrived in the school, and many received only limited support during or after the preservice program. The data also suggested that there were interactions between the teachers and university staff, but on numerous occasions the teachers felt that they were not listened to or their opinions and needs were not considered or addressed. It was often on these occasions that the negative emotional experiences were heightened.

Power and knowledge are interwoven in social interactions including preservice teacher education. The following section demonstrates to some extent the impact of university staff “not making information available” to teachers, so leaving them in professionally diminished positions.

Site-based teacher educator needs – prior to placement

Every one of the fifteen participants in my study indicated they had not been provided with significant formal preparation prior to the preservice teacher being allocated to their classroom. The limited training that was provided by one university was obviously in addition to teachers’ already heavy workloads, which made it difficult and even prohibitive for the teachers to attend. The following quotes indicate the absence of formal preparation:

_W: Did you ever have any training to be a supervisor?_  
_Steve: No never at all._

_W: So have you had any training from the university in terms of the role you take as a co-operating teacher?_  
_Loretta: No. No it’s just a handbook that we’re given early in the year when they do their morning day visits and you continue with it. It’s experience [that you rely on]_

_W: Have you had any training from say, [local university] or other universities in terms of how you work with students?_  
_Therese: No, no they always just hand the booklet_

_W: Have you had any training to be a prac supervisor?_  
_Emily: No, you don’t get anything. You just get the information that they send and you get asked - like they send around a thing at the end of the year “do you want to be a supervising teacher?” and that’s_
scary too I think, because anyone could do it and you could be worried about the sorts of things that they do in their classroom.

**Alison:** ... Well, I felt like I was left out to dry a bit [laughs]. Um, that’s when I started to look at other things of what else can I do and I basically ended up treating the girl like she was a school student in the end because I felt that I had no guidelines to tell me what I would do; scenario situations. Just no training of what I should be doing as a mentor or as a school-based teacher educator.

Alison’s response to the lack of explicit preparation and support was to develop her own set of questions for the preservice teacher to consider upon arriving in the school. Three of the teachers commented that, following the difficult experiences illustrated in this study, they developed their own resources in terms of a set of reflective questions and/or checklists that they used with subsequent preservice teachers to give them some structure and sense of control over the process. For example, Alison commented that:

*I did that because there was a lack of resources of anything in the preservice teacher handbook that was given to me. There wasn’t anything there- types of questions I could ask a teacher that is struggling when … with motivation or any models to guide me - How would I best deal with it?*

The teachers indicated that they required knowledge about the *preservice teacher’s prior experiences* as well as the programs. They suggested information would have been useful as a basis for structuring a school-based program. Many found the lack of information extremely frustrating and asserted that such information could have supported a preservice teacher in the current placement. It was not uncommon for the teachers to find that these particular preservice teachers had experienced difficulties in previous placements - situations of which they were unaware. The teachers recounted how they often obtained such information through “informal” channels when difficulties arose. Comments such as: *she had some problem in the previous prac; he didn’t finish at the other school; she failed the last prac; and this was a make-up prac* were like warning signals but they often did not receive such “notifications” until after problems had surfaced. According to the teachers, universities cited issues of confidentiality as a reason for not providing information, but such rules appeared to leave the teachers floundering in their efforts to provide the most appropriate support. For instance, Loretta was initially told her student Lyndsay was merely ‘out of phase’ because of illness on her previous placement (thereby completing the placement at an unusual time). However, after the practicum commenced she discovered that Lyndsay
had experienced difficulties on her previous attempt and had been withdrawn from the school. Loretta asserted that she could have targeted her support more carefully had she been aware of Lyndsay’s specific needs.

Similarly, Lyndall’s student Bob was repeating his placement and Lyndall argued that prior knowledge of his needs would have been particularly useful in structuring necessary support. Lyndall also discovered part way through the program that Bob, a mature-aged student, was not just repeating the program but had in fact previously been withdrawn from his internship because of his lack of ability in the classroom. The university involved had specifically requested Lyndall to work with Bob because she was experienced in the role of site-based teacher educator. However, while they trusted her capacity to support Bob, according to Lyndall, these same university staff members did not make it clear to her the circumstances under which he was appointed to her school.

Sylvia talked of limited opportunities for meaningful interactions with university staff either before or during the program. She also felt that lack of access to previous practicum reports was a telling point. Sylvia felt that being denied access to previous reports, supposedly because of possible issues of confidentiality, presumed that the teacher could not or would not be able to make an appropriate professional judgement if they had such information. She interpreted this as an attack on her professionalism:

*Sylvia*: No teachers worth their salt would fail to familiarise themselves with their students’ past records so as to provide optimum learning opportunities and enhance positive results. Uni students should be no different. It is unprofessional to believe that having access to preservice teacher’s prac reports would prejudice teachers’ judgement.

Sarah’s situation was slightly different in that one of her two preservice teachers (Terri) had been diagnosed as having a bipolar disorder, but Sarah was not aware of this until part way through the program, when the student failed to return to school following an episode where her lesson had been unsatisfactory and she had received negative feedback from Sarah. Sarah felt that the lack of information potentially put her in a difficult position, particularly with her colleagues:

*Sarah*: In one way I can understand that you shouldn’t release it but in another way you’re asking me to take on this person and that sort of information is actually information that I need to be aware of as these are my classes you’re asking me to let her loose on. These are my
colleagues that you’re asking me to let her work with. I think that I have the right to know that there is a potential problem here.

Elizabeth noted that the structure of the program Harriet had been permitted to undertake was a problem. The university, in collaboration with Harriet, had negotiated for a ‘two plus two’ model, such that the teaching schedule was interrupted every two days. Elizabeth recalled that she knew it would be disruptive but had not argued that belief with the university, so the student got away with it.

Clearly, the manner in which university staff support or do not support site-based teacher educators impacts on their emotional experiences with the preservice teachers and university staff as well. It was evident in their voices that they experienced hurt and anger in relation to many of these and other episodes.

**Site-based teacher educator considerations during the placement**

The universities associated with this study adopted differing policies in relation to the direct supervision of preservice teachers by university staff. My research participants were not able to comment specifically on policies – just on the manner in which they were enacted in their own setting. It seems clear from their stories that they recognised the need for university staff to work closely with them when a preservice teacher experienced difficulty. In some instances, as recounted by these teachers, the university supervisor was supportive when she/he did attend the school or made themselves available to discuss issues on at least a semi-regular basis. However, the most extreme cases of stress for site-based teacher educators typically occurred when university staff did not respond to their concerns. At times this was interpreted as “non-agreement” while at other times it was interpreted as “non-commitment”. In some situations it could be argued by the university that they had afforded teachers a position of “power” by leaving them alone to deal with the concerns. But what is absent in the teachers’ stories is any talk about negotiation around this – where the university might discuss the situation with the teachers and acknowledge their power/knowledge/capacity to deal with it. I argue that there needs to be such discussion and clarification of expectations between the teacher, university staff and preservice teacher if the university is to cede sole management to the site-based teacher educator. It should be the teacher’s right to determine if she/he is willing and able to continue to work without university input/support.
In some situations university staff afforded the teacher little or no power by ignoring their concerns and opinions, to the point where the teacher was ultimately and totally marginalised in the process. Both kinds of situations caused extreme anxiety to the teachers concerned. When the relationship between the school and university staff was such that the teacher had support from the university throughout the process, there appeared to be less pressure and resultant stress and emotional cost to the teacher.

The teachers recounted feelings such as abandonment, isolation, ‘being burnt’, being ‘left out to dry’ by the university staff with whom they had direct contact. Their sense of isolation was in part to do with limited levels of direct contact with universities but was exacerbated by their lack of access to understanding of protocols associated with dealing with an unsuccessful student.

Bryce’s narrative, for instance, indicates that he felt the university responsible for his student should have provided more explicit information so that the risk of confusion might have been reduced:

**Bryce:** I felt the uni should have made the liaison lecturer should’ve maybe told me at the end of the first week – “Put her “at Risk” now”. But there should’ve been – if you think right from the start, there’s going to be problems.

_W: So that’s part of their procedures?_  
**Bryce:** I don’t think that was clearly outlined enough to me, in terms of procedures.

In another instance, Emily was specifically asked to take a student who had partially completed a site-based program in another context. The paperwork from the other program was not provided and Emily, who had limited knowledge of the student’s prior program, had not been informed of the actual procedures for awarding a failing grade:

**Emily** “[The university co-ordinator] asked me “Have you filled out her report?” and I said, “Yes.” And she said, “Have you checked how many…” – because there’s a scale – “how many whatever she’s got and is that 75% or whatever?” And I said, “I didn’t realise that was what the case was”. So then she was – everything was happening a little too late every time so she said, you know “Oh (her emphasis) that’s not good…””.

Emily had not followed the university’s procedures, and was subsequently told that was the reason why she could not fail the student. Needless to say, Emily was frustrated by
the paucity of information from the university, given the circumstances of Amanda’s placement with her. Further, she was dissatisfied that the preservice teacher achieved a ‘satisfactory’ grade and was allowed to progress to the next stage of her university studies. In Alison’s situation, handing responsibility for the assessment of the preservice teacher to her was not seen as empowering, but rather as an abrogation of the university’s responsibility:

**Alison:** ... they were saying, “**Go on, go on what you feel** not really giving me any guidelines of well “‘she should be this’” or “she should be that”’ [just] “go on what you feel”. So eventually it came about after I put her at risk that we had an observer from the university come out and watch one of her lessons. And they gave her feedback and I was trying also to get some information from the observer of what else can I do to help this girl and um and there wasn’t really anything that was said that – I think they were hoping that she would fail because she was a difficult student for them out there as well. Confronting the lecturers... So [pause] I got to do the dirty work. I was telling this girl that she was at risk ...

**W:** So one of the supervisors actually came and observed her. Did [the supervisor] agree that she was at risk or...?

**Alison:** She didn’t tell me that she was at risk – she didn’t say, “Oh! Look I agree,” or, “I think that this girl is at risk.”. She just told me, “This girl needs to do this, this and this,” and “what is she like?” And when I told her, she said, “Oh OK.” So there wasn’t response or feedback.

Sylvia’s experience was typical. She requested specific assistance for herself and her preservice teacher, Mary, but unfortunately no support was provided:

**W:** So Mary’s obviously under stress and not coping. So what is the university’s role in this?

**Sylvia:** We didn’t see the university at all.

**W:** So can you tell me some more about that?

**Sylvia:** I’m not sure exactly sure why they didn’t come out to see her.

....

**W:** And so you don’t know if they wouldn’t come or couldn’t come or

**Sylvia:** I don’t know ... I did feel a bit abandoned by them. I felt that they could’ve come and first of all you have a - when you’re concerned about them you send in a form ...

[...]

They’ll say to us, “You put her [pause] you notify her that she’s at risk and we’ll put some things in place.” And that’s what happens but they didn’t come and see her in the classroom, which is really what I expect them to do.

To make matters worse, Sylvia remembers being called to the Principal’s office, to be told that Mary was having difficulties. Apparently, a university staff member had
contacted the practicum co-ordinator in Sylvia’s school, rather than talking to her directly:

**Sylvia:** With regards to Mary, I remember feeling very pressured and 'at fault’ when called to the office one morning (by the Assistant Principal/Co-ordinator at the time) to find my mature-age preservice student crying. I was asked to sit down and ‘fix up the problem’ with her - with the obvious implication that I was the problem. Seeing that I had gone out of my way, over the previous week, to develop a positive relationship (because she often showed signs of being stressed and worried in the classroom environment), I felt totally unsupported and needing a good cry myself! I hope I will be more assertive next time.

Another teacher, Annette did manage to access university staff who visited the preservice teacher. However, she found that the disconnected nature of the contacts limited the potential effectiveness:

**Annette:** You know I got 2 visits from the liaison, only 2 visits. And I expected the liaison person to be wanting to hear about improvements. They seemed to me to be almost non-related visits in fact. Almost it seemed to me that the liaison staff had forgotten what we had discussions on the first visit – though they were a week apart and so I’m not surprised. The visits were not enough, 2 visits were not enough. Yeah, more regular visits would be beneficial.

Larry, an experienced site-based teacher educator was supporting Brian, who was experiencing difficulties, and he was originally informed that the university would not send a supervisor. He was informed that a university staff member would phone and talk to Brian. However, he was not satisfied with that and recalled telling the university supervisor:

**Larry:** “That's not good enough.”[I told them] I really need someone to come up here and check him out. And I need the university to have a look at him for his own teaching, because I'm really concerned that, really concerned for my children in the class and just about the way he’s teaching.

The university staff then agreed to visit and Brian was removed from the premises after a verbal confrontation with both the teacher and the principal of the school. Following the decision by the university to fail Brian, it was alleged that Brian subsequently made serious threats to the safety of university staff involved in the assessment process.

In yet another instance, the university refused to send a member of staff to Renee’s school for a second visit, even when it became clear that the staff in the school had significant concerns in relation to her preservice teacher, Helen’s progress. Renee
recalled university staff said – “there was no need, no need for us to come back”. And I really wanted them to. And even though Natalie’s preservice teacher, Nigel, did get a supervisory visit and she attempted to outline her concerns to the university lecturer, she recounted that she felt she was treated poorly by the university supervisor. As the researcher who listened to Natalie’s story, I can still hear the anguish in her voice as she described these events:

So she [supervisor] was aware of it but she was very short, like she was virtually half out of the door while I was talking to her. So she wasn’t that interested in what I had to say about him. She didn’t want to hear it; she didn’t want to hear anything bad about him.

This section has drawn attention to those aspects of the teachers’ stories that tell of inconsistent, and I suggest inappropriate behaviour on the part of the university with respect to their preservice programs, particularly in terms of the professional preparation and support provided to school-based teacher educators prior to and during the placements. While the issues raised in this section clearly had aspects of assessment embedded in the action the teachers reported, the following section looks specifically at assessment issues that produced strong emotional responses by the site-based teacher educators.

**Issues of Assessment**

It is common for teachers to see the success of their pupils as a marker of their own success – when pupils fail to achieve, teachers (and some parents and systems) see that as a reflection of their quality as a teacher. But when a preservice teacher did not succeed, not only did the “supporting” teachers question their ability as teachers but they often felt guilty that they had been unable to assist the preservice teacher to experience success. In issues related to assessment, site-based teacher educators experienced heightened emotional distress when university staff interaction was either dominating or non-existent. These teachers believed that the university staff either wittingly or unwittingly implied that their judgement was poor or erroneous. The following vignettes demonstrate some examples of the extreme emotional distress reported by teachers during the assessment stages of the site-based program.

Bridget, the preservice teacher with whom Bryce was working, was a talented athlete in her final year of a four year degree in secondary Personal Development, Health and
Physical education (PDHPE). According to Bryce, Bridget struggled to conduct a lesson that was a meaningful experience for his students. There were some very difficult episodes in the placement – for example, times when staff needed to hold Bridget’s hair out of her face while she vomited into the staff toilet, following an “unsuccessful” lesson with one of Bryce’s classes. When it came time for the assessment, he recalled how his ability to make appropriate assessment was called into question by university staff who thought he was ‘too tough’. University staff made overt references to Bryce’s own preservice teacher education program – the implication being (as interpreted by Bryce) that he was inappropriately comparing his own preservice course to the one in which Bridget was enrolled. Bryce felt that such a response from the university staff member questioned not only his assessment of the preservice teacher’s performance but also his professionalism. It inferred that he would allow his knowledge of his own degree to cloud his judgement in relation Bridget’s assessment. He recalled that the university staff member convened a meeting where he was “confronted” both by university staff and also his own deputy principal. Bryce recounted that he was told that he was ‘too hard’ and that he should ‘amend his decision’, which he refused to do. Consequently, the university sent a second supervisor, who, as it turned out agreed with Bryce’s assessment. Bryce talked of experiencing anger, frustration and at times a ‘sense of betrayal’ when he thought the university and colleagues would not accept his professional judgement. He related how, when the university questioned his assessment, he had replied:

Bryce: “I’ve put it there [in the document]. You guys know what sort of teacher I am. The Deputy and my supervising Head Teacher of the faculty, they know what, that I’m a good teacher”. So it was sort of a bit disappointing. So I said, “You guys know what my standards are. If that’s too high then so be it. If - you see - if you want graduates that aren’t up to that standard then so be it. Right?”
W: Then you, you were angry?
Bryce: I was angry a lot at the uni.

Lyndall and Bryce were the only two teachers in this study who reported that they refused attempts by university staff to overrule their final assessment decision. Lyndall reported being determined that her decision to fail the student would not ‘end at the school’. Recalling a meeting with the university Head of Department she described becoming almost aggressive in her commitment to prevent her preservice teacher, Bob, from being allowed to continue. Even when university staff informed her that it was ‘not your place to make that decision’ she was adamant that her professional judgement
would not be ignored. She maintained that she had absolute confidence in her decision and the support of staff in her school. Lyndall spoke at length about the profession and her identity as “gate keeper”:

Yes and, um, and so he was really stunned and I said, “Bob, you’re never going to teach.” And he goes, “That’s just your opinion” and I said, “Yes as your supervising teacher, based on 20 years of experience,” I said “I just can’t let this happen.” And so he was a bit devastated.

[...] And I said, “It goes with the job, Bob, you know. It’s what we have to do if people aren’t reaching the mark.”

Lyndall recalled that highly supportive colleagues were “surprised” at her vehemence in relation to Bob’s final grade. Bob had suggested that he be permitted to attempt another placement elsewhere, and Lyndall argued that should not be allowed to happen. Lyndall’s intransigence could suggest that she felt that she had been backed into a corner, as the university did not indicate to her an alternative that was acceptable to her. She indicated that she did not have complete confidence that colleagues at a different school would not assess Bob as ‘Satisfactory’, which she saw as an easier option. Lyndall described the scene:

So we’re sitting around here at the final meeting and he has failed. And I was a bit stressed because the university people were considering giving him another chance in another school. [...] “Look, that’s not OK. You know eventually, if you give him enough chances he will find a supervising teacher who won’t go the hard yards and will just tick him off to get him out of their hair. And he’s going to be in a school teaching and once he’s in a school teaching you’re not going to get rid of this guy”.

I said “I’m really sorry but there is nobody on this staff here at (Institution) that would teach with this person.”

In a remarkable account, Emily recalled how she was told by the university supervisor (who was a member of the faculty where Emily had completed her own teaching qualification) that the university staff member had retrieved Emily’s own practicum reports from the university files. The university supervisor then used the information about Emily, who had been a “successful” preservice teacher, as a reason for requesting her to change Amanda’s grade, as she was setting too high a standard for the preservice teacher. Emily remembered the supervisor’s comments:

Emily: She [university lecturer] said, “Look, I just think that you’re probably - you’re expectations are probably far too high. She said, “Emily, I went and had a look at your results and I think basically you’re just trying to judge her as yourself and I think you need to stop
comparing her to yourself and you need to basically give her a break” kind of thing.
Well I was really, ... that’s when I thought, “Oh my God. This is not this has got nothing to do with me. That kind of was like - in my head I don’t say “Ooo, she’s not as good as me”. Gosh I would never say that. But that’s a horrible thing for [university lecturer] to say about someone else.”
W: So when [University supervisor] says to you “You expect too much” how did you feel?
Emily: I was insulted. I thought…[pause]
W: How did you respond to that?
Emily: I’m one of these people who goes into shock after people say things like that to you. And I was, “Oh my God. I can’t believe she just said that to me.” I guess that’s my own fault.
W: So you didn’t respond?
Emily: Well, I did. I said “It’s got nothing to do with me. This is all about her.”

Emily recalled that the supervisor had expressed satisfaction with Amanda’s lesson that she had observed, while Emily indicated that she had some concerns. The supervisor responded, If you feel that there’re some issues then you’re going to have to kind of sort them out, which Emily interpreted to mean that the supervisor did not agree, and so was leaving Emily to resolve any issues.

Interactions of this nature with university staff left teachers feeling demoralised, let down and in highly vulnerable positions, which exacerbated the emotional impact of working with a problematic preservice teacher.

A number of teachers spoke of situations where university staff had requested the teacher write a second report, typically because the student had requested a review of grade. In such circumstances there had been no additional support provided and often no genuine attempt by university staff to outline the ramifications of such a request. What was also stressful for Natalie, for example, was reliving the experience of working with Nigel when she had to prepare a response to the university request. In the interview she again had to relive his (false) accusations that she had not assisted him. Natalie told me that she had kept a journal of all her meetings and interactions with Nigel, so was able to draw on that material to write her very measured response:

Natalie  ...It was quite false, um. So again you know, my heart was thumping. I said, “Oh my God. How can somebody do that?”
[...] I revisited it. I thought everything was you know, finished and done and all this… and all of a sudden this jumps back, you know?
While university staff did not in the end support Nigel’s request, nevertheless they had asked her to provide additional material because Nigel had requested his transcript be amended. She recalled that the university staff did not assist with this process:

*Natalie:* What I got was the booklet before and then you know, all the forms that you have to fill in at the end for the report and things like that. That was it. Nobody came to talk to you about anything um. Not that you particularly need it, you know, because I mean I had enough material to write this report but there was never anything.

As I have indicated in the previous chapter, Annette’s relationship with the university was tested further after Susan’s placement had concluded, when university staff requested that she change the grade she had awarded. While she found the university’s request to elevate the grade professionally confronting, the receipt of this request was a reminder to Annette that her decision to award a passing grade may have in fact been an error in judgement, i.e. she was questioning her own judgement in her decision to award a passing grade.

