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The thesis explores the initial training of modern language teachers in England.

Two strands within the field of 'teacher education' research are examined: professionalization as socialization; and teacher thinking. It is noted that there is little empirical research on initial modern language training.

The thesis is philosophical and social theoretical, developing issues of epistemology and method in relation to the themes of theory and practice in teaching languages, training, and research which provide a focus for each chapter.

The study adopts and adapts a methodological approach derived from the French social theorist Pierre Bourdieu. The appropriacy and relevancy of this is discussed in practical and theoretical terms, leading to a 3-level study which moves the analyses through progressive stages of discussion of base data. Through a series of questionnaires, diaries, interviews and observation notes, five case studies are constructed. These are created as five case 'stories' in the first instance in order to allow the experiences of students to 'speak for themselves', thus providing a rich ethnographic account of students in training. The researcher engages in and with these case stories in a quasi-phenomenological fashion and constructs five 'critical' case studies in which the salient characteristics of each separate student are brought to the fore.

These critical case studies form the basis of a 'structural phenomenological' analysis of the field of training: by mapping the structural elements of the field and analyzing how and why students respond differentially in training. This leads to an analysis of the field in terms of Site, Time and Agency.

Finally, various social and post-modernist theories are employed to discuss the field of training as discourse, which implicates not only its structural components but students' own dispositions when located within it. Training is presented as demanding acts from students that are conditioned by their socio-cognitive character. The relevancy of the social theoretical approach to teacher education and the implications for policy conclude the thesis.
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Introduction

This thesis explores the initial training of modern language teachers in England. It arises from a concern to better understand pre-service teacher education and to account for the processes it involves. What is it to train to teach modern languages? and what are its processes? are the core research questions to the thesis. These central questions lead to other subsidiary ones: what happens to students in the course of training to teach?; what do they think and feel about such experiences?; how do they construct lessons and what happens in them in practice?; what are the influences and effects of those involved in training? - tutors, fellow-students, school-based colleagues; and what are the outcomes to their initial year's training? These are empirical questions, and the thesis aims to answer them through demonstration and analysis of data collected during a one-year training course: the Post-graduate Certificate of Education. Whatever the processes involved in training, students respond to them differentially. The thesis highlights this differential character and seeks to account for the way we might understand its operation.

This study is distinguished from much educational research by one characteristic; namely, the researcher into the processes of initial teacher education was also heavily involved as a participant, in that he acted as trainer to these students and thus taught, administered and assessed on their course. In the thesis, I argue that this aspect of the research gave unique contact with those being researched and insight into their practices. Furthermore, the research can partially be viewed as the work of a 'reflective practitioner'; thus, derived from a need to better understand the processes with which I was involved. However, the main focus to the research is others, training teachers, not myself. In order to
address the issue of subjectivism I have sought to objectify my position with regard to the research data at every point of working with it. I have wanted to draw on subjective thoughts and feelings - my own and those of the students - but my aim is to present objective findings, open to public scrutiny, and relevant to general situations away from the particular context in which the research is embedded. The relationship between the researcher and the researched, the researcher and the research, is an explicit component to the thesis.

Another key feature is the coverage given to broad epistemological questions. These issues are approached through a consideration of social theory and related philosophies. This socio-philosophical focus is connected to a discussion of educational theory as a social, practical event. There are two main ways in which such concerns permeate the research: firstly, methodological, as a means of making explicit my understanding of the status of the knowledge derived from the research methods employed; secondly, more specifically analytic, as a way of providing an account of student teachers’ knowledge formation as part of their advent into the profession.

Teacher education research is diffuse and eclectic. Chapter 1 sets out its principal strands and discusses major analytic concepts such as ‘professionalization’, the ‘reflective practitioner’, ‘craft knowledge’, and relates these to initial teacher training specifically.

Chapter 2 takes up the theme of teacher knowledge and the theory/practice dichotomy in order to discuss my main philosophical concerns in approaching the research. As previously stated, these concerns are expressed in order to provide an epistemological base, both for the research methodology and the analytic framework used in discussing the research findings. The work of the French social
theorist Pierre Bourdieu is used to develop a theory of research practice.

Chapter 3 sets out exactly how the research was conducted and connects the methods employed with the epistemological concerns raised in the previous chapter. The next three chapters present and analyze the data in terms of the framework developed in chapter 3. Essentially, these three chapters can be viewed as levels of analysis dialogically constituted.

Chapter 4 includes details of five 'critical' case studies, constructed from the empirical data provided by the research. The term 'critical' is used to indicate an analytic rather than descriptive approach to the account of students on the course; in other words, the researcher objectifies salient features of each case study rather than simply reporting what was said and what occurred.

Chapters 2 and 3 argue that teacher training can be understood as a 'field' in Bourdieu's terms; the structural components of which may be objectively 'mapped'. Chapter 5 provides such a mapping by taking the accounts given in the five case studies and grouping them through key components of the field of training. Essentially, the field locates students at specific temporal, spatial points; data is used to illustrate the experiences and consequences at these points, and analyses them in terms of time, site and agency.

Chapter 6, which is level 3 of the 3-level methodology adopted for the research, examines the nature of the field as constituted in chapter 5. This thesis adopts a social theoretical approach to teacher training; less in terms of the common concerns of such theory - power, class, social hierarchies, etc. - than the processes of
knowledge formation of one particular field of education. In this chapter, various social theories are synthesised in order to discuss the character of the processes of training. Chapter 6 is less concerned with the 'morphology' of the field than its operational mechanism. Communication is taken as a guiding concept; how the field communicates to students and how they respond differentially.

Chapter 7 is entitled 'Concluding Remarks and Practical Implications'. This chapter sums up the principal findings of the thesis in terms of the theory and practice of teacher training and conclusions to be drawn. Some coverage is also given to an assessment of the methodology developed and employed in the research. Finally, although the thesis is not cast in terms of policy design and innovation, some comments are offered concerning the practical implications and inferences to be made about present policy and practice.

Reading the Thesis

At one point in the thesis I refer to it as an 'epistemological experiment'. I do this, not to imply any tentativeness or uncertainty about what I am doing but to highlight the way I have sought to develop new ways of carrying out the research and presenting its results. Moreover, I have sought to interweave some highly abstract theories and philosophies with examples and analysis of practical detail from raw data. This undertaking has required me to use various narrative techniques and strategies in order to demonstrate the dynamic between theory and practice, real events and what can be said and generalised about them.
At the heart of the thesis lie five case studies derived from a detailed collection and processing of a large quantity of data. The way in which these case studies were constructed, the time it took and the processes it involved have left me with a dilemma. Although, I have reduced them to their essential features, they still require quite a large wordage in order to be presented in any coherent, cohesive fashion without losing their quality of individual student character. It has always been my intention to present something of the ‘lived experience’ of students in training, which has been given little coverage in the research literature. However, I also recognise that, essentially, the main body of my discussion only uses these studies as a basis. I have toyed with the idea of removing them to the appendix, for reference but not forming part of the main text. However, this solution skews what I did enormously in terms of time and effort; it also undervalues their content. However, putting them in the main body of the thesis creates a large section which is essentially very student specific. I have compromised by including them in the main text, in their ‘natural’ place, but have used coloured paper to set them out as distinct from the rest of the thesis. I have also provided a synopsis of each. People read theses for different reasons and in different ways. I have wanted to anticipate this and provide for the in-depth as well as the casual reader. To aid the latter, I have also a provided short synopsis before each chapter, again on coloured paper.
Synopsis

Chapter 1: Teacher Education

In this first chapter I consider the research literature on teacher education. Professionalization as socialization is discussed along with the implications of this concept to professional knowledge formation. Some coverage is given to teacher thinking, which raises several terms used by writers in this area: the reflective practitioner, craft knowledge, situational adjustment, stages of training, etc. Much of the literature does not deal with initial trainees specifically. There is little coverage of modern language teacher trainees, Nevertheless, I discuss the implications of the issues raised for initial trainees. Theory and Practice is addressed.
Chapter 1