*Annette:* It was optional – we didn’t have to. I didn’t have to regrade but it was optional “if you would like to reconsider your grading please dada dada….” And there was a form and I just thought, “No I don’t want to; I don’t like to reconsider my grading.” In fact, I had realised by that point that I let somebody slip through the net, who probably shouldn’t have been.

It appears from these recounts that there is scope within these universities programs to develop more supportive and transparent processes in relation to the assessment of preservice teachers who struggle, but also and importantly for the teachers in schools who are trying to support them.

**Site-based teacher educator considerations after the placement**

It appears from this study that school-based teacher educators received little or no feedback after the departure of a problematic student. Not all of the preservice teachers, whose stories are the background to this study, were ultimately deemed to be “unsatisfactory”, so it could be expected that they would be continuing in their program. However, even when the preservice teacher was deemed to have failed to meet requirements of the placement and thus awarded a fail grade, university staff typically did not inform the school-based teacher educator of the outcome for the student. This situation was seen negatively by all teachers, given that every participant in this project was involved in a highly emotional experience with a preservice teacher and a
university academic. In many cases, the preservice teacher was withdrawn from the program and the school-based teacher educator heard no more about it – an experience shared by Sylvia, Elizabeth, Therese, Loretta, and Larry. These teachers, it seems, were left to imagine the outcome of the problematic preservice placement. Sometimes their interest in knowing was couched in terms of concern for the student’s welfare. At other times, they expressed concern that somebody in a difficult situation, less worried about the student’s lack of professional expertise, may award a passing grade and allow the student to enter the teaching profession. Sylvia, for example, mentioned that she would have liked to have known what the outcome was for her student. While she did not find out from the university, she was able to find out through her network:

*Sylvia:* I would’ve liked to have known that. Yes. Whether or not I agreed with what happened, I would’ve liked to have known what happened to that student...
And I do know that student did pass and she’s now being employed as a supply teacher. I know that just from people telling me. I don’t know that from uni, though that that happened.

In Lyndall’s case where she took her responsibility to the profession very seriously, she was determined to maintain her control of this situation, in the face of comments from the university staff that this was their responsibility:

*Lyndall:* Sure. I could fail him on this prac but what I wanted to go a step further and make sure that he didn’t have the opportunity to go to another school where a supervisor was slack or didn’t want to do the hard yards. I guess that’s where – I was in total control of him here at [her school].

Lyndall told me that she had not been allocated a preservice teacher in the session following her experience with Bob. She indicated that she had been concerned because of her confrontation with university staff. However, she was assured by school staff that they thought she deserved a break as she had done her time.

Larry described his concern about Brian’s whereabouts on the basis of the alleged threats he made to university staff. The university did keep him informed but he indicated that there were no procedures to provide support to him by way of counselling.

*Larry:* Especially I mean, I didn’t know for a fact,... what, until I spoke to the university recently, that he was in Nepal. And then the thing is like ... I’d just like to know. Am I meant to be still ... watching my back? And I suppose too, like, I’m in the ... I’m in public life a fair
Elizabeth suggested that she had just wanted to know what happened as a result of awarding a failing grade to Harriet. At the time of our interview (three months after the placement) Elizabeth had had no contact from the university following the failure and she still had no idea what became of Harriet – a situation which she saw as problematic:

Elizabeth: ... then we waited to see if we would get something back from the university and we thought that there might’ve been some sort of follow up and they might’ve rung and asked. But nobody contacted us. Because I said to [Principal] that if they ever do, then I am quite happy to talk to them.... But where it went from there? ... Because we got no feedback. So I don’t know if they actually took her on or they gave her another prac, which is possibly what they should’ve done.

W: Would you like to know what happened to her?

Elizabeth: Yeah, probably I’d like to know you know, I’d probably like to know whether it worked out for her or not, because I would think that she had made a considerable sacrifice to do it and think that was her big problem.

Sarah, Annette, and Bryce had also found out about the outcomes for their respective students via colleagues within the system, rather than from the university. Loretta’s student, Lyndsay, failed the placement and Loretta knew that she was still active in the preservice program because she encountered Lyndsay in the local shopping centre, where she told Loretta that she was still enrolled. Sarah’s preservice teacher failed his placement and was given another opportunity at a different school, which he also failed. However, according to Sarah, members of her school staff eventually found out via their networks that this preservice teacher was ultimately given a passing grade and had graduated as a teacher:

Sarah: So they put him into another prac. He was failed there as well.

W: Do you know what happened to him after that?

Sarah: This is one thing that really, really really (Sarah’s emphasis) aggravates me.

[...]

Sarah: The university passed him (Sarah’s emphasis)

W: So he failed 2 in school...?

Sarah: He failed 2 pracs – [but passed] because his theory was very good.

While not questioning the veracity of that statement, it appeared that Sarah’s feelings of anger might have been dissipated if a university staff member had spoken directly to her, explaining the situation and the genuine basis for their decision, rather than leaving
the information to filter back to the school – with the lingering doubt about the truth of the matter.

In another instance, Renee talked about how she was supporting Helen, her preservice teacher, and remembered committing extensive time to assist her to achieve a satisfactory result – so much so that when the university supervisor visited the school, Helen presented a “satisfactory” lesson – one that Renee had basically scripted. Renee recalled feeling that the university felt that there was something wrong with her for suggesting Sarah wasn’t progressing:

**Renee:** And the supervisor saw me afterwards and I said “how did you go?” and she said, “Oh everything’s great; everything’s great”. [mimicking the supervisor’s light breezy voice] And I said, “No it isn’t. No it isn’t”. Then I started to say what all the problems were and I could see on her face “Oh, look there’s something wrong with you. [Helen’s] a lovely intelligent young women. I’ve just seen her giving quite a good lesson, rough at the edges”, but you know?; “There’s something wrong with you as an associate.” That’s the message that I got.

W: How do you feel, how did you feel about that message?

**Renee:** Oh very bad, very bad, because I didn’t want it to be about me.

As the placement progressed and Helen’s teaching performance did not improve, she was shifted to work with two other teachers, because Renee felt that she was not able to assist the student (who, she felt, would not listen to her). Helen still failed to make progress and was finally awarded an “incomplete” grade which required her to do another placement. However, Renee vividly recalled university staff coming to her school some weeks after the placement, to request professional experience placements for the following year. She remembered being appalled:

*And the first thing that the woman said was, “Look I know that there has been some problems [here] I know that there was ONE that you’ve just had where there was personality conflict but, you know, ... come on take student teachers.” And I sat there thinking, “You’re telling the whole staff that it was a personality conflict between me and this young woman?” Well, professionally I wouldn’t allow it - a personality conflict. It wasn’t a personality conflict. She couldn’t teach. When I complained to them and said, “What do you mean?” they said, “Oh wrong choice of words. Sorry, Sorry. It was her personality that was the problem, not yours.”*

The university staff in this instance gave no public affirmation that their judgement or procedures might have been flawed. In situations such as this the university was exercising power to position the teacher and/or the preservice teacher as deficient and in
doing so attempted to maintain their position of authority and privilege in the process. I argue that these teachers were not treated as equals in the preservice teacher education enterprise; in these stories, they appear not to have even been treated with respect.

As I indicated earlier, Annette tore up the “blank” report that had come back from the university. While this is a form of resistance by Annette, it is “silent” resistance in that the university never received the message that it could be construed as professionally insulting to request the teacher make a grade change. Nor were they forced to consider that it could be seen as inappropriate to call into question the initial grade in such an impersonal manner as simply sending a new blank form, without any personal or professional conversation with Annette to outline the reason for the request. Her silence never forced the university to question their behaviour, so that ultimately she colluded in positioning herself as less powerful.

At the time that I was attempting to make sense of the teachers’ stories, I encountered some moments of crisis of confidence in relation to my project. I was unsure of the direction it was taking and the methods I had finally chosen to employ. I was reading an article by Gregson and Rose (2000) that addressed the issue of performativity and reflexivity in research processes, particularly in terms of “belonging” (and how academics often perform as if they are ‘intentional, knowing anterior subjects; able to interpret and represent a vast range of social practices for academic audiences to interpret in turn, yet themselves are somehow immune” (p. 447).) – I knew I could not be immune from the meaning I was making in my work. I then asked the question, “Is this what I had to do to become an insider?” I felt very much like an outsider trying to become an insider by obtaining my doctorate. With colleagues, I examined the nature of the doctoral student as “learner”; and I read more literature around the notion of “outsider” and of the doubleness of the project as it related to my own learning. As a consequence of this reflective reading, I came to believe that not only were these teachers not treated as equals, but they were actually treated as outsiders, as marginalised others. It was at this point I decided to take a further research step to return to the field and ask my participants how they felt they were positioned in the teacher education enterprise.
Follow-up

As my interpretation of the narratives led me to the notion of outsider/insider, I chose to use that explicit language in my follow-up questions to the teachers. The results of this stage of my inquiry are presented below.

Alison had been a member of her local university’s professional experience management group, so had access to information through that network. However, her comments suggested that this position was not sufficient to enable her to take up the privileged position of insider. She remarked that:

*I think that mentoring/supervising teachers are positioned outside of teacher education. On many occasions, mentoring teachers are not given the practicum information booklet until halfway through the practicum and are only given a week’s notice (if that) to prepare for a preservice teacher. Mentors/supervising teachers are on the whole are left out of the planning and timing of practicum experience. I really feel that we are the “others” and the “unknown variable” in teacher education. How to change this I am not sure but I think greater communication and inclusion would be a start. ... [her university] does have a practicum experience committee where primary and secondary school representatives included. Before I went on leave I was the secondary school representative on this committee and I also was a part of many working parties investigating the relationship between [University] and the schools. Whilst being a member of these committees I felt my concerns were valued and included. Even though I had been a mentor a number of times, I don’t think I would have felt included in the teacher education process had I not been on these committees. Before being on these committees I often wondered what the uni was teaching the students and felt it would be good to know what the preservice teacher had covered at uni so that I could contextualise my information and feedback.*

Sylvia had similar views to those of Alison but had not had the opportunity of participating in a professional experience committee. When I asked her if she felt like an outsider, she replied:

*Sylvia: I definitely feel more of an outsider, rather than insider, of the Uni community. Rather like an out-sourced factory worker! The only contact I have is usually once a year for an inservice of school-based teacher educators at the beginning of each year at the Uni (after school) – but that hasn’t happened this year. We are not even notified personally by Uni of when the lecturer is to visit to observe the preservice teacher (Just an e-mail would be enough). Last year, the observing lecturer ’didn’t have time’ to discuss the preservice teacher (Graduate Diploma of Ed) with me following the observation session. Just a ‘How’s it going?’ would have been nice.*

W: Where would you like to be positioned by the university?
Sylvia: They should be more in the loop with [the university] and ... I would like pracs to be portrayed more positively by Uni staff. Preservice teachers should view them as chances to try out new methods and skills & ‘show off’ within a safe & supportive environment. Unfortunately, I feel that many see pracs as ‘artificial’, ‘hard work’ and just another ‘test’ to be passed/endured ... and poor communication is an area where the university lets itself down...

Likewise Bryce had similar feelings about his relationship to the university and their programs:

Bryce: The uni dumps preservice teachers on us; there isn’t a lot of consultation, they are just churning through their graduates, it’s just a business, the quality isn’t important, it’s the quantity of teachers they can push through their program.
W: How would you want to be positioned in the program?
Bryce: Be valued, have the uni have consequences for preservice teachers that are not up to standard.
W: Do you feel that the university sees you as an important part of the preservice teaching program and how do they let you know.
Bryce: I think the uni thinks we are important, because without us they wouldn’t get all their students through their program. Whether that equates to professional courtesy?? I think they just expect that we will take them on...
How do I know that they appreciate us?? Well they send us a nice letter at the end of the year. And they pay us. But they do not support their preservice teachers in the school, they might come and see them once in 4 weeks, so there is not a lot of involvement or support in that area.

Bryce is highlighting a range of issues associated with the design and delivery of teacher education programs in the universities covered by this study and the associated discourses. There exists in the discursive practices of universities and schools a perception that teachers will take on the task of supporting preservice teachers in their site-based placements, which are being conducted in a climate of diminishing resources. These resources, both monetary and embodied/personal, impact on the levels of engagement that are possible between school and university staff. Universities ‘churn’ students through their engagement with teachers that positions them as receivers of production-line goods. Typically teachers have very little input into the design of site-based teacher education programs but are expected to participate. There appeared also to be an absence of recognition that school-based teacher educators are a vitally important element in preservice education and their needs, opinions and emotional experiences should not be dismissed or sidelined.
I have commented previously on the highly reflexive nature of this research and at the point where I began writing this thesis for the purposes of submission, I revisited much of the interpretation and writing previously undertaken, with a set of lenses, informed by new ways of “reading” the texts. I noted with interest that I had originally labelled “University programs, procedures, protocols and documentation” as external conditions – conditions that I felt at the time were “beyond the control of the teachers”. As I re-searched the draft text, I had the opportunity to reflect on that interpretation and realised that it is only one interpretation (and a very narrow one, at that). I am aware now that there are other interpretations. For example, it is worth considering that when site based teacher educators take up subject positions associated with supporting a preservice teacher, knowing that they have not been provided with significant systematic preparation, they position themselves not only as lacking power but as also subject to the discourse norms of the university. By taking up such a hegemonic discourse, the teachers reproduce the “regime of truth” which permits the university to continue to exercise power in site-based teacher education. However, these teachers are positioned to feel that they are to some extent responsible for the outcome of the programs, especially for the preservice teacher and their own students – that they are accountable.

ACCOUNTABILITY

As I have argued throughout this chapter teachers’ emotional experiences are to some extent constructed by a discourse of accountability that is pervasive within the school and university context. There are a range of different sections of the narratives that I have interpreted as belonging quite explicitly to an ‘accountability’ discourse and these are presented in the following sections.

The teachers in this study were anxious to know if they had done “a good job”. For example they indicated that they wanted to receive feedback from the university; they also typically “assessed” their own professional competence, often in terms of the preservice teacher’s success or otherwise; they were concerned about colleagues’ perceptions of their support of the preservice teacher. They were also conscious of impediments to their own student’s progress. These are all different kinds of accountability, where different discursive practices are operating.
I have previously noted the absence of formal preparation for the program. Similarly, the teachers’ stories indicated there were no formal procedures for providing feedback to the site-based teacher educators, although some universities did provide an opportunity for teachers to provide feedback to them, via a form included in the documentation. It could be suggested that universities are somewhat hypocritical when they ask the teachers to make the effort to provide feedback to them in order to assist them to improve “their end of the deal” but then fail to reciprocate by providing feedback to the teachers. The site-based teacher educators explained that they wanted to know if they had satisfactorily supported the preservice teachers, particularly as these preservice teachers were unsuccessful. Sylvia indicated that she received a certificate at the end of the year but there was no feedback in relation to the management of the specific problematic preservice teacher. The teachers’ comments suggested that the feedback would have (re)assured them that the preservice teacher’s lack of success was not their fault, thereby ameliorating any associated feelings of guilt. Guilt can also be attached to ‘the gatekeeper’ discourse – the need for teachers to protect the integrity of the profession by ensuring that only preservice teachers of quality are awarded passing grades for professional placements. Sarah’s comments are typical of the views expressed by teachers in this study. She noted that:

*I can try to help people and that’s what I see myself here doing as an associate [teacher]. We need teachers. We need good teachers. More to the point, I want to help with that. By the same token, I don’t want to let people in to this profession who aren’t going to help the kids.*

Protecting the profession can come at a cost, which is borne by the teachers. They might experience guilt when they take such a stand. Lyndall described feelings of guilt that were associated with her need to stand firm on her assessment of Bob:

*There’s a lot of guilt tied up with me over the whole thing because it was kind of his last chance to make this career change and I was what was stopping him. So that was that guilt thing. On a personal level, I was feeling bad for him because he was a likable person [...] And that was the other thing, if I’d thrown my hands in the air and thought this guy’s useless, then I would’ve had a lot more guilt, I think. But because I decided to really work hard on this particular thing it was like ..., it was like a failure for me too. You know, I set a goal to really try to get this guy past the first stage and into the second stage of his internship but it just didn’t happen. It wasn’t, it wasn’t me. I know that.’*

Lyndall’s comments indicate how she dealt with the sense of failure that many teachers feel when the preservice teacher is unable to successfully meet the expectations of the
program. Several teachers indicated that they needed to know that neither the university nor the preservice teacher would be able to cast aspersions on their reputation by suggesting they were incompetent as a site-based teacher educator.

Sylvia described her interactions with two difficult preservice teachers, one after the other, and was anxious that the university thought it was her fault that the students had failed. She recalled that her only feedback was that they ‘knew the student was difficult’ and promised her a ‘handpicked one’ in the future. Natalie was also concerned that her school would ‘get a reputation’ if there was any unresolved conflict between the school and the university following her refusal to alter a preservice teacher’s grade:

- **Natalie**: I said I just don’t want it to be left as if there was some kind of conflict or anything like that between the school and the university, or him, because I said, “It’s all there for – it’s all documented,” and you know, “it’s him doing the wrong thing not us.”
- W: Mmm
- **Natalie**: .. and I just want to make sure that it doesn’t go down like “Oh, [school name] is a bad school to send people to,” you know, that kind of thing.

It would appear that a “feedback” phone call, letter or email could alleviate much anxiety for these teachers.

Alison did take the initiative to ask the university about the provision of feedback to teachers in relation to the quality of the support they provided to the preservice teachers. A university staff member indicated to Alison that they were reluctant to do so because of the shortage of teachers willing to take on the responsibility of school-based teacher educator. When I asked about feedback, she said:

- **Alison**: …. I have actually suggested to them re the problem of finding school-based teacher educators [because] – they’ve had quite a lot of problems with, um, final year students failing this year,... I said, “Well, we need to be more accountable. We need to know if we have done the wrong thing”. ... And they said, “How do you think that will go down because we’re struggling to find places anyway?” So they’re trying to avoid that thing of having a criteria or setting a standard because they can’t find enough places. So the standard of the supervising teacher is basically who’s willing to put their hand up.

In this situation the university staff appear to be less able to exercise power in terms of the selection of school-based teacher educators to work with preservice teachers. They relied on schools to make appropriate decisions in the allocation of teachers to the
position of school-based teacher educator. While universities effectively employ these teachers as school-based teacher educators (because they remunerate them for their work) the responsibility for the actual selection of the teacher for the role resided with the school’s executive. Such a situation exacerbated the teachers’ need for feedback. While it was the university and its preservice teachers with whom they work, it was school policy that determined if they were given the opportunity. Consequently the teachers were left dangling between two different masters and their interest in feedback was not addressed by either the school executive or the university.

When the relationship between school and university staff was such that the teacher received what they believed to be effective support from the university there appeared to be less pressure and resultant stress and emotional cost to the teacher. Steve, for example, had a very good working relationship with the professional experience coordinator at his local university. The university colleague held similar views to his in relation to supporting preservice teachers and was someone he felt he could contact at any time:

**Steve:** Well, I’ve got a ... most of the time that I have worked with the [Names university] where I’ve had [names university colleague] as my university contact. And we just got on like a house on fire and we’ve both got this same positive attitude. We’re here to help them through it. And if we’ve got a group or even one there that’s having trouble she will react like me - very level. We’re here to try and help you get through this.

A number of participants described taking detailed notes of episodes with their preservice teacher. Consequently, they were able to rely on these notes to support their position in relation to the assessment. Their narratives indicated that they saw this as a resource, a support mechanism to pre-empt possible questioning of their competence as site based teacher educators. For example, Alison and Therese both talked of concern about being seen as incompetent in their support of their preservice teacher. Alison kept a journal of her interactions with her preservice teacher.

**Alison:** Well I thought there might have been a formal complaint about my supervision; about my, ... whether I was a competent site-based teacher educator or not, so that’s why I thought I’d just document that, or whatever. So I could say what I had done in order to help this girl.

Therese recalled her worries over the repercussions of Neil’s failure but her support mechanism was a reliance on some of her colleagues, whom she talked to in relation to Neil’s behaviours, because she was concerned:
**Therese**: Then I thought he might go around and defame my name and saying she was a stupid bitch. “She didn’t do this for me” and “she didn’t do that”, or what not, which is unfair. I tried with him and that’s why I got so upset when they shafted him.

According to Natalie, documentation was a very important resource in addressing issues associated with grading appeals. Nigel had asserted that Natalie had failed to provide sufficient support. Initially Nigel had requested a change of setting, which was denied but which resulted in Natalie experiencing extreme anxiety. She remembered

**Natalie**: I felt, I felt really awful. My heart was racing when [Head Teacher] sort of told me about this and I thought, “Oh what have I done?” you know. And he said, “Oh no”. He actually said that, “You didn’t do anything wrong”…. And, um, I still felt um BAD - like a failure in a way, you know, in that we couldn’t get this person to see the other side of it and that he felt that he was just going to take the easy way out and going to leave. And I was angry - really I think I was more angry after the first shock sort of thing.

W: How did you deal with your anger?

**Natalie**: Um, I just can’t remember what I did. I suppose I suppose I just sort of let it go, you know. I’ve got high blood pressure and I thought, “this is not good”. I sort of just say, “Well OK what do I do?”[...] It just goes after a while and I try and calm myself down and say, “Look, if it it’s nothing to do with me personally…”

The university indicated to Natalie that they were satisfied that Nigel had been ably supported and wanted to ignore the request. However, Natalie recalled that she was adamant that she be allowed to respond to his accusations. She recounted that she had very detailed documentation to support her assertions. However, she remembered the event as extremely trying:

**Natalie**: I said, “No, I want to respond to this. I don’t want to just let it go as was suggested. And so NO, that’s wrong. I’m not having this. This is against me,” um, so I actually wrote a response. Again, you know, agonised for hours and hours. So many drafts and all this. All the time that this took; I was a bit resentful at the time that I had to do this but I felt that I couldn’t do anything else. So I wrote this response to the university and, um, it was so good because I had all my notes you know. I was so thankful that I had all these notes. So I took it point by point and said that this and then sort of responded to that.