Teacher Education

Chapter 1 Content

1.1 Introduction.
1.2.1 Teacher Education Research.
1.2.2 Modern Language Initial Teacher Education.
1.3.1 Socialization.
1.3.2 The Culture of Schools.
1.4.1 Teacher Thinking.
1.4.2 Theory and Practice (1).
1.4.3 The Reflective Practitioner.
1.4.4 Classifying Thinking.
1.5 Stages.
1.6 Summary.
Chapter 1

Teacher Education

1.1 Introduction

This chapter offers a review of the research literature on teacher education. The research field is vast and diverse. The first part of the chapter considers the eclectic nature of its content and highlights the relative paucity of research on initial teacher training, particularly in the U.K. and for modern language students. The remainder of the chapter covers two principal areas of research into teacher education: accounts of professionalization as socialization; and studies of teacher thinking - the cognitive habits, thoughts and beliefs that teachers demonstrably hold about their practice. Neither of these is necessarily specific to initial trainees, and I will make some effort to relate various issues to pre-service education. These two principal themes do, however, allow me to cover significant strands within the literature; namely student biography, course experience, the reflective practitioner, craft knowledge and the theory/practice dichotomy.

It is important to state quite explicitly that the research is to be located and analysed within a specific research paradigm, that of social theory, rather than form part of any existing approach within teacher education. I have returned, therefore, to first epistemological principles in designing my research project and devised a methodological frame for analysis of data arising from it. In this chapter I shall not give a comprehensive, comparative critique of the literature available in terms of the social theoretical perspective
I propose to adopt in this study, but I will indicate the problematic nature of the approaches employed.

1.2.1 Teacher Education Research

Research on teacher education covers an extensive field reflecting its multidisciplinary nature and the various sites that enquiry can be located. Even so, as a tradition it has a comparatively recent history. Lanier and Little (1986) point out that the first authoritative handbook on teaching research (Gage 1963) does not include a chapter on research into teacher education. The second handbook (Travers 1973) does contain a chapter, but this is mainly set within a product-process framework, where relationships between what teachers do in the classroom (the ‘processes’) and what happens to the pupils (the ‘products’) is the focus for enquiries. The third handbook (Wittrock 1986) is more comprehensive and covers who teachers are, what they do and think and the disjunctures to be found within school experience. Consistently, authors comment on the unfocussed nature of teacher education research (McNamara 1990) and the lack of its clear epistemological base (Shulman 1986). Moreover, not only is this the case generally, but there is a clear divide between American and U.K. based research. Wideen and Tischer (1990) comment on the ‘quantum leap’ in teacher education research that took place in the U.S.A. during the first half of the 1960s. Much of this work was highly empirical, and consisted of identifying specific variables and examining them in the light of dependent variables. These process-product studies were clearly influenced by the predominant academic trends in educational theory, which was often psychological, behaviourist and empirical. This tradition has found its natural extension in recent years in the ‘technicist’ view of teaching: that effective method can
be achieved through scientific experiment and the application of its results (Doyle and Good 1982).

A second major strand in teacher education research in the U.S.A. has arisen from various developments in sociology; in particular, symbolic interactionism and a general ethnographic concern for teachers' lives. Lortie (1975) gives a rich account of the experience of teaching, and others (Popkewitz 1987, Ginsburg 1988, Zeichner and Tabachnick 1982, 1985) have been keen to follow up this work by investigating schools, and setting their findings in various marxist, critical and social reformist perspectives.

At this point, two commonly-made distinctions need to be discussed: firstly, between teacher training and teacher education; and secondly, between initial teacher training and general in-service teacher education. There often seems to be an implied assumption that teacher training and teacher education are synonymous terms; although generally education is regarded as preferable, as it carries with it the suggestion of broader knowledge development than the training term which conjures up images of on-the-job, instrumental vocationalism. There is a debate to be had here but it is not one for the present context, as the issues seem to me rather semantic than substantive. I am assuming that, whatever our particular individual predilections, we are all concerned with forming teachers who are as well educated and technically able as is possible. I shall use the two terms without making fine distinctions between them except where I want to draw attention to a particular interpretation. Mostly, I shall use the term 'training' when discussing the students who form the focus of the present research as this is the normal referent employed by the educational culture of which they form a part.
The issue of the distinction between initial teacher training and general in-service education is more complex, subtle and difficult to unpick. Generally, I would argue that many of the issues involved in any discussion of teacher education apply equally well to any practising teacher, whatever the stage of their professional development. However, those beginning to teach, and undertaking training to this end, do have particular concerns, needs and experiences. Yet neither of the two major recent handbooks on teaching (Wittrock 1986, Dunkin 1987) treat initial teacher education as a principal research field. In the latter edition, one section is given over to 'pre-service' education but the author (Stones 1987) is mainly concerned with the organisation, assessment and content of training courses. Elsewhere, other authors do indeed deal specifically with initial trainee teachers, but these are often evaluative, one-off reports, or surveys which rarely go beyond the descriptive to examine the processes of knowledge formation involved at this stage of teachers' careers. Very often, the professional stage of the researched group is not referred to at all, and teachers are treated as an amorphous group in discussing issues pertaining to them (cf. Fuller and Bown 1970, Elliott 1991, Barnes 1992).

If this is generally the case in the U.S.A., which has now built up an extensive body of research on teacher education, it is perhaps unsurprising that this trend is even more striking in the U.K. Major reviews of teacher education research (Wragg 1982, 1984) again demonstrate the lack of epistemological focus amongst researchers, and the tendency to report descriptively on such areas as management skills, problems training teachers have in developing them, students' first encounters with classes and how content of lessons differed from those of experienced teachers, pupil appraisals, the nature of
different questions and their frequency, classroom tasks, the nature of teachers’ jobs, teachers’ backgrounds, accounts of teaching practice and schools experience and in-service training.

To take the PGCE (Post Graduate Certificate of Education) course, the main route into secondary school teaching in the U.K. for the past thirty years, as the prime focus, is to find a paucity of research detailing the everyday experiences of student teachers. There is not a strong research tradition in the processes of initial teacher training. Lacey’s (1977) classic study is now almost twenty years old. Otty (1972) gives a first hand account of what it is like to engage in a ‘traditional’ PGCE training course, but the content of the latter now seems dated. The same might be said of Hanson and Herrington (1976), who follow students into their first year of school teaching. Their approach is broadly ethnographic, where description is seen as a sufficient means of ‘examining’ the ‘processes’ of teacher training, without paying attention to classification and formation of early teacher knowledge or setting it in a theory of how such knowledge is constituted. Wragg (1984) is the only other extensive research project on teacher education in a British context that I am aware of, and, even here, the study does not focus on PGCE students but includes those undertaking undergraduate studies as part of their teacher training. For the rest, most publications seem to be concerned with reviews of practice (Barrett et al. 1992) or small-scale case studies to support suggestions for organisational reform (Furlong et al. 1988). Besides these, there is a recent growing body of work dealing with the research area of ‘teacher thinking’. I will refer to this tradition later in this chapter. Although it is concerned with actual teacher practice, this research suffers from the same endemic lack of focus and epistemological maturity referred to above. Thus, teacher
thinking and knowledge is interpreted in vastly different ways; developmental and subject specific differences are often ignored. The lack of maturity in this area of the literature probably reflects the fact that teacher education for secondary schooling itself did not become compulsory until the 1970s.