Bryce described how he also used his detailed report as a buffer between his anger and the criticism that his expectations were “too high” and that he had not provided his student with sufficient support.
It is understandable that teachers would adopt such a position as schools are typically sites where such accountability discourses are very powerful. Interspersed with these stories about preservice teachers were numerous references to being accountable for aspects of “normal” school life, such as the need to complete particular learning tasks with the children, finalising reports and preparing for teacher interviews. All of these are part of an accountability discourse that constitutes a significant part of the lives of these teachers.

When the teachers took up the discourse of “gatekeeper” they were responding to an accountability discourse – professional accountability. Lyndall described how supporting Bob had taken an enormous amount of energy and effort on her part as she attempted to assist him on his internship in her class. She found out part way through the program that he had failed his previous attempt at the internship. However, she recalled that even though this was his second try, he was just never going to make a teacher. She described his disorganisation, that he never took her advice, lacked important social skills, refused to teach maths, never planned anything, did not meet deadlines, etc. It was a draining experience and she indicated that she finally expressed her dissatisfaction with his performance:

Lyndall: Yes, I did ... um, right at the end. Because I just felt, I asked myself two questions - would I want this man teaching my children and the answer would have been an overwhelming NO. Would I want to teach with this guy and that was even stronger. Then I got angry because he kept saying, “We’ll I’ll do this and I’ll do that and I’ll...” And I said, [Bob] you don’t get it. You are never going to teach”. They were the words that came out of my mouth. And [the Deputy Principal] was sitting there and she was going “Lyndall, Lyndall” and I’m saying, “I’m really frustrated now. I can’t get my message across any clearer in a nice way, you know.” And he was looking at me as though this was all so new to him. Like “What are you saying? I’m not going to teach?” It was like this light came on and he suddenly realised that this was the end of the line for him. And I felt terrible, like I was “Oh my God.” But it’s not going to happen...

In a different situation, Steve had established a good relationship with university staff. He drew on his knowledge of university protocols to ensure that he had addressed all essential areas when supporting his preservice teacher, particularly the protocols associated with a preservice teacher who failed to meet expected outcomes. Further, he asserted that he was unemotional about his work with preservice teachers and that maintaining professional integrity was important:
W: Can you tell me about the process you adopt when the student is failing the placement.
Steve: Now, me being a structured person, um, the person at university [names her] - knows that I will cross every T and dot every I. And I do things by the book and I’m very unemotional about it.
W: Ah that’s interesting. Can you tell me what you mean by that?
Steve: No I, I, me personally, I’m a very positive person who goes through life and has no negative emotions. When it comes to doing jobs that’s what it is - it’s doing a job. You’ve got to keep it very down, straight down the line. So with Yeah, but Ejani was probably my one where the legalities of it and he was using the system but I had to, to make sure I followed everything right down the line. And you’ve got to keep it completely unemotional.
[...]
Steve: Yeah Yeah. It’s just me and in rationalizing your own brain like, he’ll put this emotional thing - you know, “I can’t become a teacher”; you know. “I’m not going to have a job”, but I see the other side.

While the teachers are keen for positive assessments from the university or colleagues they are often harsh critics of their own behaviour. As indicated earlier, a number of teachers felt that their inability to make the “hard” decision to fail their preservice teacher was a sign of weakness. I argue that when the site-based teacher educators assessed these performances and found that they needed to be ‘tougher’ or ‘harder’ or ‘not so weak’, they were engaging in a discourse of accountability. They were caught between the “good teacher” discourse of care and nurture and the emerging, intersecting and to some extent competing discourse of accountability. Consequently, their experiences of the intersecting discourses here were particularly painful – they were ashamed of their weakness. Bartky (1990) defined shame as “the distressed comprehension of the self as inadequate or diminished: it requires if not an actual audience before whom my deficiencies are paraded, then an internalised audience with a capacity to judge me” (p. 86). Even if nobody else judged the teachers’ shame, they certainly judged themselves.

CONCLUSION
So what are the implications of these different discourses operating in schools? Why is it important for us to understand that a “good teacher” discourse makes the role of a site-based teacher educator more difficult? How does the knowledge/power discourse position teachers as outsiders inside teacher education? And why is it that a discourse on emotions is silenced in schools and universities? The intention of this chapter was to lay bare the voices of the teachers who participated in this study. What I chose for the
reader is clearly a construction of what is important to me as a researcher and teacher educator. Others might have chosen different sections of text with different interpretations. However, I think it is evident that the situation for teachers involved in site-based teacher education is complex and made even more complex and more emotionally demanding when the preservice teacher, with whom they establish a working, if not personal relationship, struggles for success. The complexity is certainly associated with the multiple and intersecting discourses operating in and between schools and universities. The following chapter explores the narratives and my “reading” of them in greater depth and in relation to the literature associated with emotions and these discursive frames.
CHAPTER 5

RE-READING DISCOURSE

“The function of research is not necessarily command and conquer the world but to sophisticate the beholding of it.” (Stake, 1995)

OUTLINE

In this chapter I will argue that the discursive practices in and between schools and universities, engaged in the co-production of a new teacher, have significant emotional implications for the production of the subjectivities of site-based teacher educators. I delineate the discursive field in which they operate, with specific attention to the impact on the emotional well-being of site-based teacher educators dealing with an unsuccessful preservice teacher. This chapter will explore three of the major discourses in which teachers and teacher educators working in preservice teacher education are positioned and which emerged from the teachers’ narratives during the interviews conducted for this study. While the interviews presented a much wider source of interpretable information, I focus on those aspects of their narratives that fall into the broad discursive frames associated with the contexts of schools, schooling and initial teacher education. As I indicated in the previous chapter, where the larger data corpus was presented and described with less interference from my lenses of interpretation, I have labelled these discourses as:

- Expectations of a good teacher
- Knowledge, power and “othering”
- Accountability

Without a doubt these discourses are circulatory such that knowledge/power is linked to notions of the good teacher, who is assessed and normalised in an accountability discourse. Accordingly, the reader will find discussions of each intermingled throughout this next chapter.

INTRODUCTION

Emotions are an important form of communication between individuals. They are not reactions to the world but are constructions of it, such that to understand an emotion it is necessary to understand what it is about. It is through their emotions that individuals
constitute themselves, project their values and pass judgments on themselves and other people, situations and various objects in which they have invested interest. Emotions tell us who we are – they are about the self as the body produces the feel of one’s personal subjectivity and the place of the self in the world. They are complex constructs influenced by learning, interpretation and social interactions arising as ‘subjectivity is continually formed in and through interactions with others’ (Schmidt, 2000, p. 29). The emotions experienced by the participating teachers were constructs of social interactions with their preservice teachers, their colleagues, families and the university staff involved in the teacher education programs.

This chapter presents my “reading” of the teachers’ narratives in terms of these three often competing and intersecting discourses, in which the teachers are positioned as more (or less) powerful subjects, and in which they operate in relation to preservice teacher placement. Discourses embody meaning and social relations and as such, they constitute both subjectivity and power relations (Ball, 1990) by assigning authority to certain thoughts, actions and words, hence privileging certain speakers over others. So how do the discourses of good teacher, knowledge/power and accountability impact on the emotions and subjectivities of site-based teacher educators? According to Davies (1990), ‘educational institutions are places where above all others, the tensions/contradictions between being an individual and being a member of various collectives is played out’ (p. 344). The question then is how do teachers manage, negotiate and display their emotions in social interactions in schools and in this case, with university staff? Do they have choices in these places and spaces, and are these choices legitimate in terms of their positioning in the discourses? While Weedon (1987) argued that there is always choice, the discursive practices of schools are such that some choices are privileged over others and what choices there are, are limited. To choose an option that is seen as “abnormal” would potentially result in the teacher being marginalised. The manner in which teachers express their emotions and discuss their emotional experiences are constrained by their need to be seen as “normal”.

EXPECTATIONS OF THE GOOD TEACHER

I have chosen the term “expectation” because that is the word that was frequently used by the site-based teacher educators when they referred to their preservice teachers’ contributions, capacities, demeanours and the like, when involved in a site-based
placement as well as how they describe their relationship with university programs and staff. Good teachers, especially those who take on the role of site-based teacher educator are expected to be ‘a “model” of dedication to the profession … [who] helps the trainee to achieve his/her professional developmental goals’ (Zuljan & Vogrinc, 2007, p. 374). “Expectation” becomes a discourse because it is seen to be normative and privileged as appropriate. What follows here is a closer look at the discourses (competing and complementary) that construct and are reproduced in school/university interactions of professional experience in relation to the good teacher.

Competing discourses - Carer and/or Assessor

Schools are complex social sites where teachers operate from a number of different subject position, participating in and producing a variety of discourses (Alsup, 2005) some of which are intersecting and competing. The discourse of caring/nurturing is powerful in the construction of teachers’ subjectivities (Clandinin et al., 2009). According to Forrester (2005), ‘the “caring” or “mothering” aspect accompanying the teaching of young children has long been recognised as a significant dimension for primary teachers’ social and professional identity’ (p. 273). I have argued that site-based teachers similarly understand their work with preservice teachers as supportive and nurturing (Beck & Kosnik, 2000) even when they include responsibilities for assessment. At times in the mentoring process, the discourse of caring appears to contradict and compete with the requirement of the site-based teacher educator to be the assessor – the critic (Martin, 1996). This can result in difficult emotional and professional episodes for the teachers involved. There are limited opportunities in traditional schools for teachers to develop the disposition and capacity to enhance their professional knowledge through observation and critique (Day & Sachs, 2004), so site-based teacher educators often struggle with the tensions that are created in these situations.

There is a notion that a professional ideal in teaching requires teachers to keep an emotional distance from students in their classes, as evidenced by research from the United Kingdom, where school reform agendas focus on learning outcomes and “objectivity”. However, there is an enduring and accepted discourse of “good teaching” where kindness and encouragement is normalised and thus approved (Brighouse, 2008). This approval may depend on who is the “observer/listener”, such that school
administrators or university staff may prefer that teachers are “distant” and objective, while colleagues, parents and preservice teachers might value a caring disposition. However, the behaviour and emotional expression of site-based teacher educators is often defined by the needs of preservice teachers in terms of professional institutional responsibility. Given that many of the site-based teacher educators in this study appeared to engage in a discourse with their preservice teachers which positioned the latter as pupil/child, it is not surprising that the teachers attempted to manage their emotional expressions with the preservice teachers in the same manner as with their own students. Being the adult to the preservice “child”, ‘always looking for positives’, ‘catching them doing something right’, ‘being nice’ and looking for “strengths” in the preservice teacher’s work are examples of the nurturing/caring discourse of teacher’s work.

When it comes to the task of assessment and associated conflict with caring, Bullough and Draper (2004b) found that mentors feared being too harsh in their criticism of their students and feared offending them. Teacher educators, who choose to avoid negatively evaluating or providing challenging feedback, do so because they feel that it is too emotionally stressful both for themselves and for their preservice teachers. The teachers in this study also suggested that care had to be taken when giving feedback and they attempted to do this in a hopeful and positive manner. Such responses are reflected in other “caring” professions as well (Ilott & Murphy, 1997), and nurse educators have been shown to pass unsatisfactory students because the personal sense of failure, guilt and blame associated with their students’ failure subverted their judgments. These issues will be addressed further, later in this chapter.

Individuals experience discomfort when they try to perform two acts at once, such as when they attempt to negotiate the competing discourses of caring and assessing. Bullough and Draper (2004a) asserted that teachers find this challenging because they see these responsibilities as oppositional (p. 282). Even in situations where teachers are able to work within the conflicting discourses of critique and support, negative emotional outcomes can be significant. For example, although Lyndall did not avoid the seeming “unpleasantness” of failing her preservice colleague (she was determined that Bob was unsuited to teaching and was not going to enter the profession) she experienced great anxiety and stress while fighting the university system in relation to this assessment. Her strong subjective position as a teacher professional enabled her to
challenge the caring/nurturing discourse of looking for positives and avoiding conflict, by choosing to fail Bob and subsequently confronting the university staff who told her it was not her place to do so. At times such as these, when there is dissonance in the relationship between neophyte and teacher, the university can play a vital role. Elliott (1995) asserted that there is scope to develop a theoretical perspective that would assist staff to find the most appropriate ways in which to intervene in a relationship when criticism is needed for enhanced learning to occur (p. 262). It is important that the site-based teacher educators and preservice teacher are provided with appropriate support so that they are readily able to resolve these feelings of discomfort that arise when an individual is “challenged”.

What needs to be recognised here is that the discourse of carer/nurturer is often the only “story” that is typically available to teachers and so they attempt to fit their lives into these available stories (Tracy, 2000). The discourse of carer/nurturer is a “taken-for-granted” practice which paradoxically can result in significant negative emotional effects, as described in Chapter 4. If the stakeholders in teacher education can make sense of why site-based teacher educators find it difficult to fail preservice teachers then it may be possible to provide support to enable them to confront and challenge associated negative stereotypes, particularly those associated with failure. Such understanding could ‘reduce the incidence of avoidance or ‘failure to fail’ and support assessors in their role as gatekeepers of professional practice’ (Ilott & Murphy, 1997, p. 314). These researchers suggest that there needs to be opportunity and support for individuals to develop an understanding that these predictable or “normal” emotional experiences could offer an ‘assurance of universality’ i.e. it is not just you, during these difficult periods of site-based education (p. 309). It would appear sensible to make public the predictability and significance of the emotional dimension of site-based education to all participants – regardless of their place in the triad.

While there are expectations that the site-based teacher educators have of themselves, there are clearly expectations that the university has of the site-based teacher educators, particularly in relation to their capacity to support the preservice teacher (professionally and personally) and work collaboratively with the university appointed staff. I will address the issue of discursive practices associated with this aspect later in this chapter.
Emotion regulation as an expectation of the “good teacher”

Social hierarchies in any institution are established through unspoken emotional rules and teachers appropriate guidelines or display rules according to cultural standards of how, when and where to express particular emotions. The narratives of the teachers in this study appear to indicate that they block their emotional expression. It is not that they do not feel anything; rather they do not let others (preservice teachers particularly) know when and how deeply they feel certain emotions such anger, frustration, guilt, and similar. They do this by silencing their emotions.

I have argued that the participant teachers’ belief that they must maintain emotional control as “professionals”, is a social construction, in that they have learnt that there will be limited, if any, uptake of their emotions so they silence them before they can be expressed. Campbell (1994) suggested that the public expression (and uptake) of emotions is what constructs our emotional life. When an emotion is not taken up by the listener it is effectively thrown back on the speaker, thus constructing it as a problem. For example, Annette chose to ‘bin’ the request by university staff for her to regrade her preservice teacher, Susan, rather than express her obvious displeasure over the university’s disregard of her original assessment by confronting university staff. Similarly, Emily did not question university staff about why the supervisor had accessed her personal files and used them to position her assessment as inappropriate. These examples indicate that the teachers have learnt that expressing their “anger” or “annoyance” or “hurt” in the context of schooling would not be productive. However, by not expressing their emotions these teachers ultimately collude in their own positioning as subjects who have less power than university staff. Jacques (1992) noted that teachers collaborate in avoiding painful issues of tension, such that a conspiracy of silence is required and is constructed as normal. If teacher identity is constructed in the body, through emotions as well as actions, it would seem logical that managing emotions according to institutional norms implies that teachers are involved in situations of power. In other words, maintaining appropriate behaviours comes to be seen as reinforcing the power of certain rules or norms (Zembylas, 2003b), so “faking” being warm and positive when feeling otherwise can potentially lead to an alienation of a teacher’s working life and their “preferred self”. This, in turn, can lead to anxiety, despair and lower self-concept (Winograd, 2003).

My study indicates that while teachers manage and negotiate their emotions with respect to their preservice teacher, most are more likely to display their emotions to
colleagues, who appear to be a very important element in their capacity to cope in these situations. However, schools are sites where emotional dynamics may be unpredictable and shared meanings of emotions can not be always assumed. Therese felt the ‘disapproval of her colleagues’ when she “lost control” of her emotions with her preservice teacher, Neil. As a consequence, her personal admonition and the shame she felt in relation to her colleagues was palpable. Therese’s colleagues’ response and her subsequent emotions can be “explained” because her anger is labelled as an inappropriate response in a profession that has caring and support as “stable” aspects considered as “virtuous” in a teacher. Consequently, anger is to be denied. However, the discourses that construct virtue and caring as appropriate lead to the containment of women’s emotions and maintain their status as subordinate (Winograd, 2003).

When the site-based teacher educators constitute the university as the controller of the program they simultaneously constitute themselves as not being in control. The behaviour they choose, which by all accounts is “normal” is in fact constrained because when the teachers do express their feelings (as happened in Therese’s case) they have limited access to a “normal” identity. When the university dismisses the extreme emotional stress that results from a poorly performing preservice teacher as merely a ‘personality conflict’, as in Renee’s case, they are dismissing Renee’s felt emotions, as well as negating her attempts at agency in the triad while maintaining their own position as the most powerful member. An important issue here is the need for teachers to be aware of the constitutive forces of discursive practices and the possibilities for resisting or challenging practices by universities, which I am suggesting are, at times, unacceptable.

Do teachers have access to alternative discursive practices and the capacity to mobilise them or to be able to explicitly refuse them in an agentic fashion (Davies, 1990)? As mentioned previously, teachers are often unaware of the power relations inherently associated with the discourses that shape their work. If teachers can recognise the implications of their practice, either as a speaker or listener, there is a possibility for them to refuse a particular discourse or their positioning within it. ‘It also depends on whether there is choice amongst the discursive practices’ which then would allow the individual to position herself as agentic (Davies, 1990, p. 359).
Further Silencing

Not only did the teachers describe incidences where they had silenced their emotions when dealing with preservice teachers, colleagues and university staff, they also silenced their emotional experiences when talking to me. They were all reluctant or hesitant to make “public” to me/through me their felt emotions when recounting their work with the preservice teacher and university colleague. As an interviewer, I felt the need to “drill down” with the teachers to provide them with a context/opportunity where they could talk openly and name their emotional experiences. Individuals who keep their emotionality from themselves and from one another consequently “[fail] to reveal their deeper meanings to themselves” (Denzin, 1984, p. 159).

While much will be said about the management of emotions within the context of interactions with the preservice teachers and university staff, what also needs to be interrogated is my interpretation of the teachers’ apparent reticence to talk about the emotional dimension of their experience with a problematic preservice teacher. According to Fivush (2004), discourse provides a filter through which we come to understand our lives and ourselves, because it enables us to focus on specific aspects of experience while silencing other aspects, such that the degree to which emotions/experiences are voiced or silenced will impact on an individual’s ability to develop an integrated identity (p. 23). Similarly, Harding (1995) in her work on standpoint theory, asserted that it is important for teachers (as a marginalised group) to name their own experiences in order to claim their subjectivity and the possibility of historical agency (p. 128). Accordingly, I felt that it was important to encourage the teachers to talk in relation to their emotional experiences. For an individual to be fully aware of the cause of emotion requires a reflection on their belief system (Boler, 1997) – and the use of storying can potentially provide opportunities for such reflection. Zembylas (2003a) stated that it could be empowering for teachers if they are given the opportunity to talk about their emotional experiences. Certainly the teachers in this study each indicated that they appreciated the opportunity to tell their story and many expressed surprise that I was interested in hearing it. They were unused to expressing or even talking about their emotional responses to other people in the workplace.

I suspect that much of the reticence to talk openly about their emotional/painful experiences is closely related to the isolationist nature of many schools. School culture typically encourages teachers to teach in isolation with the belief in their own autonomy
and to draw upon their personal resources. Collaboration is often associated with congruence of thinking or in activities that are not likely to produce negative emotions. If any teacher sees themself as lacking agency, then it is easier for them to place blame, and constrain their feelings rather than analyse the situation to see whether systemic issues at, say, the school level have constructed the emotionally difficult situation. It is worth noting that when these teachers, who may have experienced extreme anger, frustration or hurt in relation to university staff and preservice teachers, actually expressed their feelings to me in the interview, it was typically little more than a grumble of annoyance. When anger is always restrained and guarded it ultimately ‘prevents the woman/teacher from using the emotion as a vehicle for action in social justice’ (Winograd, 2003, p. 1669) and her silence hides the problems in the system (Boler, 1997; Hochschild, 1983). Unfortunately, when the teachers spoke of their guilt and shame in relation to their own behaviour, it was not a guarded but rather was a full blown response – they appeared to find it much easier to blame and consequently punish themselves than place the blame elsewhere.

While there are certain expectations of the “good” site-based educator, in professional experience situations, there are also expectations of the “good” preservice teacher. In those situations where a preservice teacher is failing, the preservice teacher is generally not what the teacher “expects”. The following section explores the discourses associated with the site-based teacher educators’ expectations of their preservice teacher.