1.2.2 Modern Language Initial Teacher Education

During my literature search for the present research I have not come across any recent empirical study that deal with the processes of initial modern languages teacher training. This has been true for both the British and American contexts. As previously noted, most research tends to make subject differences transparent, and, where curriculum areas are referred to, the subject specialism is seen as incidental to the points being made. There is work on second language teacher education (e.g. Richards and Nunan 1990, Woodward 1991, Wallace 1991) but most of this arises from an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) background, and generally takes a 'theory-into-practice' perspective in advocating a reflection-on-action approach.

It would be wrong to deny the relevancy of EFL-based research, and I have drawn upon it in approaching the present study. However, contexts are very distinct; and training itself arises from a different tradition which has often stressed a theory into practice approach including formal studies in linguistics (cf. Richards 1991).

Despite a growing preoccupation with teacher training in recent years, the professional journal for modern languages in the U.K. has included few articles on this topic. Nott (1985) sets out a possible training programme
for modern languages in response to the setting up of CATE (DES 1984). His intent is to provide a practical foundation course in which opportunity for reflection and thus development is given. Westgate (1988) raises the issue of the lack of conceptual clarity we generally have in talking about classroom events and notes that this is precisely what training teachers need. He feels that discourse analysis offers an opportunity to do this as it 'allows a respect for the embeddedness of events in context so that non-school based sessions are less prescriptive' (p.152). Only more recently, and with increasing emphasis on school-based training, have further publications appeared. Thorogood (1993) offers a principle-into-practice support book, which details the possible form and content of school-based training. Anderson (1993) describes what it is like, as Head of Department, to work with a group of students. The focus here is on the management and organisation of their teaching practice. Peck (1994) and Taylor and Peck (1994) use post-lesson notes and questionnaires to explore the role of reflection in professional development; but these are highly practice dominated with little by way of theoretical discussion. Wringe (1994) uses his own notes from observing teachers in classrooms to give a personal account of the reasons and remedies for ineffective lessons. These notes are aimed at improving students' teaching.

The present research then does what no other research has done; namely, to present the experiences of students training to teach modern languages during a post-graduate period of study. Moreover, as well as giving an account of these experiences and thoughts, I will draw on them as a means of discussing the processes involved in training. Such an investigation requires an analytic form. However, before setting out the epistemological and methodological approach underpinning this form, I want to return to the
major teacher education research traditions referred to earlier; namely socialization and teacher thinking.

1.3.1 Socialization

Early accounts of the socialization of teachers were heavily influenced by work on other professions. Much of this was American and carried out in the 1950s and 60s, and formed part of a general concern to research the training of entrants to the professions and semi-professions. How to define a profession has been the source of some discussion (Jackson 1970, Etzioni 1969), together with the nature of professional knowledge and the characteristics of some professions compared with others.

Atkinson and Delamont (1985) identify two traditions in research on the socialization of teachers. The first tradition was heavily influenced by 'trait theory', namely attempts to draw up a list of characteristics necessary to a particular profession. Trait theory itself is understood as being influenced by a functionalist view of the professions. Structural-functionalism generally took a positivist, macro-structural view of society. A central concern of this tradition is the 'health of society'; often understood as the integration of individuals within social institutions, which are themselves integrated into the wholeness of society. Many of these studies take a neutral, unproblematic view of socialization (Dreeben 1968), as conflict is at a minimum in such healthy societies. The founding fathers of this tradition were Durkheim (1964, 1952, 1915, 1974)) and Comte (1929) before him. Durkheim, in particular, was concerned with the social conditions necessary for the moral 'health' of the nation; a theme later taken up and advanced by Parsons (1951), who developed accounts of
society along positive, neo-conservative lines. Such a macro-structural view of the world is shared by the marxist tradition, except that in the case of the latter, a negative rather than positive critique is made of the outcome of it. In its extreme form trait theory is now seen as simply a way of affirming the definition and interests of professions, as being 'static and ahistoric...overly positive, even apologist' (Ginsburg 1988: 129).

The second major approach to the study of professions, and hence teaching, is symbolic interactionism. The work of these sociologists, most noticeably the Chicago school, is much more situationally focused, concentrating on the everyday experiences of professionals. One seminal work studied the training of doctors (Becker et al. 1961). It is the story of the extensive influence of the university structure in developing a uniform professional culture.

Socialization for both traditions aimed to show how appropriate behavioural patterns were acquired by individuals. The functionalist tradition tend to see it as the passive internalization of skills and competencies; the symbolic interactionist tradition allows for a more problematic process; one where individual experiences have a higher profile in demonstrating the success, or otherwise, of the process of teacher training.

Socialization is a term that can be taken positively or negatively. It implies socialization into something. On the one hand, this must involve the induction into a specific set of skills and outlooks; on the other, it is socialization into the institution of schools and schooling. Thus, it is a professionalization that is not only based on the competencies, skills and attitudes of a
specific career, but it is also spatially located; that is, situated within the school both as a concrete and ideational structure.

The latter issue formed the core of negative 'functional' critiques of the 1970s, in which schools were seen as somehow mirroring and replicating the class structure of society (Bowles and Gintis 1974) or representing the ideological apparati by which the state imposed its will (Althusser 1971). These early, rather crude, representations of the operations of schooling often did not refer to teachers' socialization or initial training at all. By implication, however, it is possible to see initial professionalization as induction into a culture of schools. Later accounts of schools within this tradition have sought to illustrate the logic of the 'duality of structure' (Giddens 1979) between the various institutional forms and their effects on individuals. For the most part, these are descriptive accounts of the 'proletarianization of teachers through the intensification of work pace, rigidification of the division of labour and routinization of work tasks' (Ginsburg 1988: 90). However, this holistic account leaves many questions of process and form to be answered, and it is to these I wish to respond in the remaining of this chapter.

1.3.2 The Culture of Schools

In the above I referred to professions as a culture. The term culture will become increasingly significant as a focus for this thesis as it is often used as a bridge between the micro and the macro; the individual and the profession; the structural patterns of schooling and the forms of thought and behaviour to which they give rise. For example, Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) use a cultural analysis of schooling to give a negative critique of its
processes by positing academic success in terms of the acquisition of 'quantities' of cultural capital. Capital is any culturally valued product of the social system that can be used to wield power, albeit in a 'misrecognised' form, in establishing social prestige and positions of status.

Culture is a ubiquitous term. Becker et al. (1961) explains the process of socialization as induction into a professional culture. However, Lacey criticises his lack of differentiation in dealing with student culture. Becker:

Students seem to us to be very much alike. We have found it most useful to talk about one student culture than to think about many student cultures. (In Lacey 1977: 66ff)

This lack of differentiation by Becker may be 'more useful' but Lacey finds it 'surprising and worrying'. In the only recent study of a one year PGCE course within a sociological framework, Lacey gives a thorough account of the range of experiences of training students along with a social analysis by way of explanation. It is a picture of a professional culture and subject specific subcultures (similar to the ethnographic account of 'language people' given by Evans (1988)). Success or failure in training depends on the degree to which students embrace or reject the specific subject and general professional culture offered to them through the intimate experience of teacher training. The image is one of an individual leaving one group and moving to another. The culture of the latter is latent in the former; the degree of fit between the two depends on the characteristics of the individual personality determined by life experience up until that point.
Such a concern for the individuality of students points towards later micro studies of trainees. Work on student biography (Goodson 1992) has sought to demonstrate how teacher training can be understood as a form of 'self-socialization', with individual life histories very much the generative cause of needs and responses. So, because students are who they are, some have coping strategies, some do not; and response to institutional surroundings will depend on personal particularities. For example, Koster (1993) claims to be able to show that the type of teacher a student becomes is dependent on the formation of weak, strong and negative role models during the course of their own experience as pupils. Such experiences provide generative schema for ways of acting in teaching contexts, presumably as a result of 'metaphoric ways of thinking' (Calderhead and Robson 1990). Knowles (1992) thinks that such a perspective is a good way of linking the micro with the macro self, and Middleton (1992) argues that this knowledge can be used reflectively as part of a 'process of deconstructing the discursive practices through which one's subjectivity has been constituted' (p.20).