**Expectations of the good preservice teacher**

According to Phelan, Sawa, Barlow, Hurlock, Irvine, Rogers and Myrick (2006), the teaching profession is characterised by a ‘culture of sameness’ where individuals share the common task of teaching, according to a common standard, and beginners to the profession are legitimately inculcated into the “sameness” by experienced professionals through the operation of power (p. 176). Similarly, Courneya, Pratt and Collins (2008) argued that teachers evaluate others through the lens of their own experiences and so tend to look for their own practices in the manner in which the preservice teacher, whom they are observing/supporting, goes about their teaching. Such a situation exists because typically teachers see their own performance as normative and agreeable and are often unaware of the effects of their subjective position as constructed within and by the discourses of schooling. According to Hamacheck (1999) teachers ‘consciously
teach what [they] know; unconsciously, [they] teach who [they] are’ (p. 209). Importantly, these teachers are unaware of the processes that have created and continue to create their subjective positions – the processes are largely invisible and thus uncontested. It could be argued that they are similarly unaware of the discursive practices through which preservice teachers are constituted by the university and the school. As I have argued in Chapter 4, it appears obvious that the making of the “good teacher” commences during professional experience, and that site-based education, where preservice teachers are expected to work collaboratively with experienced teachers is a ‘complex discursive and interactive space’ (Davies, 2007, p. 32). The following section is my interpretation of the teachers’ expectation of the preservice teacher as a unitary, fixed individual.

**Preservice teacher knowledge**

Preservice teachers need to balance their previous knowledge of schools with new forms of knowledge construction as presented by their university or by the school in which they undertake their professional placement (Mills & Satterthwait, 2000). They have spent many years as students in schools and these histories/biographies shape their beliefs about teaching and learning. Their ‘deceptively familiar’ knowledge (Kalekin-Fishman & Kornfeld, 1991, p. 151) and their beliefs may be at odds with what they are presented in their initial teacher education course (Korthagen, 2004). Further, in situations where they are being judged as “competent”, preservice teachers’ reflections of a “good teacher” are typically shaped by managerial and technicist discourses which draw:

> them away from concerns with the social justice, with humour, with close relationships between students and teachers and with issues focused upon the emotional dimension of teaching to a position concerned with management, outcomes, strategies and the like, all of which involve rational decision-making (Davies 2007, p. 30).

As previously noted, preservice teachers who do not get the normative managerial or “good teacher” discourse right are often seen as deficient, while those who reproduce the discourse are seen as legitimate contenders for acceptance by the profession. Preservice teachers who become involved in school life and demonstrate a commitment that mirrors the site-based teacher educator’s expectation are assessed more favourably than if they enact a discourse that does not resonate well with professional norms. The ways in which preservice teachers can come to know the ‘discourse of schooling’ in operation in a particular site has a significant impact on the preservice teacher as well as
the site-based teacher educator. “Fitting in” is important, as teachers and school administrators may use the professional placement as an opportunity to assess whether a preservice teacher ‘importantly … fit[s] into the ethos of the school and the staffroom’ (Bennett et al., 1994, p.68) for the purposes of future employment.

Teachers in this study expressed disappointment, frustration, anger, guilt, and hurt when their preservice teacher could not meet their expectations of the professional placement. These expectations were constructed from their own experience, without the opportunity to engage in professional learning that could enable interrogation of beliefs and expectations embedded within the discourse of schools. Those preservice teachers who cause such emotional distress appear to be those teachers who ‘just don’t get it’ (Sarah); – or who aren’t ‘right for it’ (Therese); – as if there is an “it” – one way to be a teacher.

Korthagen (2004) asserted that regardless of how a preservice teacher establishes a “teacher identity”, once it is established it is typically resistant to change (p. 83). I have argued that this becomes particularly problematic when preservice teachers have unrealistic and unsupported positive perception of their competence. Lee (2007) writes autobiographically of her work in university liaison with a preservice teacher who ‘follows the beat of his own drum. He is not part of an ensemble … he ignores the sheet music and waving baton. Lost in his own world’ (p. 547). She described how this student appeared to lack commitment, initiative, the capacity to engage with his students – he never quite understood and acted on expectations that the school and the university had of him. A preservice teacher’s resistance to a new/different discourse of teaching and learning causes extreme frustration and often suppressed anger on the part of the teacher colleague. This is because many perceive such a response as a dismissal of their professional knowledge – an attack on their professional and connected personal identity. Universities and teacher accreditation authorities have established criteria for judging the good preservice teacher, through “professional standards” and competency based assessment. However, if site-based teacher educators and preservice teachers are given little support to interpret the standards in the context in which they are to apply them, such standards will add little to the process of making effective judgements of good teaching.
Insistence on a unitary category of preservice teacher ignores the multiple intersections from which they originate (Butler, 2006) and according to Levine-Rasky (1998), preservice teachers ‘defy generalisation as a group’ (p. 90). For as long as site-based teachers perceive preservice teachers as some generalisable category there will be occasions when they are disappointed with the individual who is appointed to their classroom. The next section discusses just that issue – addressing the unexpected.

_Not familiar – the unexpected_

Preservice teachers have traditionally seemed “familiar” to site-based teacher educators, in that they would typically have been younger than the teacher colleague and would have entered the profession with the intention of it being a lifetime commitment. While the majority of current preservice teachers may still be female recent school-leavers, increasingly they are older and/or male career-changing individuals or ‘twenty-something’ teacher education students who do not necessarily see teaching is a life-long career. Some of them are not even sure that they want to be a teacher. This new cohort of preservice teachers is quite different from the traditional Australian post-school undergraduate of recent times, who entered teaching in their early twenties with limited experience in the work force, with recent experience of schools and schooling and who intended to remain in the teaching profession for their working lives.

Many of the recent mature-aged teacher candidates have long term experiences in the work force and have only distant memories of what schools and school cultures might be like. While this may be an advantage it certainly can be disadvantageous if their memories are only of success, individualism and competition. The situation for the non-traditional teacher education students is not restricted to Australia and has been noted overseas for over a decade. Studies in the United States indicated that two thirds of non-traditional students are married and over half have children, 67% are between 30 and 49 years of age, 27% above 40 and 53% were using family resources to pay for education and were working 31 or more hours per week (Manos & Kasambira, 1998).

Teacher education students are more likely now to be in part-time work while studying full-time or in full-time employment while they are studying part-time. They may not

---

39Unfortunately the Australian Bureau of Statistics is unable to provide data indicating the demographics of teacher education students on a national level. However, anecdotally staff in Australian universities suggest this is consistent with their situation.
have learnt what it means to be ‘fully committed’ to the expectations of their site-based placement because of expectations from say, family (as was the case for a number of the preservice teachers associated with this study). Many preservice teachers have their own children, who require after-school support, which prevents the preservice teacher from remaining on the premises at the end of the school day. While these situational expectations are not unfamiliar to most employed teachers, they may be new to the preservice teacher. Making these connections will certainly assist preservice teachers in meeting some of the expectations of the schools and teachers.

The presence of these non-traditional students is changing the complexion of teacher education programs (Butler, 1998). They are not what site-based teacher educators traditionally “expect” and many site-based teacher educators are still coming to terms with the implications of the different experiences and needs of members of these newer cohorts. Non-traditional teacher education students in Butler’s research indicated that ‘becoming a teacher was far more complicated than a mere career change [and] adjusting to the milieu of schooling was not as easy as thought and that teaching was far more complicated than they had thought’ (1998, p. 12). These preservice teachers suggested that because they had made one career/life change, the saw the opportunity to undergo teacher education as more than some short-term project, so success in this new endeavour may be even more important to them. Further, career-changing preservice teachers (particularly those with “professional” backgrounds) may be used to operating in a discourse of “free choice” and with a degree of autonomy over their use of time and discretionary power to choose what they do, and participate in. However, such a discourse is a mismatch with school contexts where there are significant constraints on time and the degree of autonomy to which teachers have access. It is at the university where discussions with preservice teachers should start the realignment process.

The participants in my study were all aware, at least to some degree, of their respective preservice teacher’s background prior to entering teaching. For example, Natalie recounted how Nigel had told her that he wanted to be a teacher rather than an administrator in the Department of Defence, “because it would be easier”; while Lyndsay told Loretta that she didn’t know what else to do (see also Sudzina & Knowles, 1993) so chose teaching because friends did so. Emily recalled that her preservice teacher’s mother (a teacher) told her that “she would be good at teaching”. It could be suggested that sharing information such as this indicates that the neophytes are to some
extent “politically naïve”. Their behaviour potentially creates a situation where their site-based teacher educator’s thinking is “in conflict” with that of the preservice teacher in relation to professional commitment as well as professional demeanour. Again it would be appropriate for teacher education programs to discuss such mismatches.

The site-based teacher educators described some of the behaviours of their preservice teachers that they saw as problematic. Examples were: going down the street for a cup of coffee and staying there in the middle of the morning (interpreted as unprofessional), arriving after classes commence (interpreted as “late”), leaving before classes conclude (interpreted as leaving “early”) or ignoring teacher’s advice and failing to have lessons organised. All of these were interpreted by the teachers in this study as demonstrating that the preservice teacher “lacked commitment”. Lyndall recalled that on Bob’s very first day he made a comment which implied that the school principal “fiddled the books” – immediately raising concerns about Bob’s suitability for teaching.

The apparent lack of commitment is read by the teachers as an attack on their own professional identity and resulted in extreme negative emotional experiences. Their knowledge and commitment to teaching is what makes teachers who they are in this context. As Clandinin, Downey and Huber (2009, p. 141) noted teachers’ “knowledge is entwined with identity’. To accept a preservice teacher into her classroom requires a teacher to take on an increased workload and is a significant commitment to the profession. Consequently, when the preservice teacher’s demeanour appears to indicate that they are not taking either the teacher’s commitment or the placement seriously it is construed by the teacher as another form of dismissal.

The point here is that the site-based teacher educators’ narratives consistently indicated they had an expectation that their preservice teacher knew and understood school cultures and the related expected behaviours. Although this is an expectation which I believe is misplaced, there is little evidence to imply that the emotional impact is not genuine for these teachers. For whatever reason, the preservice teacher’s dismissal of advice or apparent lack of interest in learning to teach is felt by these teachers as an attack on their professional and personal identity.

Both Alison and Annette found themselves confronted by female students who needed to complete the education course in order to earn a living. In both cases this produced
emotional tensions associated with the need for support and nurturing and a “competing” responsibility to accept effective teaching by them. Steve’s student Ejani was a migrant who spoke English as a second language and, who Steve felt was under significant pressure because of outside-school demands of family and work put Ejani under significant pressure (see for example, Basit, Roberts, McNamara, Carrington, Maguire, & Woodrow, 2006; Cruickshank, 2004; Hobson et al., 2009). Steve indicated that he felt Ejani should have concentrated more fully on his school placement, even though family demands involved after-hours work to enable him to provide for them financially. Analysis of Steve’s narrative indicated that he was not sympathetic to Ejani’s specific needs (see Cruickshank, 2004). Unlike Alison and Annette, Steve maintained that he did not become emotionally entwined with the needs of Ejani, or any other preservice teacher. Rather, he suggested that he was “straight down the line” and preservice teachers were expected to ‘produce the goods’.

It could be argued that both Steve and Ejani would have benefited from professional learning opportunities that enabled them both to understand how they are positioned in the discourse of “good teacher” – Steve as the dispassionate gatekeeper and Ejani as a “non-traditional” preservice teacher. Such labels accumulate considerable “meaning” in schools and schooling. Given that these issues are evident in initial teacher education, the responsibility for the professional learning may lie predominantly with the university teacher educators. However, there is a professional and personal responsibility of a teacher, who takes up the discourse of ‘gatekeeper’ or ‘guardians’ of the profession, to fully interrogate the position they adopt and to understand the full implications of the decisions/assessments they make. How these responsibilities – those of university and site-based staff – are fulfilled has implications for teacher education and the profession more generally.

Ten of the site-based teacher educators interviewed in this study described their experiences with non-traditional students. This classification is based on the fact that the preservice teachers, who form the background to this study, were either “career-changing” or second-chance entry into the teaching profession or non-recent school leavers. Harwood, Collins and Sudzina’s (2000) research found that non-traditional (in their study, older) students failed more often than younger students and males failed twice as often as females. These results were recently supported by Hobson, Giannakaki and Chambers (2009) in a large UK study that found males in general were more likely
to withdraw and older males (35-45years+) were 2.5 times more likely to withdraw than females. Harwood, Collins and Sudzina (2000) noted that older males appear to find it difficult to take advice from (typically) younger, female site-based teacher educators, while Brookhart and Loadman (1996) argued that male preservice teachers in their study suggested their teacher preparation program to be of less value than did female students, while still being as positive about their teaching skills. These views are reflected in comments made by Nigel who did not see the need to complete much of the work prescribed by the university. Eifler and Potthoff (1998) claimed that non-traditional preservice teachers found starting in a new career was ‘hard and ego challenging … [and that]… teacher educators must maintain a precarious balance between honouring [these] students’ prior experiences’ while attending to their novice teacher status (p.189).

Studies of failing students identified the most common cause of “non-completion” was actually the preservice teacher’s decision that teaching “was not for them”. However, issues associated with classroom “presence” and inability to complete fundamental tasks such as planning, teaching, and using management skills were cited as reasons for failure. As well as these, there were contextual factors such as the preservice teacher’s inability to understand school cultures or needs of school students – issues that were outlined by the participants in the study reported here (see also Harwood, Collins & Sudzina, 2000). The Eifler and Potthoff (1998) study also indicated that non-traditional students ‘had unrealistic expectations of young people and were frustrated with the strategies they had successfully used when working with adults proved ineffective with young people’ (p. 189). Unsuccessful career-changing preservice teachers often have a naïve expectation of the time and effort required to create quality lessons. They failed to understand that impromptu “flying by the seat of the pants” would rarely be successful (Sudzina & Knowles, 1993).

How do non-traditional preservice teachers come to develop their sense of what is good teaching? How do they interpret and operate successfully within the discourses of schools, particularly those whose previous relationships and interactions with 21st century schools is limited? The models of teaching which more-mature-aged students typically have experienced are those where a teacher delivered a lesson in a transmission model, which required the teacher to give information, from the front of the classroom, to a class of students, who were sitting individually in rows of desks and
who were expected to “absorb” the information. Further, such teaching/learning experiences were often coloured by memories of a discourse, in which they were a successful student, which privileged competitive, individualistic learning, and where the teacher was seen as the giver of knowledge from a position of power (Marsh, 2002b). Consequently, these preservice teachers often struggle to connect their memories to current discourses on teaching and learning in Australian schools which requires more of a transformative model of learning, where students jointly construct their new knowledge in a collaborative manner.

The media also influences individuals’ perceptions of teachers and teaching and contributes to “new” teachers’ perceptions of schooling. Further, mass media and the general public typically see teaching as a low priority career choice (Richardson & Watt, 2005). We need to ask the question; What other/prior experiences have non-traditional teachers encountered which may impact on their understanding of schools and schooling? What other public narratives do these teaching candidates access? Do these narratives provide an “accurate” representation of what it means to be a teacher, as ‘public narratives have a significant influence on construction and negotiation of teacher identity’ (Søreide, 2007, p. 132). Gregory (2007) would argue that public narratives of education actually ‘invisibly distort all students’ and teachers’ notions about what education is for, how it should be conducted, and what kind of experience it should provide’ (p. 8). While there may be an attempt to fix in the teachers’ minds an ideal preservice teacher, there are always possible other interpretations of ways of understanding the world. It would appear that any professional learning program that prepares site-based teacher educators for their work with preservice teachers needs to include discussions around public narratives as well as the changing demographics of candidates in initial teacher education programs. Likewise, teacher educators need to prepare non-traditional preservice teachers for a participation in a new discourse and its associated practices – one in which they are less powerful.

In the next section of this chapter I will discuss what I could label as “expectations of the good site-based teacher educator” in relation to what those teachers think are the expectations held by the university. I will explore these as an aspect of “othering” and argue that the teachers’ narratives indicate that the university has certain expectations of teachers that position them as outsiders inside teacher education.
POWER/KNOWLEDGE - OTHERING

Situations where teachers learn from one another, as in a preservice triad, will necessarily involve moments of discomfort and anxiety, according to Hargreaves (1998b). Teachers need to feel they work in a supportive environment. Their own personal histories are important for how they will manage tensions associated with opening up their classroom and their professional beliefs and practices to criticism – constructive or otherwise. This is what happens in preservice programs in schools as teachers make their work public by welcoming a preservice teacher and the university supervisor into their classroom.

Site-based teacher educators are important participants in the process of teacher education. As numbers of preservice teachers grow, professional bodies ensure universities comply with mandatory requirements for preservice teachers to undertake placements in school settings. Many sources, including school principals, teachers and policy documents reiterate the value of their participation. But their place/role is at times contradictory and it is helpful to turn to theories of subjectivity and discourse analysis to interrogate this contradiction.

In Chapter 3 I described how discourses constructs subjects in certain ways – typically in a hierarchical manner (Lasky, 2000). Consider the language used to “hail” site-based teacher educators: it is typically “co-operating teacher”, and “associate teacher”, labels that position site-based teacher educators as peripheral to teacher education. These are not terms that ascribe any particular status or power to the teacher, yet much of the literature suggests site-based teacher education is important. How can it be “important” when one of the potentially significant contributors is secondary? If knowledge gives an individual power to make decisions and take control, I argue that university staff make decisions (whether deliberate or not) that maintain their privileged position, and that they exercise power to position site-based teacher educators as outsiders inside teacher education.

University staff in this study did not provide important information on course content and/or procedures for addressing the learning needs of preservice teachers by way of professional learning programs for site-based educators. Many university staff members failed to respond to requests for support from the teachers who were supporting their students when the literature is clear that the role of university supervisor is important in
such situations (Haigh & Ward, 2004). The teachers’ narratives indicated that they felt their professional contributions were deemed unimportant. In terms of assessment, for example this was reflected in a number of events, all of which added to teachers’ perceptions of not being valued. These episodes included the university’ requests for some teachers to change grades they had awarded; implications of lack of trust when the teachers were not entitled to know their preservice teacher’s previous grades or sight previous practicum reports; silence around the final outcome for the neophyte; and lack of feedback in relation to their overall contribution to the program. The provision of information and consideration by university staff of teachers’ needs is possible and would have been appreciated by these teachers, particularly in the circumstances around “problematic” preservice teachers. Such events exacerbate negative aspects of the program for these teachers as they simultaneously construct the teacher as less valued, and increase the severity of negative emotional experiences.

As I indicated in Chapter 2, negative emotional experiences for the site-based teachers involve issues of inclusion, preparation, support, valuing, etc. Success for a site-based teacher educator is limited when they are unsure of the role and/or their preparation is limited (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Gibbs & Montoya, 1994). Problems associated with role ambiguity and competing discourses exacerbate problems for site-based teacher educators (Elliott, 1995). Yet it is clear that none of the six universities involved in this study has to date seriously confronted this issue and the potential impact that their lack of support has on the outcomes for their preservice teachers and for their colleagues in schools. My study clearly suggests that collaborative negotiation between teachers and university staff around role expectations and definition could reduce some tension associated with role ambiguity. What is also apparent from the literature review is that these are not new issues for many universities and teachers in site-based preservice programs.

Poor communication can lead to adversarial feelings towards the university as teachers believe the university is indifferent to their needs, schedules, assessments and opinions (Duquette, 1998; Koerner, 1992). When teachers are kept informed of university expectations or outcomes, they are more able to respond to preservice teachers’ needs appropriately. Further, as Fry & Martin (1996) noted, site-based teacher educators experience heightened stress if university staff disregard their comments and they apportion blame to themselves, even though the lack of direction is not of their making
The narratives of the teachers in this study (see Chapter 4) reveal they seek support through affirming interactions with colleagues, but it is clear that the voice of “the university” is too often sadly silent in this situation when it is most needed.

The literature highlights the importance of professional preparation for teachers but the teachers in this study were not provided with any such support. As I noted previously Polachek (1992) and a decade later Beck and Kosnick (2001) asserted that academics must engage with teachers and recognise their contributions as learning theorists if universities are to have a significant influence in the field. A further decade on, I reiterate this argument on the basis of the findings here. These issues remain unresolved, in that all the universities featured here are still to address them. It is not new for researchers to argue that reform in teacher education is doomed because teachers have little sense of ownership over the reform agenda (Adey & Speedy, 1993; Del Gesso & Smith, 1993). And it is clear that the experiences of the participants in this study are also not new. Opportunities for collaborative work to develop and share their understandings (even if they are different understandings) were either not offered or were offered on a voluntary basis such that teachers could only attend in their own time for no remuneration. Teachers see the opportunity to contribute to teacher education as recognition of their expertise and it provides them with an active role in the process (Adey & Speedy, 1993; Beck & Kosnik, 2000; Hawkey, 1998). However, my data indicate that when teachers are marginalised from the decision making processes, they perceive that their identity as a professional is under attack. In teacher education, then, I argue that such taken-for-granted discursive practices place academics at one end of a spectrum of power and control and site-based teacher educator at the other. I suspect that it is not only in relation to situations involving (failing) preservice teachers but it is just more obvious when there are problems.

Certainly, a similar situation exists in nurse education where researchers have identified the tensions for site-based educators who, while being accountable to the profession for delivering quality nurses, are not supported through preparation for the assessment aspects of the process and importantly are left to deal with unsuccessful students by “absent” university staff. Cahill (1997) and Duffy and Watson (2001) noted that there is limited preparation for the site-based nurse educator and Duffy (2004) noted that ‘[g]iven that mentors are ill-prepared for their role in failing students, it is recommended
that mentorship programmes address the issue of accountability. It should also be recognised that the issue of responsibility in relation to ‘failing to fail’ lies not only with individual mentors, but also with individual lecturers’ (p. 71). Similarly, Sharp’s (2000) study noted that nurse educators at times felt undermined by the university staff when their assessments were not supported and they also were rarely informed of the outcome of the “difficult” student because the university failed to provide any follow-up or debriefing of these often painful episodes. Further, and in relation to assessment issues around unsuccessful student nurses, May, Veitch, McIntosh, and Alexander (1997), indicated that the university needed to be more actively involved in assessment to support site-based staff.

Wenger (1998) noted that even when communities of practice overlap and problems are shared, boundary crossing is not without tensions. Unacknowledged differences and understandings are potentially more problematic such that moving from participation in one community of practice (schools) as teachers, to the role of site-based teacher educator (with its connectedness to university) requires a renegotiation of meaning, action and ultimately subjectivity. As Bullough et al. (2004) noted, uncertainty abounds as teachers are often unaware and uninformed of the appropriate ‘meanings and actions’. What makes this renegotiation even more difficult and complex for teachers is that this ‘boundary encounter’ (Wenger, 1998, p. 113) takes place in an emotionally-charged situation involving a preservice teacher who is failing and where teachers have to engage with university staff who typically take up a position of superiority in the discursive practices surrounding site-based teacher education. In these sites the university retains “ownership” of the preservice teacher as a problem but passes on the angst. The teachers in this study, including those who appeared to have access to personal and professional resources on which to draw, responded that they found the whole process of working with a problematic preservice teacher to be incredibly emotionally demanding.

By accepting a preservice teacher into their classroom, they subject themselves to a discourse which positions them as less important than university staff and, in many situations less important than their preservice teacher. Most cases in this study are

\[40\] Here again I see the “doubleness” in this study as noted in Chapter 4 – this is also the situation for the non-traditional/career changing preservice teachers - they have to renegotiate meaning, action and subjectivity. The site-based teacher educators are positioned in the “new” discourse as partners with power but only very limited power.
painful examples of university staff erring on the side of the preservice teacher at the emotional expense of the site-based teacher educator, with a resultant negative impact on teacher subjectivities.

Reliable and valid judgements about student performance are not likely if those making such judgements do not have access to systematic training (Hawe, 2003). Corbett & Wright (1996) noted that mentor training should establish an explicit definition of the role expectation held by both university and site-based teacher educators. Training could provide opportunities to establish communication networks and develop shared expectations between the university and teachers about the goals, anticipated outcomes and procedures for dealing with problems should they arise (Mander, 1997). It is evident that sound preparation for the role of site-based teacher educator has the potential to enhance the outcomes for all stakeholders (Faire, 1994; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Hulshof & Verloop, 1994; Koerner, 1992). However, Beck and Kosnick (2000) claim that if teachers are presented with professional learning opportunities which have been developed by university staff without consultation with teachers, they will reject it, as “more of the same”. There is little likelihood that such a program will lead to enhanced outcomes for either teachers or the preservice teachers they are supporting. There must be recognition of teacher expertise through their direct involvement in the development of professional learning programs. A view such as this where power is shared and decisions are negotiated will have significant implications for teacher education programs ‘because it redefines where knowledge lies. Knowledge does not reside exclusively in the domain of the university, nor is it found solely in the domain of the school experience. Rather, knowledge is found in the transaction of both theoretical and practical experiences’ (Ewart & Straw, 2005, p. 186).

Teachers’ feelings of vulnerability (of not being in control of processes and tasks for which they feel responsible) are at least partly the result of being ill-prepared for the role that they undertake with the preservice teacher. When teachers experience vulnerability, they develop protective coping strategies that may result in ‘conservative micro-political actions aimed at preserving the status quo’ (Kelchtermans, 2005, p. 997) such that they may choose to learn the rules so they can get it right the next time rather than taking a macro view and resisting the causes of their vulnerability i.e. the failure of the university to prepare them for the task of supporting a preservice teacher. Hall and Noyes (2009) suggest that while learning the ‘minutiae of the rules was a form of
resistance [against being] unfairly judged’ by others, it was ultimately a capitulation to the accountability agenda. For most of the teachers in this study, the only form of resistance they had, as a means of limiting their vulnerability, was to refuse to take another preservice teacher, which of course, is at odds with their desire to support the profession.

This study has highlighted the inadequacy of support provided by university staff for site-based teacher educators. It could be argued that the sorry state of affairs, particularly in Australia is a consequence of tertiary teacher education courses historically being in “teachers’ colleges” that were administered by state governments and so were intrinsically part of the schooling system. Consequently, site-based teacher educators, many of whom are the products of such a system still see their role in teacher education in this light. However, many of the traditional teachers’ colleges in Australia became part of the university system in the 1980s and teacher education in some universities holds a minor (often under-funded) position. Many teachers are aware of the impoverished financial state of Faculties and Schools of Teacher Education. They “excuse” universities for not providing any significant professional preparation for the teachers – “That’s how it is” is another taken-for-granted discursive regime in which universities failings are “forgiven” and the situation becomes normalised. I argue teachers are unaware that their acceptance of this situation means they collude in their own exploitation – unaware of the impact of their actions. They fatalistically accept their exploitation (Freire, 1997, p. 46) and by playing by the university’s rules they do not engage in conversations ‘to develop professional obligations on their terms’ (Webb, 2006, p. 212).

Further, university academics are, I suggest, not unaware of the impact of their behaviour, though they often do not appear to have the capacity or means to change what is happening. Cochran-Smith (2003) argued from work that included a case where teacher educators attempted to reconceptualise site-based education that they need to learn new practices and to unlearn ‘some long-held idea, beliefs and practices, which are often difficult to uproot (p. 9).

Another issue associated with the marginalisation of site-based teacher education is the devaluing by university staff of the site-based component (Tang, 2002; Zeichner, 2002). Gore and Morrison (2001) argued that the cultures and contexts within which teacher
educators do their work limits their capacity to actively engage with reforms that impact on their work. Increased levels of casualisation, associated with the poor financial situation in which universities find themselves, impacts on the quality of support available to site-based teacher educators. Martinez (2004) and Raths and Lyman (2003) noted that time constraints for university staff meant that their interaction with site-based teacher educators is often limited to ‘snatched conversations’ (as Renee explained) or an unwillingness to even attend the site, as indicated by Sylvia. Further, Beck and Kosnick (2002b) noted that supervision is often allocated to doctoral students or retired teachers. Programs where practicum supervision is carried out by “permanent” staff are often characterised by the minimum number of school visits needed to assign a practice teaching grade (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Slick, 1998). Academics find themselves torn between the demands of teaching, research and publishing (Raths & Lyman, 2003; Zimpher & Sherrill, 1996) such that time spent in schools is seen by many as time poorly spent. Support of preservice teachers in schools is ‘not as highly regarded or rewarded as graduate work, research, and publishing’ (Beck & Kosnick, 2002b, p. 6).

However, there are academics in Australia who have recognised the importance of professional learning not only for site-based teacher educators but for university staff as well. For example, Le Cornu and Ewing (2008) described how their respective universities have accepted the responsibility for developing quality learning programs and have committed resources – both financial and intellectual – to improving initial teacher education programs by working closely with site-based educators as well as preservice teachers and university colleagues. Staff from schools and universities working in pedagogical and interpersonal partnerships require support at an institutional level (Tang, 2003). One could argue that all the individuals involved in these partnerships have identified and addressed issues of quality and accountability in their work as teacher educators. In the next section I extend this discussion of accountability and the impact that a discourse of accountability has on the emotional experiences of site-based teacher educators.

ACCOUNTABILITY

In this section I am suggesting that discourses and emotions associated with assessment, feedback, observation, and “performance” are all aspects of a meta-discourse, which I
have labelled *accountability*. I assert that this is an appropriate tag because these issues are all related to aspects of evaluation, whether of preservice teachers, site-based teacher educators, university staff and/or programs. There is increased emphasis on accountability in schools and universities, driven by a “standards” agenda, audit culture as well as rituals of verification (Day & Sachs, 2004, p. 4) where ‘clarity and transparency conceal the pain, the conflict, the unpredictability and the irrationality’ that are a part of teaching and learning (MacLure, 2003, p. 170). According to Smyth (2001), the discourse of teaching has been hijacked by emphasis on restructuring of management; attention to administration and organisation and little to do with the essence of teaching and learning. Discourses of schooling are less about teaching and learning and more about ‘efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability’ (p. 141).

Receiving affirmation for a job well done can be an energising aspect of teachers’ work. The teachers in this study particularly wanted feedback about whether they were doing a good job when the outcome for the university student had not been so positive. Positive feedback followed by the corresponding positive emotions this produces gives teachers a sense of purpose for what they are trying to do. Teachers rely on support and affirmation from colleagues to validate and confirm that they are doing a professionally competent job. However, if colleagues or others then criticise particular forms of emotional expression (displayed in the act of seeking support), it can have devastating effects on the individual. They are particularly vulnerable when an expression of uncertainty, a need for affirmation is judged as “abnormal”. Campbell (1994) writes ‘[as] feelings are formed through expression, people can exercise restrictive control over our feelings through controlling our acts of expression and thus dismiss or diminish the possibilities for finding or creating significance in our lives’ (p. 55). Consequently, if teachers become focused on performativity/ accountability aspects of their work then there is a likelihood that the emotional discourse of teaching will be restrained (Hargreaves, 1998a). Teachers experienced a sense of loss when they felt unsupported or when their colleagues did not agree with the manner in which they supported their preservice teacher, interpreting a lack of support as a negative assessment of their work with the preservice teacher.

They did not want the university to think they were ineffective because the preservice teacher earned an unsatisfactory grade. Teachers were genuinely concerned that the university staff would see them as the failure. The discourses of accountability and
performativity, which are features of both schools and universities, disciplined some teachers into spending significant time in assisting preservice teachers to plan learning experiences, including developing or sourcing teaching resources so that the preservice teacher would appear successful when assessed by the university (Beck & Kosnik, 2000). In effect, the teachers were creating a ‘fabricated success’ for their preservice teacher (Webb, 2006) – a fabrication that many later regretted and to which the preservice teacher must struggle to sustain. Other teachers took copious notes, recording their interactions with their preservice teacher as a form of protection against claims (either by the preservice teacher or university staff) that they had failed to provide appropriate support for the preservice teacher. These teachers were “disciplining themselves” because previous experience had taught them that they may well be evaluated on their learner’s success (or otherwise) and they anticipate needing to be able to justify the learner’s results (Perryman, 2007).

The teachers’ stories indicate that they want their performance as a teacher educator to be within the bounds of acceptable; to be seen as normal. Such disciplining mechanisms may lead teachers to decide not to accept another student teacher in the future, which is what Natalie decided. She felt that her inability to be tough meant that she did not meet her own standards – she found her performance wanting. Performativity, according to Ball (2003) works both from the outside in and the inside out, such that while others may assess an teacher’s performance, so too do the teachers themself. Annette, Elizabeth and Sylvia indicated that they felt they were too “weak” in relation to their respective preservice teachers’ assessments while Therese experienced shame. These teachers assessed their performance and used normalising judgements as technologies for self-criticism. The negative feelings teachers experienced were a response to their self-blame. Winograd (2003) suggested that such a ‘self-accusatory stance … diverts teachers’ attention from structural problems in their working conditions and, instead, focuses attention on the inadequacies of teachers as individuals’ (p. 1642).

It is worth noting here that Natalie was the only teacher in this study who did make the decision not to accept another preservice teacher. Many had already been allocated their next preservice teacher when I interviewed them. The normalisation of teachers needing to ‘do the right thing’ by accepting a preservice teacher into their classroom, and thereby support “new members of the profession” surpassed the concern with negative (emotional) experiences that may be associated with such a decision. However, the
teachers recognised the need to be tougher and engage with the discourse of gatekeeper. They also responded to the powerful discourse of carer/nurturer and were not able to accept the possibility of failure – for themselves or their preservice teacher.

All of these elements are associated with knowledge and related issues of power. The accounts of experienced site-based teacher educators such as Steve, Lyndall, Emma, Larry, Bryce (who knew university procedures and/or staff or who felt personally “strong” enough to counter the demands of the problematic student and university staff) indicate that this knowledge supported them to survive the stresses more than those with less knowledge and connectedness to the university, like Loretta, Emily, Sylvia or Elizabeth. However, tensions still existed for these teachers as they tried to ‘accommodate two opposing courses of action where choice is limited … tensions invade the inner self, arouse stronger emotions … for those teachers who combine self with the teacher role’ (Woods et al., 1997, p. 21). Those teachers who took up different positions in relation to the university, such as Alison, Bryce, Larry and Lyndall, mobilised other discourses to refuse and/or refute their positioning by the university. Bryce and Lyndall, for instance took on the identity of “gatekeeper” in what they articulated as a professional responsibility to assert the importance of their practitioner knowledge, contesting the hierarchical place of the university. According to Gore and Parkes (2008) their actions can be seen as contesting this ‘regime of truth’ that normalises the notion that university staff are best-placed to make these decisions. Teachers such as Bryce and Lyndall were able to operate as agentic within the discourses that operated in their schools where they were positioned as “good” teachers in situations of professional authority, though talking back to university staff held some risks.

There were occasions when other teachers did indicate that they were able to refuse the discourse of the university: Annette in her decision not to amend the grade, Larry in demanding that a supervisor attend the school. However, it is important to note that this only occurred when they felt they were positioned on “safe ground”. As I mentioned before, Annette had not been able to refuse the university’s request to take a preservice teacher when she knew that the preservice teacher was not prepared for the difficult Special Education setting. She did not amend her assessment, though, in spite of the university’s request. But she stood her ground “silently” – without confronting university staff about it – in the safety of her classroom. Interestingly, Bryce was able to
refuse the university staff member’s request to change a grade but then chose to not engage in discussions in relation to his report. He used silence to maintain his personal control (and not display his anger) and in doing so denied the university the opportunity to refuse his decision. Larry’s power to call the university supervisor to the school was related to his relationship with senior members of the faculty and the proximity of the school to the university. The school typically supported many preservice teachers from the university involved – and here Larry exercised power over the university. To have dismissed his demands could have jeopardised future access to that site – he knew the university needed his school for placements. As I have indicated previously, power circulates and in different discourses different individuals will have more or less capacity to exercise power.

O’Connor (2008) suggests that a performative culture associated with the standards movement ‘emphasises accountability and the public demonstration (performance) of professional attributes above teachers’ ethical and emotional qualities’ (p. 119). For all those involved in teacher education within such a culture, engaging in discussions about the emotionality of teachers’ work forms a counter-discourse to the performative and technical rationalist focus that arises from a standards agenda.

The reader has to this point been presented with my interpretations of the teachers’ narratives in terms of the main discursive practices that appear to operate in the site-based component of initial teacher education and which produce the norms and standards that individuals use to shape, and importantly, judge their own conduct as well as those with whom they work and interact. Such “judgements” clearly impact on their subjectivity as a teacher and as a professional; they are evidenced through the resultant emotional experiences. Some judge the behaviour to be conduct that is “unbecoming” of a teacher. But what does this interpretation tell us? The following section examines these interpretations in a broader socio-cultural framework.

DISCUSSION
What are the implications for teacher education (or the other “caring professions”) of these interpretations? How can teacher educators (both tertiary and site-based) address issues of power/knowledge including preservice teachers’ limited understanding of the discourses of schools, the site-based teachers’ expectations of a normative preservice
teacher and their expectations that all preservice teachers share the same understandings and same commitment to teaching? Hargreaves’ (2001) framework of “emotional geographies” is useful here in assisting us to understand the implications. He defines emotional geographies as the ‘spacial and experiential patterns of closeness and/or distances in human interactions and relationships that help create, configure and colour the feelings and emotions we experience about ourselves, our world and each other’ (p. 1061). Emotional geographies are culturally and psychologically bound, such that experiences of “emotional distance” in one country may well be very different to those in another. Further, individuals may be emotionally close while residing on different sides of the world, as such, there must be a psychological dimensions to “distance”. Hargreaves’ model has five specific but interconnected forms of distance – socio-cultural, political, moral, physical and professional. The model is useful in making sense of the aspects of teachers’ work; particularly here in relation to their work with preservice teachers, that result in both positive, and importantly in this study, negative emotions.

Teachers are engaged in intensive emotional labour in achieving emotional distance or closeness with students and significant others, such that emotional geographies are ‘active accomplishments by teachers that structure and enculture their work, as much as being structured and encultured by it’ (Hargreaves, 2001, p. 1062). As the demographics of teacher education students change, so too will the socio-cultural “distance” between teachers and their preservice teacher colleagues. When the teachers are “distant” from the preservice teacher, as is often the case when they are working with non-traditional preservice teachers, they may experience accentuated negative emotions. Similarly, as noted by Eisenberg, Heycox and Hughes (1996) in their research on “failure” of students in social work, cultural differences and/or gender differences are a significant issue in instances of failure. According to Hargreaves (2001), socio-cultural distance often leads teachers to stereotype individuals. The “othering” by teachers may result from the teachers’ unwitting assumption that their way is normal and privileged (Popkewitz, 1998).

Teaching is a value-laden enterprise and the closeness/familiarity of values and morals impacts on the emotional experiences for all participants. In this study, the teachers commented that their preservice teacher was a ‘good guy’ (Lyndall), ‘nice bloke’ (Alison), ‘lovely girl’ (Renee). Such connections/closeness with the preservice teacher
can make failure more difficult and I would suggest that, at times, the “caring” nature of the site-based teacher educator clouds objective judgement associated with the final assessment. However, in the case of these three teachers, they did not succumb to the romance of caring, and did award their students a failing grade. Consequently, the emotional cost may have been even greater as they struggled to manage the competing discourses of carer/nurturer and professional gatekeeper. It certainly has been identified as an issue in other “caring” professions as noted for example, by Duffy (2003) in the nursing sector (as indicated in the previous section of this chapter) and in social work, according to Sharp and Danbury (1999) and Shapton (2006).

Negative emotions result when a moral distance is created (Hargreaves, 2001) – when teachers feel a sense of loss when they are criticised or devalued by others. The teachers’ narratives revealed that some felt demeaned by university staff in relation to support of the learner (preservice teacher) and/or the assessment. As was indicated in the previous chapter, there were occasions when university staff rejected teachers’ assessments and/or failed to provide support to the teachers when the preservice teacher was evidently struggling to achieve successful outcomes. Teachers are often unable to defend themselves because they perceive university staff to be more powerful and/or they lack the resources to defend the stance they have taken – a situation that could be labelled as ‘political distance’. However, teachers who do argue back to the university find themselves in a more vulnerable position. Teachers such as Lyndall, Emily and Bryce, who refused the universities’ attempts to diminish their role in the assessment/quality assurance process, were taking a political stand in preventing teachers they believed were not capable of effective teaching from entering the profession. They were attempting to defend their professionalism and their passion for teaching in the situation. Calhoun (1994) asserted that we can best understand the ‘depth and intensity of teachers’ negative feelings towards the “intrusions” and “challenges” of other adults, if we see their reactions as political, in the broadest sense, and in particular as part of the struggle for recognition involved in the “politics of identity”’ (p. 20). Often teachers find it difficult to struggle against a system over which they have limited control – who are they to struggle against: the university, their principal, the employer? Their position in teacher education is often limited to one that is afforded them by others – it is not of their own making.
Interestingly, in relation to Hargreaves notion of moral distance, the notion of physical distance was at times, a tension for some of these teachers, so much that when difficulties arose they needed space away from their preservice teacher. Emily and Alison described how their colleagues took the preservice teacher “away” just to give her space; Lyndall found Bob’s habit of ‘hugging her’ in appreciation very disturbing, while Therese found safety in distancing herself from Neil. Often even having an extra person in a staffroom meant that it became “crowded” so that Sarah’s colleagues avoided the staffroom when Nick was present. Further, preservice teachers who stand too close (invade the personal space), smell strange or are too “in your face” engender emotional responses of teachers that are, according to Lupton (1998) ‘interbound with cultural assumptions’ about what it appropriate in terms of closeness, for example (p. 35).

In order to establish sound professional and personal connections with colleagues, closeness is required – physical closeness that is developed over in time, as well as professional and socio – cultural closeness. According to Hargreaves (2001), infrequent and non-face to face communication makes the establishment of emotional understanding and professional partnerships very difficult. The short time frame of most preservice programs, typical of teacher education programs in Australian universities, makes it difficult for teachers to establish relationships with their preservice teacher. Further, the site-based teacher educators’ recounts indicated that they had limited opportunity to develop a professional relationship with university staff. Typically they did not meet university staff prior to the placements, and they also described feelings of abandonment when university staff failed to come to the school when the preservice teacher was struggling. When teachers had the opportunity to forge a “connection” with a university-based colleague, there appears to be less anxiety if difficulties arise. For example, Steve reported that he had an excellent relationship with the university supervisor and they had very similar views about, and procedures for, supporting struggling preservice teachers. This was a relationship that had been established and built up working together in a school-university dyad over a number of years.

Currently, preservice teacher education is on the periphery of the work of teachers in schools – teachers provide a service and are paid an “honorarium” – remuneration that
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41 The Higher Education award is currently $12.45 per day for secondary teachers and $21.20 per day for primary teachers in Australian schools.
does not reflect the intellectual, professional and personal commitment required to undertake the task effectively. Until site-based education is considered differently by both schools and universities, I argue that the experiences of teachers involved will continue to be emotionally demanding, because of the differential status/power of teachers and university staff – the distance between them. This is a situation that needs to be addressed and not left uncontested. A repositioning/realignment of the emotional geographies of the triadic relationships will enable its members to acknowledge and address differences in status and explicitly negotiate the different purposes of participants involved in teacher education.