This area of research is prone to excessive determinism, in that previous schemes and practices are deemed to have been reproduced by identifying them in past and present experience. It says rather less for the complex processes. However, such issues begin to highlight the way that individuals respond differentially in certain situations; suggesting that the outcome of training is partially dependent on the extent to which they can adjust to particular contexts.

In socialising terms, Lacey sees such adjustments as being dependent on a number of identifiable strategies. He claims that the word 'strategy' is appropriate 'because it implies a purposive, guiding autonomous
element, within individual and group behaviour' (p. 67). Strategies are developed at the interface between individual guiding personalities and the constraints of the social situation, itself shaped in the light of social forces. Strategies should be interpreted only in particular contexts. They can be identified in terms of actions or ideas, and their selection involves responses to local conditions. This is to say that they are not necessarily always consistent; they cannot be, as they are produced only in response to the specific, which, by definition, can never be the same twice. Indeed, it is through contradictions and inconsistencies that we may have a clearer idea of the changing views of students to their world of teaching and their relationship to it, which in turn may provide insight into the processes underlying observed action (a point I will develop in my chapters on methodology). Lacey's strategies - redefinition, compliance, adjustment, collecting, privatising, displacement of blame - create an image of divergence and convergence with school systems, tutors, student colleagues, etc. It is a picture that seems to ring true to someone involved in teacher training, and the notion of individually constituted strategic configurations enacted and reactivated in practical contexts is particularly vivid. Besides Lacey's empirical evidence, there is consistent research data to show that this model of variable training experience is at least partly true. Hanson and Herrington (1976: 16) comment on the ways that students' apparent progressivism during training is only appropriate for this particular milieu; once students go into schools they revert to traditional behaviour and beliefs appropriate to their new institutionalised selves. Response and adjustment are hence highly context dependent, and the difference between school and training institution is here most acutely felt.
The latter issue goes to the very heart of training, and so it is worth taking some time to dwell on it. Various authors including Lacey and Lortie refer to the differences of experience between the two locations of training. Hanson and Herrington write that three quarters of their sample found that teaching practice was the most important part of their training course; although intriguingly also note that students most critical of the course were subsequently rated low by their headteachers. It is then necessary to interpret these findings with some caution. For example, Bennett et al. (1993: 214) see student satisfaction with their courses fall after a long teaching practice, noting that such dissatisfaction may be more a reflection of student stresses and strains and lack of success than an evaluation of the working of their training course. However, a caricature remains of training institutions as places of theory, whilst schools are considered places of practice. Such a crude picture has partly arisen from predominant trends in educational theory during the 1960s which shaped courses well into the 1980s. The belief was then that the educational disciplines of sociology, philosophy, history and psychology should be included alongside subject specialist courses as part of the foundational training of teachers. I will refer to the issue of theory and practice later in this and other chapters. For the moment, it is enough to note that the subject specialism and its practical preoccupation seems often to be overlooked in discussions on the relative activities of schools and training institutions. Moreover, and partly as a result of this and a traditional view of general educational studies, this predominant picture of training courses conforms more to a caricature than the reality based on evidenced research. Russell and Munby present this image of training when calling for greater reflection on action and the use of metaphor in working with student teachers:
Teacher education seems to rely on the premise that propositional knowledge from lectures and books can be translated into practice. This premise fails because it cannot explain how the act of teaching is used by the beginning teacher to acquire practical knowledge.

(Russell and Munby 1991: 185)

Research in this area is very small, particularistic and fragmentary. Moreover, it does not seem to correspond to the training course that is the subject of this thesis. More work is needed on 'conceptualising the relationship between teacher preparation and teaching practice in order to provide goals and objectives which are possible to attain and have the potential to improve teaching' (Koehler 1985: 28). Fox (1983) studied the personal understanding of lecturers and students on training courses and concluded that each viewed what was going on through separate 'metaphoric' images. He felt that students were not getting enough specific information. The issue is a complex one involving not only what sort of information, but when, where and how. Fuller and Bown (1975) accuse teacher education of not dealing with students from where they are; particularly in the U.S.A., where a skills/competency approach to teaching has become increasingly dominant. They see this tendency as resulting in simplification of the teaching process and ignoring students' life histories and the relationship between these and particular situations. In a more recent study, Brown and McIntyre (1993) also criticise the inadequacy of the 'scientific' approach to teacher training as concentrating on planning a good lesson at the expense of knowing 'how' to present material. They see this as leading to inflexibility, as any interruption in the class is consequently disruptive to the planned route of the lesson. A broader approach is advocated by many writers. For example, Bullough (1990 quoted in Kagan
1992: 164) sums up the problem as finding oneself as a teacher, of establishing a professional identity; two aspects that are conspicuously missing from most lists of beginning teachers’ problems. The issue is one of ‘reality shock’, which leads to security and discipline being the major preoccupations of students. The issue is complex. McWilliams (1992) takes a post-modernist line in attempting to deconstruct the ‘discourse’ of training; in particular, addressing the perceived conservatism of students as viewed by their trainers, by which she intends the way trainers express frustration at students’ preoccupations with discipline, and their inability to engage in the reflective habits that are being encouraged on the training course. For example, Tickle (1993) sees the outcome of reflection as being a certain security and control over a situation. Yet, this search for security and control may be more readily available to students through the routinization of a repertoire of practices generated from institutional and curricular restraints. Adopting these as a part of situational adjustment may lead to reflection closing over.

Trainers are then criticised for being instrumental in their approach to teaching, for being too theoretical, and, in more recent reflective modes, of imposing an attitude to knowledge that is not appropriate for students. McWilliams encourages a critical self-reflection on the part of the trainer; to confront the opposition between student needs and trainers’ good intentions; not to see students’ conservatism as their problem, more to confront trainers’ impositional tendencies. This points towards a more dialogic relationship in training between those involved and the various modifying contexts in which they find themselves.

These brief comments on student biography, situational adjustments and training course experiences put some
further flesh on the bones of contexts for strategic behaviour outlined by Lacey. Yet, these former research fields often proceed without direct reference to either sociology or the socialization metaphor as a way of accounting for initial teacher training. Lacey’s own account partly reconciles the functionalist/symbolic interactionist dichotomy alluded to earlier. Even so, although referring to individual particularities, his account is essentially focused at a macro level and is schematic in nature. The strategic behaviour described is supported only by an assertion of a neo-positivist view of knowledge and knowledge formation, and has no clearly defined epistemological underpinning. Indeed, knowledge seems to be a ubiquitous and amorphous term; a sort of lubricant for the functionalist frame of socialization. Where detail is given, the macro-structural links are ignored, and there is little consideration of the relationship between knowledge foundation and the organisation of the groups involved. Little wonder, therefore, that Atkinson and Delamont (1985) refer to socialization into teaching as the research that ‘lost its way’. They criticise the early functionalist and marxist accounts of schools and schooling as giving way in Britain to a new sociology of education that has focused much more on pupils and teacher/pupil interaction. Yet, they also take exception to the symbolic interactionists, who they feel have argued themselves into a corner where an emphasis on ‘situational learning’ takes little account of the issue of knowledge; how it is generated and operated.