Those of us who are working in preservice teacher education need to find ways to make productive the possibilities to learn from individuals who are different from us. If we keep places such as schools (and universities) culturally bleak, such that there is little difference among the individuals working there, we run the risk of schools becoming balkanised and exclusionary, which will result in sites being emotionally as well as intellectually bland. Further, it would be desirable for the teaching workforce to reflect the diversity of the student population, as well as the population as a whole. As funding to Australian universities is soon to be connected, in part, to the numbers of students from disadvantaged groups – Indigenous, low SES – enrolled in courses (Commonwealth of Australia, 2009) it will be imperative for universities to address specifically the needs of non-traditional students and to review current university policies and procedures particularly in relation to “connecting” both preservice and in-service traditional and non-traditional educators (Manos & Kasambira, 1998).

One of the important issues to address will be the recognition of the “different” characteristics of “young” preservice teachers, whose world is framed differently to the young teacher education students of ten years ago. The young teacher candidates of the 21st century are constructed by a world that values high speed communication and networking and importantly, and are individuals who will potentially change their jobs much more frequently than the “baby boomers”. People aged 20-24 are three times more likely to change jobs in a year than those aged 45-54, and nearly 25% of 20-24 year olds change jobs in any given year (Drake International, 2006).

In addition, teacher education institutions need to recognise the special needs of mature-aged and career-changing preservice teacher and be sympathetic to their differing circumstances by providing greater support to these students and their mentors (Basit,
Roberts, McNamara, Carrington, Maguire & Woodrow, 2006). One could argue that such work done by the universities would reduce the tensions of professional experience for these students, and for the site-based educators with whom they work. A report commissioned by the Australian government’s Department of Education, Science and Training noted that:

[S]ome ‘career change teachers do not have the pedagogical or interpersonal skills to interact with students, their strengths in content knowledge are not sufficient to assure a successful transition into their new role. According to one respondent, ‘a lot more needs to be done to target particular groups: those truly suited to teaching - versus those looking for a change and a romanticised view of what teaching is about’ (Phillips KPA, 2007, p. 50).

Undoubtedly there exists a need for site-based teacher educators to engage in conversations around the demands of supporting a preservice teacher. This should be couched in terms of competing discourses that produce the field as a whole. I argue that such knowledges would potentially increase teachers’ sense of agency, and that enhancing teachers’ capacity to deconstruct the “texts” of schools and relationships would enhance their capacity to deal with some of the complexities of the preservice triad. Following Weedon (1987), this may ‘introduce the possibility of political choice between modes of [subjectivity] in different situations’ (p. 87). Graham (1997) argued that it is important to acknowledge a socio-historical position that has constructed the teacher as one who is certain and stable. However, how does a teacher establish that stability? What are the means of coping and sources of support on which she relies? Are they innate, constructed or offered by others? One of the accepted “truths” of the teaching profession is that “teachers” are professionals who typically interact with one another and provide collegial support and ideas. Day and Leitch (2001) suggested that there are increased benefits for teachers when they are able to work collaboratively with a critical friend (p. 413), as is potentially possible in a practicum program. Unfortunately, often it is on occasions such as those identified in this study, when staff need the support of colleagues, that they retreat into a private space for fear of being found wanting.

Not only is it important for teachers to understand the discourse within which they are embedded; it would seem sensible that teacher education courses should include aspects of “understanding discourse” as a component of professional education. According to Winograd (2003) and Marsh (2002b), this is crucial because within discourses, teachers, children and families ‘are positioned in very particular ways in relation to one another’
(p. 453) – and these ways are changing as social landscapes shift (Clandinin et al., 2009). Consequently, teacher education courses need to assist preservice teachers attend to the discourses that shaped their lives as well as those that shape the lives of teachers, students and their families. Marsh (2002b) asserted that ‘learning to examine the discourses through which we enact our teaching lives provides us with opportunities’ for choices (p. 453). Importantly, too, such knowledge may enhance their capacity as teachers to be transformative by finding ‘alternative ways of viewing the world in which relations of power can be disrupted and reconfigured’ (p. 469). Similarly, Alsup (2005) asserted that teacher education programs ‘should be political in their pedagogies. [They] must enlighten students about the political nature of education as well as help them understand how to engage in teacher identity discourse … and empower them to change the educational system through transformative discourse’ (p. 182).

It has long been recognised that preservice teachers often imitate their former teachers, who they thought were successful or who they admired. Others may adopt an accepted view of what a good teacher should be, rather than evaluating their own classroom in an attempt to critique their own pedagogy, and this can lead to a ‘stagnation in professional development’ (Lortie, 1975 p. 190). I argue that it is in preservice teacher education that the development of dispositions of personal/professional critique should begin – thereby interrupting taken-for-granted discursive “truths”, such as ‘teachers do not criticise each other’ (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2004). However, we must also ask how preservice teachers find a balance between overt compliance and transformative action, when they are in a less powerful position than the teachers with whom they are working? Teacher education has a role to play in supporting preservice teachers and site-based teacher educators to develop a knowledge base as well as political literacy (Achinstein, 2006, p. 125).

An important part of initial teacher education involves assisting preservice teachers to ‘revise and expand the scripts they bring to their daily work and equip them with the discursive tools to collaboratively plan’ for teaching (Smith, 2007, p. 102). Smith claims that site-based and university-based staff should move away from the idea of developing a “shared agenda” and instead focus on developing capacities for all stakeholders to engage in conversations that may involve conflict resolution and negotiation, as these kinds of discussions will potentially prove to be more educative for the participants. The idea of a ‘shared agenda’ is an effect of the discourse of caring i.e.
never wanting to engage in conflict or tension. The teachers in this study enacted a discourse that privileged “caring” almost as a moral act, such that most avoided dissonance. However, as Galman (2009) notes ‘dissonance plays an important catalytic role in the teacher education process’ as it enables preservice teachers to experience transformative learning (p. 468), while practice that avoids dissonance restricts the opportunities for transformative teaching. As Galman claims, learners may be happier but the potential for significant development is limited by removing any source of dissonance. Further, as Chubbuck and Zembylas (2008) argue, it is the emotions associated with ‘discomfort that inform our ways of seeing and being in the world’ (p. 286). Positive relationships are an important issue here and extended engagements with schools, rather than short term programs have the potential to enable preservice and site-based teachers to establish stronger relationships which would facilitate “honesty” when providing feedback (Ewart & Straw, 2005). Site-based educators who seek to avoid confronting difficult issues do not do preservice teachers “any favours” in the long run. Accordingly, teacher education programs would be enhanced by exploring preservice teachers’ experiences of dissonance rather than merely remediating them.

It is clear that the experiences of the teachers I have studied here were particularly stressful. What are the effects of such an experience on each of them, both personally and professionally? Negative emotions experienced in a problematic practicum may have a significant impact on teacher identity, which is produced through a dynamic process where emotional highs and lows clearly impact at any given point in time. What will be the university’s response to teachers who are left vulnerable by such an experience? I argue that university staff need to assist teachers to place emotions in a public space by naming them and collectively analysing them rather silencing and denying their political construction (Boler, 1999).

Teachers need support mechanisms to assist them to reconstruct and reaffirm their identities when faced with situations where they are diminished rather than enriched by the process of preservice teacher education (Bartky, 1990). Universities must work collaboratively with the schools and centres where preservice teachers are working to more effectively support site-based teacher educators (and the broader school community) particularly when the outcome is less than positive. Clearly, there is potential for assisting teachers to cope with an experience such as a problematic student if university personnel make time to hear and respond to the teachers’ stories. Part of
that support could be focussed on making sense of each teacher’s subject positioning(s) and how these affect their interpretations of their own and others’ behaviour in circumstances such as site-based teacher education.

It would be highly productive if opportunities for face-to-face sharing of stories, such as those told by the participants in Martin and Rippon’s (2005) study were included in courses for preservice teachers, as well as in preparatory sessions for site-based teachers. This would demonstrate that such situations have been, and continue to be experienced by others. It could also create space for participants to realise, know and experience open communication between members of the triad/dyad, while perhaps recognising, accepting and identifying strategies to deal with the existence of emotional tensions associated with providing feedback. Noddings (1996) argued for the inclusion of teachers’ stories in teacher education, especially those that portray feelings and show how effective teachers come to terms with and productively use their emotions.

Talking with others who share an understanding of their situation may help teachers clarify their thoughts, reflect upon their actions and ultimately feel more positive about their situation due to an increased sense of control. I suggest such conversations between site-based teacher educators would enhance their sense of empowerment – talking through beliefs, ideas or ideologies with others is related to increased self-understanding (Aslup, 2005). Similarly, Zembylas, (2003a) argued that it may be empowering for teachers to become aware of their emotional circumstances through storying, as this enables them to interrogate often constraining emotional rules and to create strategies of resistance. It is not, however, as simple as talking to somebody. Nias (1999) argued that those involved need to share a common commitment to exploring the meanings within their “stories” as the ‘shared construction and discussion of their narratives can help them deal productively with the ‘politics of identity … for the affect revealed in the making and telling of stories can become a productive starting point for collective action’ (p. 305).

There are obviously private sources of support for site-based teacher educators, such as colleagues and family, but this is not always possible. Therese, for example, spoke of feeling embarrassed in front of colleagues when she was unable to manage her preservice teacher who was openly rude, while Annette would not let her colleagues know the children in her class were unruly because of poor management by the
preservice teacher. Consequently, these women did not seek colleagues as confidants or listeners. Teachers who do not have a significant partner at home will also lack that essential level of personal support. Alison and Sylvia both spent nights at home alone “stewing over” how to most effectively support and ultimately find the strength to fail their respective student. Certainly the university has a role to play in providing opportunities for these teachers to debrief at the end of the program but more importantly to provide support during the placement (Hrobsky & Kersbergen, 2002). Further, while the university may “provide” support when requested, there is a need to adopt a more proactive role – as indicated previously. For teachers to ask for help may be an admission of failure, which is something that is difficult to countenance. University staff need to develop an increased sensitivity to what is happening to their preservice teachers and their site-based teacher educators and thus respond more positively to the needs that arise for participants in situations such as those that have been highlighted in this study.

CONCLUSION

Undoubtedly there were other discourses operating in the interactions between site-based teacher educators, university staff and preservice teachers in the very complex enterprise of “on site” teacher preparation. However, I have chosen to address these three persuasive meta-discourses, as I think they necessarily and sufficiently illustrate my assertion that the discursive practices in and between schools and universities, engaged in the co-production of a new teacher, have significant emotional implications in the production of the subjectivities of site-based teacher educators. The following chapter will revisit my interpretations and make some recommendations for further study and future policy development.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

‘My point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do’ (Foucault, 1982, pp. 231–232).

OUTLINE

In the first five chapters of this thesis I have examined the literature associated with discourse on emotions and emotional discourse, and provided an outline of a methodological approach that enabled me to further develop my understanding of emotions in relation to a set of experiences of site-based teacher educators involved in difficult situations with preservice teachers and university staff. Finally I presented one analytic interpretation of the narratives in light of this particular theoretical framework and an understanding of discourse. My “readings” of the teachers’ stories constructed a complex interweaving of often competing discursive practices in schools and universities, such that the difficult and often ignored emotional experiences of the teachers involved are accentuated. This chapter reviews these interpretations, brings together the threads from the previous chapters and suggests possible pathways forward to address the implications for initial teacher education programs, the well-being of site-based teacher educators and the learning of preservice teachers.

INTRODUCTION

This study emanated from my need to understand the complex issues associated with site-based teacher education as a fundamentally important component of initial teacher education. My personal experiences of an intense emotional response associated with a problematic preservice teacher – as a university educator and senior administrator – provided the impetus for the study. Further, I was mindful that the voices of site-based teachers involved in preservice teaching are seldom heard and when heard, are often underplayed, often perceived as a “whisper”, as ‘all speech is not treated as equal’ (Boler, 2004, p. 329). I felt that it was important to speak to and speak out for these teachers, whose voices are often marginalised in preservice teacher education and who may not feel safe in resisting the discursive practices of universities (and the schools) in
which they work. Finally, as a senior university administrator with a responsibility for
the provision of successful site-based programs in my home institution, the study was
an opportunity to develop a deeper understanding of the experiences of my students and
the teachers we employ, as they actively participate together in a preservice program,
hoping that such understandings could guide improvements in the programs offered by
my university, and others in similar situations.

DISCOURSES DISCUSSED

I began my study with a naïve realist expectation that I would just need to listen to the
teachers’ stories and that would give me a clear insight into their experiences. Even
after completing a significant amount of reading of the published literature on emotions,
I was not attuned to “the meaning” of the teachers’ stories (mindful that there are
multiple meanings) when I gathered them together. The published research that I
initially read had been primarily from a psychological framework that centred the
emotions in the individual and failed to identify the felt emotions as social
constructions. I had chosen to use a phenomenological approach as my theoretical
framework, as this appeared most appropriate for attempting to give participants status
in research. However, once I started to listen “deeply” to the accumulated narratives I
soon realised that a phenomenological perspective would not enable me to make sense
of the regularities in the meaning in the texts – the emotional experiences were more
than a “phenomenon”. The adoption of methodology informed by poststructuralist
theories enabled me to understand more fully the role of discourse and discursive
practices in the construction of not only the negative emotional experiences but also the
positioning of teachers’ subjectivities within it.

Poststructuralist theory, informed by the work of Foucault (1972, 1980, 1983, 1988,
1990, 2000) encouraged me to read differently, not only the teachers’ narratives but also
in literature related to emotional discourse and discourse on emotions. I was able to
critique the literature that positioned emotion within the individual – something to be
controlled, something irrational. Authors such as Boler (1997, 1999, 2004) and
shaping how the study progressed, because of their work exploring power as an aspect
of emotions. Power and language are cornerstones of poststructuralists’ theorising and
my second and subsequent re-readings of the interviews told me much about the role of
discourse, knowledge and power that circulates within and between schools and universities through their involvement in preservice teacher education. I have argued that the discursive practices constructing these relationships have significant emotional implications for the production of the subjectivities of site-based teacher educators.

I arrived at these interpretations by examining teacher narratives for discursive regularities that are reproduced by and produce the teachers. It appeared from the interviews that current practices, as taken up by the university staff (and university policies) work to position the teachers as outsiders inside teacher education. The teachers’ voices were not heard as authoritative within university-framed practice of professional experience supervision, nor were their needs addressed. However, what was totally unexpected in the analysis was the unravelling of the teachers’ constructed understanding of “the” preservice teacher (the ideal subject of this discourse) and how those expectations also worked to create an emotionally difficult situation for the teachers themselves. I read their “expectations” as discourses – normalised and privileged – such that when the teachers were confronted (both literally and metaphorically) by a non-traditional, problematic student (and all that might mean) many found the experience to be extremely draining both emotionally and physically.

As teacher educators and researchers, we may well be aware of the ‘shifting parade’ (Clandinin, Downey & Huber, 2009, p. 146) that is part and parcel of schools and the context of schooling. It is essential then, for teacher educators to support teachers as they ‘compose stories to live by that will allow them to shift who they are and are becoming’, because what they “know” to be “a teacher” is also a process of change. Their understandings should not be seen as a criticism of how they perceive their identities as “teacher” (p. 146). New understandings of a “teacher” could potentially enable the site-based teacher educators to more successfully interpret the “unexpected” behaviours and dispositions of their preservice teachers.

Clearly these teachers’ stories tell of “conduct unbecoming” of an educator on many levels: in relation to their problematic preservice teacher, other teachers, their university colleagues and themselves. My analysis shows that such “conduct” is produced when the university places learners - both the preservice teacher and the site-based teacher educator - in risky, dangerous situations where teachers are under-prepared, ill-supported and even dismissed as they interact with their preservice teacher. University staff appear in this study to have expected the teachers to know what to do and how to
address the needs of the preservice teacher with almost no input and support, and sometimes active opposition on their part. I have argued that there is a significant need for university staff to review the way that site-based teacher educators are positioned in preservice teacher education; to review a regime of truth that positions universities as more powerful than the other partners in the teacher education triad, who simply set up and legitimate the (sometimes difficult) relationships between the others.

Teaching is typically a culture where teachers work in isolation and one where publicly criticising colleagues is ‘un-natural’. Consequently teaching has failed to develop a model of supportive critique. According to Kleinhencz and Ingvarson (2004) there has never been a reliable system in which teachers have professional confidence, or reflects the complexity and depth of their work as professionals. In addition, the discourses of teacher education in which these teachers operate belong to much broader societal discourses that typically position teaching as a feminised and caring profession, where the privileged discourse produces the good teacher as a supportive person who looks for positives in any situation, does not criticise colleagues and behaves in a “genteel” manner (Ortlipp, 2005). All but three of the teachers in this study were female and all of them (including the three men, who operated in this feminised workforce) spoke of looking for positives, being supportive – constituting themselves as subjects within a normative discourse that privileges restraint and constructs the expression of emotions as abnormal behaviour. The teachers spoke of never expressing their negative emotions to their preservice teacher, and importantly, they did not express their feelings to university staff either.

One of the other major issues raised in this study is the power of an accountability discourse, which is also one of performativity – where teachers believe they are held accountable for their preservice teachers’ success or otherwise. Smyth (2001) argued that the greatest danger in the “standards” discourse ‘lies in its capacity to represent itself as authoritative, and not merely as one among many possible discourses about teaching’ (p. 143). However, teachers need to understand the power of such discursive constructions in order to refuse them – and herein lies another responsibility of university teacher educators.

Discourses are multiple and contradictory, and while I have argued on one hand that teachers such as Bryce and Annette adopted silence as a form of resistance, I have
claimed that others (like Alison and Renee) resisted by adhering to an accountability discourse that resulted in them keeping copious notes to ensure they had “evidence” to support their assertions. Interestingly though, it is also this discourse of accountability that is taken up when the teachers award a passing grade to a preservice teacher who they felt to be unsatisfactory: concerned that if the preservice teacher was unsuccessful, then they would be apportioned blame for the lack of success. This blame goes hand in hand with feelings of guilt associated with a preservice teacher’s failure. Consequently, they attempted to “protect” themselves, and protect the preservice teacher by awarding a passing grade. However, in their reflective accounts in the interviews with me they ultimately “tell on themselves” when they openly criticised their own weakness for not demonstrating the “toughness” required to fail the underachieving candidate.

I have argued that teacher education courses need to provide spaces for teacher education students to engage in serious discussions in relation to discourses of schools and schooling, about how preservice teachers are positioned in the discourses and ‘the possibility of functioning effectively within multiple discourses’ (Marsh, 2002a, p. 345). Further, and as noted by Searle (1997) teacher education course must recognise that:

‘for marginalised or “at risk” students to become socialised into academic discourses, they are required to put in much more effort than is required for those students who are more closely aligned to the privileged discourses. For this reason alone, members of the academy should reflect not only on their own teaching practices but on student learning, and how they may assist all students to become successful apprentices to academic learning’ (p. 69).

As outlined in Chapter 2, there is considerable literature that tells us that traditional and non-traditional preservice teachers struggle to “fit in” to the context of schools. They often find themselves positioned as “powerless” in the pervasive discourse of “experience” in schools. It is only through open discussions can we hope to enhance students’ capacity to find alternative subject positions within the discursive practices of schools and universities. I claim that part of the discussions with preservice teachers should also be about why teachers in schools “feel” the way they do – what constructs them as subjects with particular emotional responses to particular situations. Academics and preservice teachers need to commit time to discuss issues such as a site-based teacher’s responses when expectations are not met.
This study has illustrated that the teachers experienced sadness, regret and disappointment as a result of perceived loss – lost opportunities for additional support in their classroom, loss of status when the university dismissed their opinions or requests for assistance, and loss of confidence when they were unable to support the preservice teacher to achieve a satisfactory outcome. Similarly, when the preservice teachers appeared to be uncommitted by demonstrating a lack of preparedness, arriving late, leaving early, for example, teachers interpreted these behaviours as failure to preserve some very valued traditions of teaching that are held as key truths in the discursive construction of the teacher, and that site-based teacher educators therefore hold as important. The teachers appeared to interpret the apparent lack of commitment as a dismissal of part of their identity as teachers.

What could prove to be useful in teacher education is an exploration of the role of dissonance in learning and repositioning of difficult emotions as a productive, rather than being seen as a negative aspect of learning and teaching (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). I have argued that dissonance has a role in transformative learning and it can be a powerful tool in teacher education programs, where teacher educators need to foreground the challenges of the profession and preservice teachers’ entry into it. It is clear from this study that teachers found the idea of criticism and dissonance to be, in the majority of cases, so antithetical to their identities as teacher/carer that they avoided it, at significant cost to themselves and their preservice teacher, and I argue, the profession, as well. It is unrealistic, I believe, to expect either preservice teachers or site-based teacher educators as individuals, to alter the occupational socialisation patterns of current initial teacher education programs – i.e. to accept challenge and welcome dissonance. I argue that currently both of these groups typically hold marginalised positions in teacher education – preservice teachers when they are in schools and teachers with respect to their relationship with the university. For these reasons, both have limited capacity to achieve such an outcome, as marginalised members of this triadic learning community (Lave & Wenger, 1991). However, this thesis has recognised the possibilities that arise when teachers reject dominant/normative discourses in favour of one less privileged but one that reflects their construction of teacher professional.

While universities focus on the critical analysis of education with their students over an extended period of time, site-based teacher educators are expected (by both the
university and preservice teacher) to address their needs “immediately”, given the typical short time frame in which the students are working in schools. While universities may desire that their preservice teachers will become change agents in schools, research evidence indicates that this does not happen (Cope & Stephens, 2001), and my analysis has shown that the university staff associated with my study did little to support site-based educators to initiate or maintain such changes. University staff typically criticise the practices of site-based teacher educators – if not to their faces, certainly in the published literature. However, it is imperative that we move beyond such “othering” and develop possibilities for both preservice teachers and teacher educators to see challenge and any associated discomfort ‘as a catalyst to growth rather than, as is often the case, as judgement of development’ so that the gap between the discourses of carer and assessor may be bridged (Martin, 1996).