They refer to Bernstein, who writes on the predisposition of sociologists to examine the ‘message’ rather than the medium of education:
...this programme, whatever else it produced, did not produce what it called for...general theories of cultural reproduction...again appears to be more concerned with an analysis of what is reproduced in and by education, than the medium of reproduction; the nature of the specialised discourse. It is as if the specialised discourse of education is a voice through which others speak (class, gender, religion, race, region)

(Bernstein 1986 but quoted in Atkinson and Delamont 1985: 318)

The present research partly responds to this charge in that it is concerned with how knowledge is formed for teacher trainees. It seeks to give an account of such without specific reference to these 'other voices'; to examine this 'discourse' of training - the medium - rather than use it to assert the 'message' of these 'voices'. Taking on board Bernstein's project is to connect with the 'new' sociology of knowledge initiated by Michael Young (1971). This seminal volume of papers, now over twenty years old, urges the need to look more closely at the process and transmission of knowledge. Although not specifically referred to, it is possible to take this perspective as a starting point in considering the socialization of teachers. By doing so, we break with the holistic terms employed by the structural-functionalists, whether in their positivist or critical guise; but also go beyond straight description and situational analysis in order to arrive at a consideration of teachers' own 'epistemic discourse' (Young 1981); that is, how their own knowledge base is characterised, and how this arises and gives rise to professional knowledge and its causes and effects on actual practice. The nature of knowledge itself then becomes the focus of the research project. As soon as this happens, it becomes clear that professional
knowledge is not uni-dimensional but polyvalent, including theoretical, technical, explicit, implicit, practical, subjective and objective and objectifiable representations. Jamous and Pelouille (1970) call this the 'indeterminacy of knowledge'. Atkinson and Delamont draw on the work of Bourdieu to argue that such indeterminate knowledge serves the interests of the professional group by mystifying teaching and how it is accomplished. But this is not the main topic of this thesis. Indeed, to argue that teaching skills need to be objectified and demystified is, if pushed to an extreme, to encourage a scientific, competency based approach to teacher training. The present research is more concerned to analyze the field context of training, and, by studying the work of individuals, to illustrate the situational processes involved. By doing so, I hope to show how individual students' professional knowledge is initially formed in the context of training to teach modern languages. By taking a very specific context, it may be possible to locate and identify processes that can be extended beyond the immediate topic. In this sense, we may return to the macro-structural nature of training by a microstructural route, and, in so doing say something more general about the character, form and mechanism of teacher training.

In this section I have considered the notion of teacher training as socialization into a profession. I have suggested that teacher knowledge is a major theme in need of consideration if we are to avoid an over reliance on macro-structural theories and micro, situationally based descriptions. The idea of knowledge as discourse based and constituted has been referred to, as well as the intention of this thesis to address the training of modern language teachers through a macro/micro synthesis as a way of examining the processes involved. I want now
to discuss the other major strand to teacher education research mentioned earlier in this chapter. This is to indicate the ways in which teacher knowledge is often represented in the teacher thinking literature.
1.4.1 Teacher Thinking

I have already referred to the vast and amorphous nature of teacher education research. Pope (1993: 22) alludes to the field as being 'pre-paradigmatic' in linking to Kuhn's (1970) view that a paradigm is established by a group of scholars developing premises and a language that sets them apart from a previous paradigm. Zeichner (1983: 7) describes teacher education paradigms in terms of received/reflective and certain/problematic dichotomies: hence, behaviourist is based on competencies and skills; personalist on personal growth; the traditional craft paradigm on craft and apprenticeship; and enquiry-orientated on wider social contents. It is the purpose of this section to explore such approaches in terms of the coverage given to teacher thinking. Rather than set out the standard morphologies of teachers' cognitive and metacognitive habits, thoughts and beliefs, I shall begin initially by considering the notion of theory and practice. I will use this as a base to elucidating and commenting on the concept of the reflective practitioner, from which it will become clear that to define the nature and process of teacher thinking is itself highly problematic. Finally, I will give the main rubrics for classifying teacher thinking and link these to specific stages in teachers' professional development.

1.4.2 Theory and Practice (1)

Many writers address the theory/practice dichotomy, question how each may be defined and discuss ways in which they are linked. For example, Dearden (1984) and Carr and Kemmis (1986) all argue that teachers are involved in practical actions which entail choices that can only be properly made on the basis of understandings that are in some ways theoretical. But the form, content and application of educational theory have been the
centre of some controversy, most noticeably since Hirst’s (1966) attempt to ground it semi-autonomously between actual teaching practice and related natural science disciplines: sociology, psychology, history and philosophy. Hirst was reacting against O’Connor’s (1957) view of educational theory in terms of a scientific paradigm; and thus as a way of forming, connecting and evaluating hypotheses to explain particular educational phenomena. Hirst believed that this misrepresented the nature of educational theory, which he thought should be understood as supplying the principles that guide pedagogic action. Educational theory hence becomes practically orientated; although the link still seems to be indirect with theory providing the ‘principles of practice’ rather than prescribing practice itself. Dearden sums up what might be expected from theory:

(1) a deeper grasp of the nature of learning, and of the implications of various research strategies; (2) a more adequate and considered set of educational values, with an appreciation of their curricular and methodological implications; (3) a deeper understanding of the background or context which provides the setting for educational practice; (4) a certain imaginative liberation through seeing the actual distanced, and thus revealed as only one possibility; (5) and, quite generally, a degree of reconstruction of ideas through critical reconsideration of their truth and adequacy, and hence greater intellectual control over practice.

(1984: 19)

This principled view of theory is a long way from the traditional form it often seems to take; as detached from practice and therefore pragmatic concerns, and overly formal and abstract. Nevertheless, the traditional view seems to persist. Elliott (1991: 46) writes that teachers
see theory as the product of power through mastery of techniques which undermine their own craft knowledge. This latter is tacit, becomes shrouded in mystery and represents the authenticity of lived experience. The implication of theory is that practice is not enough to gain competence; a notion that disempowers teachers. Moreover, and as previously alluded to, the theory/practice divide is also often institutionally linked; with schools being the site of practice and training institutions the site of theory - a belief that both emerges from and exacerbates the power relations inherent in the two representations of knowledge. The danger of these divisions is that there arises a common belief that ‘practice is naturally conservative, theory naturally progressive’ (Waller quoted in Lieberman and Miller 1992: 109), and therefore that the two are antipathetic. At best theory, and the institutions from which it emerges, seems to be regarded as being idealistic rather than realistic, and thus not having direct relevance to practice.

Griffiths and Tann (1992) try to resolve such issues by finding ways to link personal and public theories. In effect, this means greater concern to uncover personal theories and finding ways of expressing them, be it pictorial or metaphorical. Walsh (1992: 139) has suggested that recent decades have seen a shift in the view of theory as both multidisciplinary and prior to practice, which was Hirst’s established position in the latter half of the 1960s, to a view of theory as ‘emergent’ and forming a single complex with practice. In passing it is worth asking what this may imply for student teachers. It is again clear that commonly practice and schools are seen as the authentic sites for training, but there remains a need to learn techniques and develop personal rather than situationally specific competencies. It may be that student teachers, in their
immediate concerns with pupils and classroom management, are unable to sufficiently work from personal theories. This inability can lead to preoccupations with techniques rather than working on the experience of contradictory elements in classroom practice. It follows that a move towards such personal perspectives will involve a relocation of relationships both to immediate classroom reality and the theories and their formal representations coming from other sources in the training process. Griffiths and Tann advocate the use of language, and in particular metaphoric language, as a way of expressing those things that would not otherwise be able to be expressed; in other words, as a way of articulating and thus developing the shifts of perspectives contingent in the relationships between theory and practice and their sites of relative activity. Such an approach to training moves the discussion towards the concept of the reflective practitioner.

1.4.3. The Reflective Practitioner

The notion of reflection and the metaphor of the reflective practitioner have had great influence in thinking about teacher education in the 1980s and 90s. A topographic survey of initial training institutions in England and Wales conducted in 1991 reports that: 'almost three quarters of respondents described their course as being based on a 'reflective practitioner' model' (Barrett et al. 1992: 25). Reflection as embedded in and constituting professional practice clearly links with the principled approach to educational theory referred to above, and contrasts markedly with scientific applied theory as a basis to professional activity. The distinction is sharply drawn in the work of Donald Schön (1983, 1987) in his efforts to present a new 'epistemology of practice' (1983: 36). It is true that Schön is directing his attention to all professional
activity, and in passing I might add that this would include the occupation of researching, a theme I shall need to take up in my later methodological chapters. However, in the present context I shall examine the appropriateness of this term, as well as its validity and applicability in the field of teacher education in general and initial teacher training in particular.

Schön’s main thesis is as follows: it is possible to classify professional knowledge in terms of its practical activity, and a reflective mode better captures the character of it than one of applied science. The latter, he argues, is based on too technicist a view; where ends are established and means selected to achieve them (1983: 40). This blunt image is located in a technical-rationalist understanding of knowledge; a paradigm that Schön finds inappropriate to explain and develop professional competence. The latter operates in a world that is ‘troubling and uncertain’, where ends and means are neither clearly defined or attainable. Schön contrasts a rather linear, uni-dimensional definition of professional knowledge with that of the reflective practitioner. Such an individual adopts a more holistic, person-orientated approach and develops a professional artistry to the job in hand (ibid.: 130). What this means in reality is that ‘problematic’ situations are ‘framed’ whilst both the aims and possible means are held together relationally (p. 41). Much of this goes on tacitly as ‘knowledge-in-action’ (p. 49), which involves a process of unfamiliar, ‘new’ situations being made sense of through the identification of familiar, general characteristics in them (p. 138). Schön insists that such a process is far from unproblematic; indeed, initial moves to ‘deal’ with situations give rise to new phenomena which themselves are problematic and have to be responded to. Essentially, however, professional knowledge is experientially grounded as attempts are made.
to understand and respond to the demands of situations; an activity that is essentially one of personal control and effectiveness. There is a distinction to be made here between ‘reflection-in-action’ and ‘reflection-on-action’. The former is what goes on in real situations and constitutes professional practice. Moreover, it is individually specific. Schön presents four ‘constants’ (p. 270) that form the background in which reflection takes place. The first is the ‘media, languages and repertoires that practitioners use to describe reality and to conduct experiments’; this is the form of information used by professionals and their characteristic language. The second is the ‘appreciative systems they bring to problem setting, to evaluation of enquiry, and to reflective conversation’. The third is the ‘overarching theories, by which they make sense of phenomena’. The fourth is the ‘role frames within which they set tasks and through which they bound their institutional settings’. Each of these constitute separate forms of knowledge as well as its use and articulation. For example, the last ‘constant’ may be institutionally or individually defined; and ‘overarching theories’ begs the question of what sort of theory, and how much it reflects what is happening in practice. Moreover, simply because a common vocabulary is shared by individuals, it does not mean that misunderstanding or simple differences in understanding can be discounted. Even so, research into the reality of these four constants would give a good deal of information about the professional in practice, and it could be argued that a reinterpreted form of them lies at the heart of this thesis: what are the four constants of initial modern language teacher trainees in practice? For the moment, however, I wish to enquire a little further into the form of reflection in and on practice. Schön (pp. 276 – 278) recognises that such reflection may only be tacit, but more objective forms may be impossible, or even
dangerous. There may just not be the time to operate reflectively even if an individual is competent to do so. Reflection-on-action is hence limited and dependent on time and place. Moreover, there are questions concerning the extent that reflection is a priori or a posteriori to professional knowledge development. In other words, reflection may be central to building up professional competence, but we need to know what this means in reality: for example, certain questions need to be addressed concerning forms of knowledge, how they are expressed and what reflection on them as a part of professional development may look like.

Reflection and the reflective practitioner are powerful images; certainly ones that ring intuitively true to those involved in professional training. Yet to consider the content of these images is to reveal a complex grid of representative forms of knowledge and processes of their realisations. It is only necessary to refer back to the brief coverage I gave to theory and practice to understand that reflection may be on either knowledge form. If on practice, it may be recent/current or past; observed or directly experienced; private or publicly shared. If on theory, there is the question of how this is defined - formally, research based, personally held - and whether it is a private or a public activity. It is true that the research field on teacher education covers all these representations of knowledge and what possibilities there might be for reflection on them. Basically, the research can be divided according to macro criteria, often related to social and historic influences on teaching; and those that take a much more pragmatic, situational view.

Cruickshank and Applegate (1981), for example, see a reflective approach as essentially teachers building up their craft of teaching by thinking about the practice of
classrooms and the scope for alternative action. The development of good techniques and practice would be the desired outcome of such an activity. Gore (1987) sees this as principally a shared, social activity which, particularly with student teachers, helps develop a sense of collegiality. 'Scientific' knowledge of researchers is seen in this as inferior to valuable, practical knowledge. But such a perspective is not uniform in the research literature. Fenstermacher is one writer who has argued for the practical application of research, albeit linked with teachers' own practical knowledge. He acknowledges that teachers and researchers produce different forms of knowledge (1987) after previously arguing that teachers need to use the outcome of scientific enquiry (1986) in a way reminiscent of Hirst. He attempts to combine the two perspectives (1988) by presenting a 'practical argument model'. Practical argument is a form of reasoning leading from a desired end state, which give rise to various premises to act in a certain way:

> Among the types of premises intervening between the expressions of an end state and an intention to act are those that are empirical and those that are primarily situational in character.

(ibid.: 41)

He then argues that research can bear on practice by altering 'the truth or falsity of beliefs that teachers have, as it changes the nature of these beliefs and adds new beliefs' (1986: 43). Liston and Zeichner (1991: 75) view this argument as simply rhetorical, as it sets up objective knowledge in an adversarial position and applies post hoc reconstructions to something already observed in practice.
Buchmann (1987) takes a more parochial view of teachers in action. It is an image of teachers coping with the enormous totality of teaching events, and the way institutional and socio-historic factors impinge on these. This is a socialization model of teachers acquiring the habits and behaviours of teaching through imitation and custom; what she describes as the 'folkways' of teaching. Such folkways act as a means of enhancing security and self-esteem in potentially overwhelming situations. The image is of relatively passive acquiescence. There is an opposite - 'teaching expertise' - in which teachers are more critically involved in examining the reasons and consequences of their action, but this occurs on relatively few occasions. Unsurprisingly, she too criticises research knowledge (Buchmann 1984) and finds training courses useless as they are external to the practitioner. Yet the question is again raised as to the nature of research knowledge and how it is used. For example, Beyer and Zeichner (1987: 327) call for 'enquiry-orientated research', which analyses the culture of teacher education itself and places it in the patterns and processes of schooling. This form of enquiry implies a more socio-historic account of teacher education, and a critical understanding of such on the part of teachers as a form of self-awareness.

Elbaz (1983) and Connelly and Clandinin (1988) take up this type of perspective and seem more optimistic about teachers' ability to influence situations. They discuss teachers' personal narratives and images. These images are formed in past experience and shape future action in the way suggested in the section on student biography. However, to interrogate the content of such 'images' is to return to the problematic notion of reflection and knowledge. Liston and Zeichner (1991) would want such images to reflect the socio-historic conditions of
teachers' lives' specifically class and biographical determinants. For them, the reflective practitioner is one who is aware, critically, of the origins and purposes of their action at all levels. Such an individual goes beyond Schön's construct which now seems too narrow by focusing on vocational skills and professional technique. Day (1993: 86) also criticises Schön for failing to deal with the dialogic, discursive dimension of learning and failing to adopt the socio-historical perspective referred to above. Adler (1991) too finds Schön's concept to be utilitarian, and Cornbleth (1987) calls it a 'myth'; she warns against thinking of professional competence - skills, techniques and practices - as somehow inherently right or wrong. This essentially deconstructivist account of a metaphor such as the reflective practitioner sees it as still essentially symptomatic of the technical-rationalist character of modern education. It is important to contextualise this work as American and arising from 'critical' sociology. Equally, it is important to note how such a metaphoric form as 'situational adjustment' can be seen as an expression of cultural hegemony or as a practical, pragmatic aid.