Similarly, teacher educators, both university and site-based, must examine and deconstruct preservice teachers’ stories about why they are entering the profession [and their expectations of it] as well as assisting them to accept ‘the bureaucratic and politicised terrain and [respond] agentively to it’ (Galman, 2009, p. 479). This sort of reform is not likely to be easy but such discussion and deconstruction needs to be included as a foundational component of initial teacher education courses. If universities fail to adopt such reforms, then the current situation where preservice teachers struggle to negotiate the cultures and discourses of schools will continue. It is well accepted in the discourse of teacher education that a means of counteracting the purported deficiencies of practicing teachers is achieved by addressing them in initial teacher education (Cope & Stephen, 2001). However, it would be unproductive to simply assume that if preservice teachers do have an understanding of discourse and the socialising nature of the profession, it will mean that they will be agentic and transformative.

What must be considered in tandem with such campus-based course development is the inclusion of site-based teacher educators’ opinions and knowledge in the development of such reforms, as well as in professional learning opportunities with preservice teachers. To include teachers only for the purposes of telling them about how the university perceives schools, schooling and their importance in initial teacher education is not productive. Such an approach would simply maintain a situation where teachers are positioned as less powerful and less knowledgeable – as outsiders – rather than
adopting a model where initial teacher education is co-produced by all the participants. A possible model and one to which we could aspire is, according to Barab, Squire and Dueber (2000), one in which initial teacher education links the learning of preservice teachers with the learning of experienced teachers and teacher educators, always mindful however, of who has the capacity to exercise power in such relationships.

I argue that there is less of a need for a “shared understanding” than there is a need for recognising and respecting the different (but no less important) roles of university-based and site-based teacher educators in successful teacher education programs. According to Feiman-Nemser (1998), it is not productive to merely to try to “fix” site-based teachers, nor to distance preservice teachers from site-based teachers’ practice by “critiquing” it. She argued that:

> both responses are short-sighted and self-defeating. They reflect a deficit view of the field. They bypass what thoughtful teachers know about teaching. They miss an opportunity to frame teacher education as a collaborative enterprise that depends on research-based knowledge as well as teachers' knowledge and ways of knowing and on continuous exploration, development and critique (p. 65).

When the culture of a setting is focussed on assessments and standardised outcomes, which is an ever-increasing aspect of teacher education in Australian universities and schools, “teaching” is often directed by assessable outcomes and management is increasingly hierarchical and evaluative in nature rather than being characterised by ‘dialogue, trust and flexibility – the markers of professional learning communities’ (Bartholomew & Sandholtz, 2009, p. 160). It is these kinds of learning communities that are required in initial teacher education – where preservice teachers, site-based teacher educators and university staff engage in open dialogue and trust each others’ contribution to a successful triadic arrangement where power is shared, although this will require reflexive attention to the difficulties of such an undertaking.

I have indicated that there are other models of initial teacher education that enable the development of “communities of learners”, where it appears that participants are all equally learners and teachers, noting the work of Le Cornu and Ewing (2008) in this regard. In both these cases, significant commitment of intellect and resources at both school and university level have been employed to support quality initial teacher education programs in learning communities. These models recognise and embed the valuable contributions as well as the needs of all participants, and highlight the role for
learners in actively supporting the learning of others in co-participation rather than in an individualistic model. Any model that constructs teacher learning as collaborative could, according to Le Cornu and Ewing (2008), break down ‘individualistic cultures where teachers spent much of their working lives’ in isolation (p. 1805) and being concerned about others’ perceptions of their mistakes or “shortcomings”. Collaborative communities, such as those described by these authors, also provide spaces for teachers to support each other emotionally as well as intellectually (p. 1806). It is important to note that merely achieving genuine partnerships is “hard work”. For many years school/university partnerships have been a feature of the UK teacher education landscape – naming a “partnership” does not bring it into existence. Research suggested that there were serious concerns with those models and the collaborative nature of these partnerships was called into question. For example, Glover & Hudson (1995) concluded that UK models of partnership ranged across the spectrum from mere ‘placement’ to a meaningful working collaboration, while Bullough et al.’s (1997) research also confirmed that “partnerships” still afforded a privileged place to staff from the tertiary sector – an issue of power and whose knowledge is privileged.

As my study has shown, it is in teacher education programs where taken-for-granted hierarchical practices exist, where teachers are left unsupported and isolated when dealing with problematic preservice teachers that negative emotional experiences become accentuated. I am not suggesting Le Cornu and Ewing’s model is the only teacher education program that is attempting to address issues that are identified in this study, but I present it here as one example of a reconceptualised site-based education program that does address the emotional and intellectual needs of learners, including site-based teachers and values notions of reciprocity where there is a responsibility of participants to support and include each other emotionally and intellectually.

Connected to the idea of community of learners (but with less likelihood of uneven power relations) is a move towards the perception of the teacher education relationship between schools and universities more broadly as “co-production”. In this framework, the distinction between “consumer” and “service provider” (in the idiom of consumerism) is diminished such that all are stakeholders are seen as ‘necessary, expert and generative co-participants and co-partners’, and not as an occasional localised practice but at a system-wide level (Dunston, Lee, Boud, Brodie & Chiarella, 2008, p. 40). A co-production model would see universities working with schools and it would
disrupt the notion “expert” university and “passive” school/teacher who accepts the preservice teachers into their classrooms, usually on the university’s terms and where site-based teacher educators’ contributions are often seen as deficient. In a similar vein, Le Cornu, Mayer and White (2001) suggested that co-construction of knowledge, attitudes and beliefs would enhance the pedagogical practices associate with site-based education. In order to achieve a genuine co-production of initial teacher education, there would be a need for substantial socio-cultural and organisational change, which inherently involves shifts in the distribution of power (Dunston et al., 2008, p. 42). Though this is an exciting concept, the challenge here cannot be under-estimated. It becomes messier when we consider that both teachers and university staff are, at times, providers and that both are, at times, consumers. The complexity is further increased with the inclusion of the preservice teacher as a “consumer”. However, given that power continually shifts and circulates within this triadic arrangement, it would appear useful to consider that teacher education would benefit significantly from embracing a genuine co-production discourse. The members of the triad would become co-participants, co-designers and co-producers – and all would be located as ‘insiders’ in teacher education (Dunston et al., 2008, p. 45).

At the same time as there is a need to reassess where the exercise of power resides, many universities will need to reassess their commitment to initial teacher education if they are genuinely serious about the enterprise (Zeichner, 2002). It is apparent in universities that initial teacher education is becoming the “poor cousin” among university programs – both literally and metaphorically. Courses are increasingly being taught by part-time or sessional staff (Clandinin, Downey & Huber, 2009, p.150), who cost less to employ but who are often not involved in the development of the courses in which they are teaching and supervising preservice teachers. Further, some Australian universities have abandoned undergraduate courses for post-graduate studies only, while others have abandoned preservice teacher education completely to focus on research and graduate studies, which are two of the key indicators on which universities are evaluated.

However, universities will continue to be ‘assessed” by teachers in schools, their preservice teachers and the community in general. When the community is dissatisfied with issues of adolescence and schooling, the attention is initially directed at teachers. Attention is then diverted to the quality of the teachers, which then directs attention to
the quality of teacher preparation. Australian federal and state governments have
instigated numerous reviews in the past twenty years, examining the quality of teaching
and teacher education, with the latest reviews leading to increased levels of external
control and surveillance through “standards” frameworks. Such standards are enshrined
in legislation and these government agencies have the responsibility for overseeing the
design and accreditation of initial teacher education courses, including the entry
requirements of teacher education candidates. Consequently, university staff are
increasingly required to respond to external agencies in relation to the development of
their own programs and this results in associated loss of autonomy.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The emotional dimension of teacher education is so underexplored that there are many
opportunities to open the door on emotion and emotion discourse in teacher education
(and the other caring/feminised professions). I suggest that there are some major areas
where attention could be focussed.

The time that preservice teachers are at university is an appropriate time and place for
academics to challenge the construction of emotions as “irrational” and feminine, while
at the same exploring new understandings within the school context. Teacher education
courses should attempt to demystify some of the long-held views about teacher
emotions and their relationship to working conditions and social structures (Winograd,
2003). However, there are other reasons why preservice teacher education courses
should attempt to address issues of emotions. According to Goldstein and Lake (2000),
preservice teachers have romanticised and idealistic expectations of teaching and their
caring role in it, which is characterised by ‘oversimplification, essentialism, and idealism’
(p. 870). The authors suggest that “expectation” makes new teachers particularly vulnerable
to burnout and exhaustion due to unrealistic demands on themselves (Liljestrom &
Roulston, 2007). If these issues are not discussed within the “safety” of a university
classroom, they are not likely to be discussed in the more public space of a school. As
indicated previously, such romanticised views are often the result of media portrayals of
“champion” teachers who soldier on to achieve success against the odds – images such as
those in ‘Stand and Deliver’(Menéndez, 1988) or ‘Dead Poets Society’(Weir, 1989) or even
‘Goodbye, Mr Chips’ (Hilton, 1933).
There are also opportunities for longitudinal studies to explore discourses of emotion within initial teacher education and in the work of preservice teachers and university staff. There exists a gap in the published research to explore how experienced teachers “manage” their emotional expression and if their strategies for coping with difficult experiences change over time. Consequently, there is scope within the field to explore emotions that do have a long-term and perhaps deleterious effect on the teacher (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). This question relates to the degree and kind of experience that can aid teachers to become more resilient - both to the stressors related to preservice teachers and/or their colleagues or university staff. In what way do teacher’s emotions influence their choice of strategies for dealing with preservice teachers? How do “anticipated” emotions moderate site-based teacher educators’ behaviours – for example, is coping by avoidance of conflict/dissonance a viable option?

Third, I argue that educational managers must take a leadership role in addressing the emotional dimension of teaching and learning. Teachers’ emotions, as a component of educational policies, are under-recognised (O'Connor, 2008). It is not a teacher’s personal responsibility to have to cope with and manage the emotions that result from difficult personal and professional circumstances. Howard and Johnson (2004) claimed that education bureaucracies and school leaders have a significant role to play in supporting teachers in situations such as site-based placements and not only for the benefit of the school. It would be timely to investigate in what way initiatives such as time release, appropriate professional and personal support could reduce the level of negative emotional experiences that teachers endure during site-based teacher education programs (Sinclair et al., 2006).

There is undoubtedly still more to be done in recognising the connectedness of emotions, power, teacher identities and the forms of subjectivity associated with site-based education. Poststructuralist understanding potentially allows researchers to explore the micro-political level of interactions such as those that occur in site-based teacher education – particularly in terms of the power-knowledge relationship. Further, poststructuralists attend to “technologies of the self”, potentially allowing for deeper exploration of the silencing of emotional expression. Researchers, including teachers should examine the ways in which power is exercised by whom, for what purpose. Certainly, it would be teachers in schools who could potentially benefit from
researching in this area, but typically they are not the people undertaking the research, so their voices may well remain unheard.

It is clear from teachers’ responses to the questions I posed in my follow-up interviews that the role of ‘storying’ can be a powerful tool for healing and developing teacher identity. Zembylas (2003a) suggested that teachers becoming aware of their emotional responses through storying may in fact be empowering. Renee was one of the first teachers I interviewed and she claimed that the opportunity to tell her story was ‘cathartic’ and I have already noted that many of the participants expressed surprise that somebody was bothering to listen to their stories. Other than the opportunity offered by this study, none of the participants had been provided with any form of follow-up support by their partner university after their difficult experience. Clearly, there is potential for assisting teachers to cope if university personnel can make time to hear the teacher’s stories, particularly those with negative experiences. Making public such stories could reduce the sense of isolation felt by many of these teachers in similar situations and potentially see teachers’ willingness and capacity to make public their felt emotions. However, it must be noted that “enabling” such open discussion about emotional experiences is not without dangers as well.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has attempted to interrupt current conceptions of site-based teacher education by exploring the emotional experiences of teachers working with preservice teachers who struggle to achieve the desired outcomes of their initial teacher education program. I have used the experiences of marginalised teachers to generate critical questions about preservice teacher education though what Collins (2004) refers to as “oppositional consciousness”. I speak from a position of privilege that is afforded to me by my “place” in the university and from my own experiences in teacher education. That position may or may not authorise what I argue in this study. The academy might not agree with my interpretation. However, I believe it important not to retreat from providing a space for teachers to be heard, even if it is in my interpretation of their stories. I do not pretend to speak for them, nor do I want just to speak about them, but rather I hope that the reader hears me speaking with these teachers.
There have been multiple stories feeding into this text and my own personal stories and experiences affect my interpretation of the teachers’ narratives. As an academic working at the boundaries I am in a position to produce a counter-hegemonic discourse (hooks, 2004) in relation to preservice teacher education. The teachers’ stories allowed me to grasp a clearer understanding of the extremely difficult emotional experiences of some of those with whom I work in preservice teacher education, those in other sites and circumstances. However, what has been of greatest interest and importance to me has been that the narratives have laid bare the taken-for-granted discursive practices that constrain the field of initial teacher education. I have been able to identify specific discursive practices associated with accountability, power/knowledge that position site-based teachers as ‘marginalised’ others, while bringing attention to constructions of preservice teachers that are held by site-based teachers – constructions that may work to accentuate their difficult emotional experiences and ultimately result in them withdrawing from what can potentially be a professionally rewarding opportunity when they support their newly-forming colleagues.

I believe there is much to take from this study, not only for university teacher educators and how they conduct their programs, but also for experienced teachers working with preservice teachers. The findings have the potential to encourage university staff to consider preservice teaching and teachers’ place within it differently – to be the impetus for encouraging university staff and teachers to work together to develop understandings of discourse and identity construction in relation to preservice teacher education. By speaking about and recognising the effects of marginalisation on teachers involved in preservice teacher education I hope that I have contributed something of value to processes that can interrupt marginalising practices with positive outcomes for teachers, preservice teachers and university staff.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


de Marrais, K., & Tisdale, K. (2002). What happens when researchers inquire into difficult emotions?: Reflections on studying women's anger through qualitative interviews. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(2), 115-123.


APPENDICES

Appendix 1  Copy of the semi-structured interview guide

Appendix 2  Participants in the study - brief overview

Appendix 3  Example of coding of text using nVivo

Appendix 4  Published articles emanating from this thesis;


APPENDIX 1

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Questions to be addressed in the Interviews

1. **GRAND TOUR** Can you first all just tell me as much as you can about the experience of working with this student. (

2. How did you **cope** when the student was experiencing difficulties – (prompts-silence, avoidance …

3. Were there times when you felt you weren’t coping? Can you tell me about them?

4. Where did you seek support from?

5. What **support/preparation** did you get before the placement?

6. Did the university explain the process for dealing with a “difficult” student?

7. What support did you receive from the uni or colleagues during the placement?

8. What support was provided after the placement was concluded? What would you have wanted the uni to do?

9. How do you go about **maintain control** of yourself when the situation is a difficult as you have described?

10. What did you learn about yourself through this experience?

11. What did you learn in terms of professional knowledge…?

12. How has this experience impacted on you **personally…professionally**? What emotional costs did you make?

13. Did you carry feelings related to these events into your personal life..home….?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Teacher (SBTE)</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Brief description of participants</th>
<th>ITE of Preservice Teacher</th>
<th>Preservice Teacher (PST)</th>
<th>PST pseudonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Experienced senior executive, co-ordinates placement program at her school</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>One non-recent leaver and one mature-aged</td>
<td>multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; several years teaching experience</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret /April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; many years teaching experience</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>Mature, Career changing</td>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndall</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; many years teaching experience</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>Mature, Career changing</td>
<td>Bob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; many years teaching experience</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>Post uni</td>
<td>Helen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; many years teaching experience</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>Mature, Career changing</td>
<td>Nigel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; several years teaching experience</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Recent school leaver</td>
<td>Bridget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; many years teaching experience</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>Once career changer and one recent school leaver</td>
<td>Nick &amp; Terri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therese</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; many years teaching experience</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Recent school leaver</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; many years teaching experience</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>Mature, Career changing</td>
<td>Ejani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; many years teaching experience</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>Mature, Career changing</td>
<td>Harriet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; many years teaching experience</td>
<td>Post grad</td>
<td>Mature, Career changing</td>
<td>Brian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Experienced SBTE; many years teaching experience</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Mature, Career changing</td>
<td>Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Young teacher and inexperienced SBTE</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Recent school leaver</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Young teacher and inexperienced SBTE</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Recent school leaver</td>
<td>Lyndsay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
W: Introduction
T: What I am interested in is the emotions associated with having that prac student then I'm interested in finding out how you coped; what role did the university have in all that; um where you got support, if you got did get any support at all all that general kind of stuff but I’ll keep - I’ll come back I won’t expect you to remember all those silly questions.
I know I’m interested in emotions but firstly just tell me the story around Neil and how you dealt with him and then I’ll come and ask questions I need you to answer.
T: All right. OK. Well I got young Neil for the first week observation that’s what he was only prepared to do observe. If you asked him if he would like to read a story, he said, “NO. I haven't read the story before” and I don’t know how you could go past a year 2 picture book type story. I don’t know why he had to pre-read that. Anyway, I got sick for 2 days during that first week and I had them off and I was so glad because I knew it was going to be difficult.
W: I’ll just stop you there and to ask to check sound level that’s fine
T: So the casual teacher he had didn’t have I very high opinion of him also. He wasn’t very interested in listening to anything that I said about how the school was running etc. Um. This is a terrible thing to say, but as a person he is very repellent. Um that W: is that all
T: He is- he has an affected accent which you know is an affectation plus he is very effete (?) Um his person hygiene he had wax coming out of his ears and he’s getting into your space. And he wouldn’t do what - that was where the whole crunch came. He wouldn’t do what you asked him. Now when he actually came to teach, he decided that he would have the whole lessons over by Monday the first Monday. And they weren’t that terrific and he wouldn’t listen and I did write that down in the very first lesson plan. Um it just kept continuing - the other teachers would say, “How do you put up with him. He’s so rude?” …..(muffled)
So I thought No the university lecturer’s suppose to come and check them out. But then NO I rang up. We rang up because he was really quite awful
W: So besides being personally and physically repulsive um was there other things that you were concerned about in terms of his
T: He just would not listen - he just would totally ignore what you had to say. He was so great that he didn’t feel that he had to be answerable to anyone. And I said, “You’re answerable to me and the university.”
“NO!”
W: So how are you feeling now, as in that point in time when you were waiting for the university to come and he’s not doing what you want?
T: I was really quite um I was angry. I was angry with him because I thought there is nothing more I can do so I went to the boss and he decided to contact the university but I didn’t expect him to get shafted the way he was. Because why we rang up was to get him some help. That made me feel really dreadful.
W: The fact that he got shafted made you feel really dreadful?
T: Yeh, Yeh, because he I wasn’t actually allowed to say anything to him about the lecturer being there. And of course when he found out, you know, he said he didn’t think things were very bad. And I thought, “Well what did you think?
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Introduction

This paper examines the methodological dilemmas associated with analytical framing as an aspect of the research process. Doing qualitative research potentially changes a researcher - changes their sense of self, who they think they are, who they want to become (Gregson & Rose, 2000). The paper examines the ethical dilemma of what that change might mean, for the project, the researcher and the participants.

Members of the academy concede that undertaking research brings with it the opportunity for new learning and through such learning the researcher is potentially changed. As a research student (and student of research) I am required to interrogate my methodological processes to ensure they will meet the demands of the academy for rigour and completeness. That interrogation then makes me a subject of my research – an object of my reflexive gaze. I and others concede that the researcher learns from engaging in the research process; it then follows that the lens of analysis may well be altered as a result of the learning, and the researcher may see earlier stages of the work as inadequate. Such a reflexive gaze brings with it the risk of silencing the researcher in order to protect herself from just such a gaze of the academy – regulated by, and simultaneously constructing, the discourse of the academy. Research as performance defines a subjectivity of the researcher within the academic discourse – an identity that ‘is a constant process of becoming - an endlessly revised accomplishment that depends on very subtle interactional judgements, and is always risky’ (MacLure, 2003, p. 19). I would argue that research is a highly reflexive endeavour and with that reflexivity are related ethical dilemmas - dilemmas associated with viewing the data (and even the research process itself) through a different lens, with the potential for different readings. In this paper I attempt to make sense of the methodological conflicts that arose when I adopted just such a reflexive orientation to my work.

Context/Background

This paper emanates from research associated with the emotionally charged experiences of site-based teacher educators who were working with preservice teachers who struggled to achieve a satisfactory outcome on their field placement. It was one particular unpleasant episode with a
preservice teacher who had failed the site-based component of his course that propelled me to undertake this study. The student in question had been very problematic while working in the school on his placement. He behaved in ways that the teachers felt were compromising the learning of the children and were “professionally’ confronting. He used abusive language to the staff and exhibited a range of anti-social behaviours, to the extent that university staff terminated the placement and he was withdrawn from the site. Following the award of a failing grade, the student then threatened the safety of staff, both in the school and on the university campus. University and school-based staff were clearly shaken by the experience, particularly those that had direct contact with the student during and after the placement. I felt that the outcomes for individuals involved in such occurrences should be explored in greater depth and particularly the perspectives of the teachers. While the voices of academics and preservice teachers are represented in the literature on site-based teacher education (Bloomfield, 2004; Goldenberg & Waddell, 1990; Ortlipp, 2003), I felt the teachers’ stories of these events needed to be told too (Siebert, Clark, Kilbridge, & Peterson, 2006). ‘The project of freeing the voice [of the teachers] and the politics of emancipation which this carries’ has been an important characteristic of research in teacher education (MacLure, 2003, p. 100) and feminist research more generally. Accordingly, my research focussed on the site-based teachers’ recollections of incidences with preservice teachers who experienced difficulties on their placement.