1.4.4. Classifying Thinking

It is clear from what I have written so far that the whole of the research literature on teacher education can be understood as struggling with the contingency of teacher thinking and action. On the one hand, contexts are emphasised, whether situational or socio-historic, as the source of teacher knowledge. On the other this knowledge itself is interrogated in order to understand the processes and products of its application. Knowledge is a practical activity. Butt et al. (1992: 61) refer to it as 'praxis' in trying to capture the notion of professional craft knowledge according to its
evolutionary nature. If teacher education as socialization has taken an amorphous, macro view of knowledge, specific work on teacher thinking is prone to a technicist, constructivist approach. The product-process accent of the teacher education literature has carried on into teacher thinking research in the form of a preoccupation with the cognitive psychology of teaching: teachers’ thought processes and their links with observable activities in the classroom (Clark and Peterson 1986). This theme again throws up the issue of ‘inner thoughts’ and ‘outer activity’. Teachers clearly do hold inner thoughts and theories, but, in terms of research it is often difficult to get at these as many are implicit or unarticulated. Brown and McIntyre (1993: 5) refer to Morine-Dershimer’s outline of the four influential interpretations of teacher thinking: thinking through schemata, and reflection in/on practice, both of which they believe have a cognitive psychological orientation; formulations about pedagogical content knowledge; and perceiving practical arguments. Each of these tend to be psycho-centric. Diamond (1991) illustrates this in his use of repertory grid techniques to explore the personal self constructs of teachers. Surrounding contexts are also included in these, however, as schemes of thought about lesson agendas, activity structures and routines derive from very definite structures within the classroom. Carter and Doyle (1987) focus on teacher knowledge as demonstrable around the structures of lessons and classroom management. In this case, structure is seen as an observable epiphenomenon of thinking.

It is impossible then to ever fully separate thought from context. There are, however, ways of dealing with such thinking which have very definite implications for what teachers do and think, and how, and for the consequent conclusions that may be drawn in terms of their education.
and training. I will take 'craft knowledge' by way of illustration.

Craft knowledge is a term that has been used to describe 'that which teachers acquire through their practical experience in the classroom' (Brown and McIntyre 1993: 18). In effect, such knowledge would include the tips for teaching that are the norm in identifying good practice; what has recently been termed 'teacher edification'. This research seems to operate under the belief that focusing on 'good' teachers' personalised 'normal desirable states', and how these are achieved in particular personal and material conditions, is a good way to approach teacher education generally and initial training in particular.

Continual research into teaching craft knowledge should, we hope, make it increasingly possible for student teachers to gain an extended theoretical understanding of its general nature and of its substance in relation to particular aspects of teaching, from reading and academic study.

(ibid.: 113)

However, this is a subtle argument and one that is difficult to achieve in practice. Solomon (1987) agrees that such reflection and theorising should start with craft knowledge gained in the classroom, but, of course, in the case of a student teacher this is rather limited. A consequent argument may be that student teachers should be supplied with a minimum set of lesson techniques and then work with their experiences of putting them into practice. This chicken-and-egg argument - to teach skills and reflect on their practical and theoretical application, or to reflect on the latter as a way of acquiring the former - seems to be endemic in the research. For example, Elbaz (1983) studied one high
school teacher and distinguished between the rules of practice, those routines followed by habitual encounters with the same lesson experience, and the principles and images of practice which are much more based on reflection and intuition. The latter can only be gained from direct practice, but the former are the way in. A narrow set of technicist skills alone would be "unprofessional" in terms of Schön's reflective practitioner. It is a question of how such skills are constituted, how they are conveyed to trainees and the form of assessment used on the basis of them.

The case of Competency-Based-Teacher-Education (CBTE) is a good example to cite; particularly as it seems to be a model that has gained increasing currency in the U.K. and U.S.A. in recent years. Essentially, CBTE relies on the isolation and listing of teacher competencies, trainees' induction into them and their consequent evaluation on the basis of teacher performance. The construction of competencies in this way, and the value attributed to them, and by whom, raise questions of knowledge, power and control, in that the latter resides with those who define them. Little wonder, therefore, that Elliott (1993d: 22) sees the movement as a perfect example of the application of social market principles to teacher education. It is possible to construct ways of determining competencies that are collegiate and collaborative (Elliott 1992), but this is rarely the case; rather, lists of competencies are drawn up from outside of the profession or with political pressure on an imposed norm according to which the professional will be judged. Whitty and Wilmott (1991) recall that the CBTE movement has been called a 'bandwagon in search of a definition' and argue that it has no epistemological base. BERA (1992: 17) refer to the recent list of competencies contained in the DES (1992) circular on initial teacher
training as a 'conceptual mess'. Hyland (1993) finds it 'incoherent and confused' in its uses of ideas of knowledge and understanding. Elvoque and Salters (1992) argue that the CBTE movement commits the behaviourist fallacy of confusing performance with knowledge and understanding. As Eraut (1990) notes, tacit knowledge is often as important an element as decision making, yet its presence is not always recognisable or demonstrable. These writers seem to suggest that it needs to be less a question of what should training students 'do' than what they should 'be', as it is in this way that they begin to generalise across a number of particular instances.

The situation-based, interpretative development suggested in the latter is termed 'practical science' by Elliott (1993a: 66), to distinguish it from the social market, technicist view of training propagated by such 'New Right' associates in the U.K. as Hargreaves (1993). There are two principal issues: firstly, whether professional learning is seen as unfolding and developmental or a progression through a preset list of content features; secondly, in either case, whether the skills and knowledge required can be taught, and, if so, where and how, or whether they are merely 'caught' by sitting in on the job as it were. In both cases, what is being contested is knowledge: its formation, content and practical applicability.

Practical and craft knowledge are still sufficiently general as to give no clear view of their actual content and process. Where this is attempted, as in CBTE, there are problems of definition, control and application. Work on subject specific knowledge is relatively limited. Wilson et al. (1987) are concerned that most teacher education research has focused on generic, cognitive processes that transcend the particularities of subject
matter. They refer to this latter as the 'missing paradigm' (ibid.: 108), and go on to argue that subject knowledge is 'relearnt' in a form that makes it transferable to pupils. This 'pedagogical content knowledge' is constituted from prior knowledge of the subject and the present pedagogical contexts. Long term schematic representations are 'regrounded' through experience and used in pedagogic practice. Lack of such representations will consequently lead to superficial understandings, misconceptions and inaccuracies. Bennett and Turner-Bissett (1993) demonstrate how lack of subject knowledge in primary school trainees exhibits itself in lessons that are less intellectual in input, with more time being spent on classroom management. Both writers see lack of appreciation of subject knowledge as leading to rigid structures in teaching; repetition and replication of practical craft knowledge given in training rather than reapplication of these along with integration with personal knowledge that is crucial to true professional development. However, it is again a question of balance. McNamara (1991) stresses the importance of subject knowledge and thus sustained academic study, but warns against emphasising the subject rather than the child. In other words, teaching is relational, not merely academic: and the relational aspect leads us back to consider the social context. Zeichner, Tabachnick and Densmore (1987) amongst others argue that craft knowledge itself needs to be linked with the macro, holistic structures of teaching.

In this section, I have indicated how the content of teacher thinking research can be viewed in terms of dichotomies of process/product, personal/contextual, psych/socio-orientated, with various authors locating themselves within the field at various points along
interconnecting continua. I want to conclude the chapter with a brief consideration of the stages of teachers' professional development.
1.5. Stages

In the course of this chapter I have made passing comments on the relevancy of particular research claims to the career stage of teachers all whilst building up a general account of the salient trends of the field of teacher education.