I entered the field to talk with teachers in schools – teachers who had been put in contact with me by colleagues, in universities across eastern Australia, who knew these school teachers had recently worked with a preservice teacher who had struggled. Although I had phone conversations with the seventeen teachers in order to organise the interviews, consent etc, I had not met any of them prior to the interview – they were “strangers to me” even though I (mistakenly) felt at the time that their stories would be very familiar to me. Of the seventeen teachers, fourteen were female. Interestingly, also, was the fact that only four of the failing students that formed the
backgro...backgro...

straight from school into their undergraduate degree or straight from their undergraduate degree into a post-graduate initial teacher education program. The remainder of the preservice teachers were typically career-changing or re-accrediting older individuals – “non-traditional” preservice teachers (Hastings, 2009).

I used my network of colleagues in seven different universities not only to identify teachers whose stories I wanted to hear, but also as the initial point of contact with the participants, rather than me contacting them “unannounced”. I hoped that by making the connections to the research through a mutual colleague I could enhance the level of trust, as the success of an interview may depend on the trust and rapport established before and during the interview, especially as the focus of the interviews was addressing possibly painful experiences. Feminists from different theoretical positions have championed the conversational interview and forms of analysis that curtail the authority of the academic researcher, by encouraging aspects of collaborative interpretation (MacLure, 2003). Interviews are not neutral tools for data gathering but an active interaction between researcher and researched, which results in a contextually-based outcome (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 645). As means of connecting with the participants, I exposed my own “wounds” in relation to personal/professional experiences associated with preservice teachers as a means of demonstrating an understanding of the emotional costs associated with the task of mentoring a preservice teacher who experienced difficulties on their school placement. My personal tale as an academic working with such preservice teachers was one of anxiety, fear and frustration. I had extensive experience working with preservice teachers, originally as a site-based teacher educator then as an academic supervisor.

Initially, I had every intention of employing a “qualitative feminist framework” in a liberal humanist sense (see inter alia Tong, 1992). Using a feminist framework means to ‘look at the world from a woman’s perspective honouring the common experiences and histories of women in
society’ (Bierema & Cseh, 2003 p. 8). Feminist researchers use lenses that attend to the ‘structural inequalities that frame the lives of women’ (ibid p. 8) and I wanted to honour the authentic voice of site-based teacher educators – a group that I believe is silenced in the literature on teacher education. I wanted to hear the stories of their lived experiences.

I chose to undertake the study as a narrative project, where the data gathered was a product of the interaction of the interviewer and interviewee and other contexts. I agreed with the assertion that ‘by studying and interpreting self-narratives, the researcher can access not only the individual identity and its systems of meaning but also the teller’s culture and social world’ (Lieblich, Turval-Mashiach & Zilber, 1998, p. 9), always mindful that my interpretation of the data would always be personal, partial, changing and responsive. In a manner typical of the discourse of narrative inquiry, I undertook a close reading of the material, which required me to listen dialogically to three voices - to the voices of the participants, in unison with the theoretical framework and while reflexively monitoring the interpretation (Bakhtin, 1981). In this instance, the iterative process occurred between the researcher/reader, the participant’s narrative and its meanings (Lieblich et al., 1998).

What I thought was appropriate methodology I later came to see as problematic in terms of what Lee (2000) calls a naïve realism, where I was attempting to represent the lived experiences of teachers without situating my analysis in a social theory that could contextualise my reading and with an unequal power relationship often associated with academic researchers - a stance that is foregrounded in the literature (MacLure, 2003). When I tentatively presented my first “reading” of the data and mentioned my analytic ah ha moment to colleagues, they suggested that I needed to engage with the big theories and situate my study within a coherent theoretical framework. As a new researcher vying for a space in the academy, I certainly did not want to be seen as ‘insufficiently theorised and too unsystematic to compete for academic journal space’ (Fishman &
Reflexivity is not new and writing reflexively into and about research is not new. Orland-Barak (2002) chose to disburse her personal reflections into the main narrative to highlight ‘biological nature of the reflexive process of writing’ (p. 270). She suggested that research frees us from some sense of superiority over a past. Similarly, Lincoln (1997) noted that the lives of the researcher are influenced by the research. However, that comment appeared to be in relation to the responses and respondents, not so much about the potential for researcher learning through the methodology. Bloomfield (2006) did recognise the interrelatedness of method and analysis and the transformatory potential of that relationship, as did Mauther and Doucet (2003), who argued that there is an ‘assumption built into many data analysis methods that the researcher, the method and the data are separate entities rather than reflexively interdependent and interconnected’ (p. 414).

As an outcome of my reflexive work, I came to also understand how my work was being regulated by a discourse of the academy. I suspect that like many early career researchers, I wanted to be positioned as an insider, within the academy, while I also desired the agency to refuse the power of the academy to position me in a particular way – I wanted to see myself in the work that I was producing (Ellis, 1997). I felt that it was important to express my understanding of my felt marginality and position as a place of resistance (hooks, 2004, p. 157) and it is imperative that researchers name their experiences ‘in order to claim the subjectivity, the possibility of historical agency’ (Harding 1995, p.128).

The data reconceived or ill conceived

In this section I turn to the data to demonstrate the dilemma in which I find myself placed and I will be drawing on material from two of the interviews – one which was conducted early in the project (Annette) and the second presented here (Therese), was the very last interview undertaken.
As part of the transcription and coding process, I read and reread my interview with Annette. The first thing I noticed was a difference from other transcripts in the textual form of Annette’s story – hers was orderly, tight, while others had typically been more disjointed, as the teachers attempted to capture their complete and emotional story, often by a very circuitous linguistic path. On the first reading, her story appeared familiar, known and understood to me - ‘in our everyday world … meaning is intersubjective, publicly available, linguistically constituted, and deeply familiar. ... we understand in and through the experience of being involved … in events’ (Kerdeman, 1998, p. 246). I thought that I knew what was happening in Annette’s situation. She told of an unsuccessful student whose behaviour engendered feelings of guilt, disappointment, frustration – not what she “expected” of a preservice teacher – expectations shaped by her prior experiences. There is no doubt that Annette’s experiences with her preservice teacher were highly emotional and will be reported as an important part of the study.

Embedded within her account of the emotional experience of her school-based supervision of this student, Annette also spoke of not allowing the preservice teacher the opportunity to ‘take over the class’. Annette’s recount indicated that she felt she would lose control of the students, who would be ‘out of control’ with the preservice teacher, and their behaviour would flow over into the playground and other classrooms, and then ‘they would know something was wrong in the room’. It was just such language that I identified as an ah ha moment – which led me to employ a different analytic lens. Subsequent readings of the text, informed by a post-structuralist lens that revealed the dominant discourses of schools, teaching and the power relations at play, allowed me to better understand what was going on in this situation – not necessarily explain but certainly understand (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000).

The ‘they’ to whom Annette referred were her colleagues, who operated in a discursive frame where the ‘good teacher’ is in control and controlling of her students. In order to remain in control, Annette also maintained control of the opportunities for the preservice teacher. Annette did not
want her colleagues to know that things were not right in her classroom. For Annette, her subjectivity as a good teacher is clearly important to her – her sense of self is closely aligned to her success in her school and classroom. According to Labaree (2000), school classes are characterised by ‘structural isolation’ where teachers establish their own set of rules and typically work alone (p. 230) – and away from the gaze of others. Further, Annette later in the interview described her behaviour as weak as she succumbed to pressure from her preservice teacher to award a satisfactory grade, even when she did not believe that it was warranted. She asserted that a teacher’s disposition to always be supportive and look for positives in her pupils is a position (I read discourse) that ‘works against being able to give a really good objective judgment at the end of the prac’. Consequently, she criticised herself yet she never questioned the university’s failure to support her and her preservice teacher during and after the difficult placement. The university even sent her a letter requesting she reconsider a higher grade for the preservice teacher and her response was to “silently” put the letter in the rubbish bin.

The second case to which I wish to refer is that of Therese (Hastings, 2008), who, as I indicated, was the last teacher interviewed as part of this study. At this stage of my study I had just begun to genuinely engage with a Foucauldian view of schools and schooling. I was particularly interested in the ways in which ‘power works through the discursive practices and performances of schooling’ (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1997, p. 288). I wanted to understand how power works in schools, such as - who are those that exercise the power? How do they become the powerful? Foucault explored power in terms of who are the beneficiaries of the current policies, structures, curriculum, systems in operation– systems etc. that produce the dominant and also the subordinate in the context, so his work was informative and significant in directing my thinking.

As the interview and analysis proceeded, what I thought of as familiar became unfamiliar, strange almost –as my gaze employed the different lens. When I interviewed Therese, it was in a small
temporary office in the hallway outside a boys’ toilet in a busy primary school\textsuperscript{1}. Therese’s story, while being familiar, was almost heart-wrenching to me. In her account of the events surrounding the preservice teacher who was assessed as failing, she described powerful emotional episodes. However, an examination of her interview also revealed a teacher who was positioned as powerless in significant aspects of her life – but not all of them. Other individuals appeared to exert control over her and positioned her as ‘needing’. Therese recounted comments from colleagues that suggested she was unprofessional and unsupportive in her relationship with the preservice teacher and inexperienced as a mentor. She described how the Principal took control of the final assessment process and the university supervisor, who did not consult with her about the course of action he wanted to take in relation to the student’s assessment – he positioned her as ‘outside’ of the process. Therese also recalled how her own children told her how she should have responded to the student’s behaviour. The preservice teacher, who she thought of as a “child – the same age as my children”, refused this positioning and also refused her the position of ‘expert’ within the classroom – the teacher, as somebody whom she believed he should respect. Therese was unable to exercise power that she felt came with the position of site-based teacher educator.

When Therese did attempt to gain control of the situation and she “lost it” with her preservice teacher, she experienced feelings of shame – the discourse of schooling is one that privileges “managed emotions”, nurturing behaviours and unexpressed emotions, including anger. Boler (1997) argued that shame was ‘the distressed comprehension of the self as inadequate or diminished: it requires, if not an actual audience before whom my deficiencies are paraded, then an internalised audience with a capacity to judge me’ (p. 86). However, she also claimed that shame was socially formed rather than some idiosyncratic or individualised phenomena, as the judgements one makes about one’s self, are framed within the norms and expectations of the social practice in the field in which one has failed. While her colleagues may have criticised her anger, Therese was much harder on herself.
A teacher may be seen as more or less powerful in relation to the knowledge and authority she has in her life at any particular time – as carer, leader, supervisor, administrator and colleague in her work environment, and as mother, partner and consumer, say, in other environments. For Therese, her story is of a woman who was marginalised in her work situation and lacked the capacity to exercise power/agency in multiple and intersecting discursive frames. ‘It is the imaginary quality of the individual’s identification with a subject position which gives it so much psychological and emotional force’ (Weedon, 1987, p. 31). To be denied power as a subject heightens the emotional impact of the experience – it is the emotional impact that is the focus of the study.

Discussion
How then do these examples illustrate the methodological dilemma associated with the analytical framing of my research? According to MacLure (2003),

the pursuit of methodological innocence often makes the workings of power even harder to see ... it often ends up repeating the knowledge crimes that it sets out to avoid ... Despite the search for more innocent forms of representation in which the voices and concerns of subjects might be heard without distortion, issues of power and authority will always return to the research writing (p. 104).

In this paper I am attempting the make those workings explicit.

The methodological dilemma relates to the impact that a reflexive stance - highly valued within the academy - may have. I argue it may ultimately lead to presenting a story that was not originally intended nor sought, and for which participants have not given, and may not have given, consent. There must always be an emergent aspect of the research - an interplay between the design and what emerges. The emergent issue is a result of the learning that occurs through engaging in research that in turn demands a shifting lens, which exposes different issues as it mediates the text. When I engaged in the initial conversations with the teachers around their experiences, I was at pains to make clear to them my intention of telling their story - to present the teachers’ authentic voices - not mediated through the lens of the research. Clearly though, even that “relaying” was never neutral. A typical response from the teachers was surprise that anybody would ‘bother’ to listen to their story and many expressed an appreciation that I wanted to hear their stories and tell their stories.

By applying analytic technique informed by a poststructuralist framing, I fear however that I have created an abrasion –a collision between my initial realist, liberal humanist framework and the
effects of a second reading informed by poststructuralism. A collision between the need to hear the authentic voice and an equally pressing need to tease out aspects of teacher subjectivity and the power of institutions. I concede there is no singular interpretation of the text–my interpretation is always partial, and another reader may have a different interpretation than mine. Certainly when the teachers read the transcripts, they read through the lens of their experiences and noted that the text was an accurate representation of the interview. But my reading is the one presented here. How do I honour the perspective of the teachers while simultaneously bringing to bear the critique and understanding afforded by my use of a poststructuralist lens?

In this methodological dilemma I am positioned as powerful in that I exercise power to shape the world the way I see it, while simultaneously responding to the demands of the academy. I am not comfortable with the way I now find myself positioned - as a subject of the research. I see myself an active player in the whole process. I do not want to see myself as marginalised, as an outsider. And yet, framing the analysis this way sees me create an even more uneven relationship with the participants. My intended positioning in this research process was to be speaking with my respondents, to my respondents. I feel now that I am not even speaking for them - I certainly don’t think they would speak of themselves in this way –as marginalised, as regulated by the discourse of schooling. I sense that I am speaking about my respondents. Hooks captures my sentiments when she says, ‘I do not want to be seen as a coloniser, the speaking subject who tells it back to the participants in a new way such that the story is now mine’ (2004, p. 158).

Lincoln (1997) reminded us that the choice of audience and purpose of the text will influence how the research and researcher is presented within the text. Another consideration might be who the researcher is attempting to persuade and convince with the choice of text. As I become more embedded in the research community - the academy - I see it as the primary consumer of this new knowledge. My need to construct a deep analysis plays into the discursive practices of the
academy – ‘the regime of truth’ of what counts as academic work. However, one of the tenets of my original feminist qualitative methodology is the importance of “member checking” – providing the participant with copies of the writing or even writing with the participants to ensure the “authentic” accurate voice is represented. The question is - How far should member checking go? At what point do I not share my writing? Can I assume that the teachers in my study are not the audience of the research? In whose best interests is it to not show them what I have written? I considered was it perhaps preferable to protect them from harm, in that they might find the reading of my analysis quite hurtful? There is clearly a doubleness between protection from harm versus the ideals of member checking. Further, there is also an obligation on me to write the analysis in such a way as to make it clear that I am analysing the discourse realised in their words and not them as people.

Would others see this as a dilemma? Certainly Gore (1992) in her critique of Giroux, argued that he failed to look reflexively at his own work – a task that Gore (and others) see is integral to critical practice but which sees me enmeshed in this dilemma. If I were to ask some eminent feminist post-structuralist writers if they experienced these same dilemmas, what might be their response? Would an examination of their work find that they used feminist thinking to select the objects of their gaze but then it was a post-structuralist lens that was bought to bear more heavily? For example, when Davies (2007) reported her analysis of a collaborative research program between teachers and academics, she did so in less than glowing terms. She suggested that the project was aimed at ‘enabling the co-researchers to gain access to different conceptual and discursive practices’ but could only deliver the “measurable goods” in neo-liberal terms (ibid p. 38).

Resolution of a dilemma?

The search for ontological security ... does not produce the comforts of certainty and authenticity, but produces oscillations instead - between scientific and personal authority; between mastery and surrender; between nostalgia for the authentic voice of
the subject and the desire for certainty that leads researchers to override it ... (MacLure 2003, p. 168)

Consider the outcomes of speaking - ie speaking for and speaking to as central to the debate. According to Alcoff (1995), the original author’s voice as an act of representation is no more authentic or neutral than speaking for others. What the teachers chose to tell me about their experiences illustrated what they saw as meaningful – ‘the stories they told me told on them’ (Phelan et al 2006, p. 164). However, it is essential while we are considering who is speaking, we do not obscure the very important issue of why we are speaking – ‘what are the effects of the speech on the discursive frame’ (Hennessy, 1995, p. 144). Writing the interpretation of the narratives through a post-structuralist lens has the potential to support teachers to understand the significance of different, intersecting and, at times, competing discursive frames and resultant different expectations. Such an interpretation has the potential to enable teachers to maintain a sense of agency within the discourses, and to make the emotional work of teachers, such as Therese and Annette, much less debilitating. Fishman and McCarthy (2000) would suggest that it is potentially transformative.

I hope that teachers, who find themselves in situations similar to Annette and Therese, will eventually be in a position to read my text and will find it liberating or even give them scope to exercise power in their working lives. I would argue that Therese’s lack of knowledge of her own subjectivity, university protocols and the expectations associated with the task may have exacerbated her situation, as she had to rely on ‘others’ and her personal preservice experiences to frame her responses. Therese was subjected to her colleagues’ interpretations of how she ‘should’ act and how she ‘should’ respond. She did not have the personal nor professional resources to ‘refuse’ that subjectification. She also sought support from the university, and from family and colleagues. Therese’s support at school was differentiated and her teenage children at home were not always supportive of her dilemmas – asking her to take up the school education discourse to
match the position she has within their family. As ‘mother’ she can ‘deal with it’, whereas as school-based teacher she apparently could not.

Importantly, one of the discursive constructions of teacher is ‘rational’ and unemotional. There is an expectation that a teacher should not lose control of her emotions in front of the class, with the consequence being that emotional expression is to be silenced. Therese felt demeaned when she ‘lost control’ with the preservice teacher – even though she felt her response to his behaviour was justified, she criticised herself for her lack of control. In the discourse of schooling a “good teacher” is rational and in control – of her emotions, her class, her life. Managing such emotions requires significant emotional labour and could potentially be debilitating when required continuously through a professional experience program such as those in which Therese and Annette were engaged (Hochschild, 1979). Further, while Annette is powerful within the context of her classroom, her story tells of someone marginalised by the university and treated as an outsider in the teacher education process when they encouraged her to change her grade. If Annette ‘understood’ that use of power by the university and could interpret the discursive practices in play, there exists the potential for her to refuse that subject position of “outsider” - as one who is less powerful than her university colleagues.

My study has two purposes. It gives voice to the silenced and illuminates the issue of the emotional cost of professional placements. By framing the research in terms of discursive practices and the construction of subjectivities, I can complete a deeper analysis as a way of meaning-making beyond the cases of teacher/preservice teacher interaction. For example, this study reveals situations of unequal power relationships between teachers in schools, between teachers and university staff; and it identifies the marginalisation of teachers involved in preservice teacher education.
Analyses such as these and then sharing these interpretations, has the potential to assist teachers understand their own subjectivities and the multiple subjectivities of their preservice teachers. To understand the “unexpected” behaviours of a preservice teacher assists the disruption of the notion that there is a fixed, predetermined or singular way to ‘be’ a preservice teacher. Consequently, this may reduce the emotional impact on school-based teacher educators that result from the difficult experiences with preservice teachers. If I had not explored or engaged with a post-structuralist framework as a tool of the research, then I may not have revealed even to myself such understandings and arguably, not to the teachers. If they understand the basis of their emotions, then they are, I think, more likely to be able to effectively respond to them - not to silence them, nor to dismiss them, but recognise the ‘truth’ of them within the discourses that shape their working lives. Britzman (2000) noted that there is a point when there is more to be gained by taking an omnipotent stance, and presenting the teachers’ stories as they themself could not, nor would not, have done – the desire to publicly question how these teachers are discursively constructed.

The way forward then for researching the field of teacher education, and specifically researching with a feminist post-structuralist lens, might be to see the project move from the real/authentic to an indicative representation - a case study, such that it is not about the participants – it is about the issue. As Britzman (2000) suggested, the study then becomes an attempt to represent their actuality, but also noting it is a partial representation governed by my experiences in time and place. If such situations are left unquestioned, and teachers never read such cases, we run the risk of perpetuating our culture’s and our schools’ injustices – the marginalisation of school-based teacher educators in both cases and the unrecognised regulatory nature of the good teacher subject. Freire (1993) wrote that in liberating others, one liberates the self. At some point I will find this a liberating experience, even if I am unable to achieve a socialist feminist goal of explaining fully the nature and function of these women’s ‘othering’ (Tong, 1992).
Ultimately I knew that I could not become bogged down in the dilemma. I needed to acknowledge it and remember that accounts are always fabrications ... weaving something new yet assembled out of fragments and recollections of other fabrications such as the interview data and field notes as well as the scattered traces of innumerable other cultural texts of identity, policy, institutional life, career, curriculum (MacLure, 2003, p. 187). It is not appropriate to do nothing to the text, but to imagine that the analysis reveals ‘the truth’ is also somewhat foolhardy - such that other readers/analysts would almost certainly constructs a different truth, another fabrication within the norms of a different discursive tradition.
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Notes
1 At the time I was shocked at her situation and I felt she could have made an effort to find a better location. It certainly never occurred to me that she did not think my visit was important enough to make that effort -ie refuse me any kind of status, but of course she could have been doing exactly that.

2 Her honesty is refreshing but I’m not sure what the teachers would think of her analysis. And the question is – would she care?
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