To sum up within the teacher socialization tradition, specific studies have been carried out on teachers in initial training, but these are limited in number. Moreover, there is a lack of detail on the process of knowledge formation; specifically related to particular subject areas. Socialization is generally seen as ongoing, or at least partial and incomplete (Lacey, Lortie op. cit); and the picture is of trainees participating in a world that is partially alien to them and reacting ‘to the structures of language and practice...(in a way that) can glorify existing institutions or seek alternative, oppositional structures’ (Popkewitz 1987: 6).

The ‘teacher thinking’ tradition sees teacher professionalization as developmental and gives more consideration to the particular needs and the nature of knowledge characteristic of each stage. Huberman (1993) describes them as ‘career cycles’; from entry, stabilisation, reassessment, conservatism and eventual disengagement. Each of these has patterns of attitudes and habits, as well as levels of professional support. Zeichner, Tabachnick and Densmore (1987: 23) consider such cycles to be definable in terms of three levels of practical knowledge: prior to training; during pre-service education; and during the early years of teaching. These are the critical periods after which teachers become expert. The first pre-training period is seen as crucial as it is here that previous experiences
and relationships are important in shaping teaching; a theme that clearly relates to my previous comments on student biography. Zeichner et al. stress the need for studies to show the degree of students' institutionalization and the effect on their practical knowledge. The development of professional knowledge is also at the heart of Elliott's four phases of professional learning (1993a: 75ff.). These stages are marked by increasing autonomy in what goes on in lessons and a more automatic, intuitive grasp of what needs to be done in order for teaching to occur. The novice, or advanced beginner, 'needs to develop an ability to discern on the basis of observation and analysis, a wide range of aspects, both situational and non-situational' (p. 75). Such knowledge is the basis to the 'practical science' alluded to earlier; as teachers' level of competence is embedded in practical situations through self evaluation and objectification. Field (1979 quoted in Lieberman and Miller 1992: 110) interprets such thought processes as student teachers gaining 'control' over their professional lives. Again, a developmental model is given. In stage 1, teachers do not have a feel for how to move their classes along and are dependent on their lesson plans. In stage 2, they relax somewhat, gain a certain amount of confidence with early successes, and are able to let pupils work on their own more. Learning becomes more continuous and less viewed as a series of assignments. In the final stage, teachers act with a greater sense of achievement and see classrooms more as an integrated whole.

Underlying all these models is an effort to describe in developmental terms what has been referred to as the 'two main tasks of teaching'; namely, achieving social order and managing academic work (Carter and Doyle 1987: 147). The two must interact, but overall there seems to be a preoccupation on the part of the student teachers with
the former, as routines are developed to maintain order even at the expense of maximising the usefulness of learning experiences. Fuller and Bown (1975) report on the preoccupation that beginner teachers have with disciplinary matters, which somewhat questions the significance of the pedagogic content knowledge referred to earlier. If student teachers' main task is to cope with the limitations and frustrations of the classroom, there is the issue of if and how subject specific knowledge develops when embedded in such experiences. Kagan's research (1992) claims to confirm these preoccupations with the immediate disciplinary and practical concerns of initial teachers whilst emphasising four facets: firstly, that the initial inward focus of student teachers is extremely important; secondly that gaining knowledge of pupils is an initial primary task; thirdly, that schema for pupils and self evolve together; fourthly, that procedural routines are developed to integrate instruction with classroom practice.

The picture emerges of a complex interaction between social and cognitive forms of knowledge. Context is all, and students need to develop the social, relational skills necessary for them to found a pedagogic personality for themselves. Yet, together with such a personality, there appear to be necessary competencies that, although actualised in practical situations, have their source in other personal and theoretical frames of reference. Reflection, as previously referred to, is central to this. However, as a concept it is problematic, and there are numerous questions concerning its actualization to consider. Certainly, the notion that the 'reflective practitioner' is a sufficiently rigorous metaphor to guide training is to be questioned. Berlinner (1987: 81) amongst others has advocated the need for reflection, particularly for beginners, as a way of objectifying and internalising knowledge and routines.
But, as previously stated, just what is reflected upon, and how, is openly contested. McIntyre (1991), for example, warns that reflection is 'effortful'; in other words, it is not necessarily an open, linear, non-disturbing activity, but can confront, unsettle and challenge - can be destructive as well as ultimately constructive in developing professional teacher competence. Such disruption may be of value to experienced teacher when set patterns of thought and behaviour need to be unlocked as a part of reevaluation. However, initial trainees are in the process of creating patterns; anything disruptive can therefore have a negative effect on further professional competence. How such patterns form and how they are the product of positive and negative effects of components within training is the main focus of this thesis.
1.6. Summary

In this chapter I have provided an expansive review of teacher education in general and modern language teacher training in particular. The issues contained in the former are pertinent to the latter, although applications and reinterpretations are constantly required. Two prime traditions - socialization and teacher thinking - have been identified and brief details given of their respective research contents. The issue of knowledge, its definition, procedural formation and practical application has been a prominent theme to the chapter. A number of conceptual metaphors have been presented, which may form a rich source for analyzing student experiences in the course of training; for example, situational adjustment, the reflective practitioner, craft knowledge, etc. So far, however, a clear epistemological focus has been generally lacking in the literature, as is detail on subject specifics. It is the principal objective of this thesis to address these two major themes: namely, questions of epistemology, both in terms of teacher training and research into it; and the specifics of modern language teachers training in practice.

The following two chapters develop a framework for carrying out the research and analyzing data arising from it. The framework is constructed on the basis of a discussion of the nature of educational theory and practice, and related philosophies. In order to do this, a 'theory of knowledge' is presented which is essentially social theoretical in origin. The reasons why such an approach is considered to be appropriate will be addressed. The intent is not so much to present a 'sociology of teacher education' than to use the dynamic that social theory provides at a methodological level to study processes in the professional knowledge development of modern language teacher trainees.
Synopsis

Chapter 2: Methodological Concerns

This chapter deals with the main epistemological concerns that have guided the research. It is philosophical and social theoretical in character. The nature of educational theory and practice is addressed and connections made with principal research paradigms. Some coverage is given to phenomenology and its significance as a base for educational research. Two major qualitative research approaches are discussed as a way of highlighting issues of theory and practice. There then follows a substantial section which presents and discusses the work of the French theorist Pierre Bourdieu, and draws out the implications it has for research practice.
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Chapter 2

Methodological Concerns

' the desire for a theory of knowledge is a desire for constraint - a desire to find "foundations" to which one might cling, frameworks beyond which one must not stray, objects which impose themselves, representations which cannot be gainsaid'.

(Rorty 1980: 315)

2.1 Introduction

The epigraph to this chapter is taken from a book entitled 'Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature' by the American philosopher Richard Rorty. The book is a treatise against what Rorty sees as the ambition of some modern philosophers to construct final foundations of knowledge. For such writers, he claims, philosophy must literally 'mirror' nature, represent what exists in reality. Rorty eschews discussion towards the ultimate basis of thought, and, taking a pragmatic line, espouses plurality of opinion and solidarity through consensus. I offer the quotation partly as a warning, to myself and the reader, and partly as a way of injecting a degree of irony into what I have to say about epistemology since much of it may seem like a similar thirst for ultimate theories of knowledge. That I do not believe this to be the case should become clear from my comments later in this chapter. However, for the moment. I should say that I do not accept that avoiding the foundationalism that Rorty writes of necessarily means embracing relativism. Rorty himself constantly argues against this interpretation of his work (Rorty 1982, 1991a), although perhaps never totally successfully (cf. Hall 1994: 77 -
At the same time, I take it that, as practising researchers, we use the best of our knowledge and abilities to conduct the research we undertake and to account for the findings arising from it. In pursuit of this, it could be argued that representationalism, or the search for a truthful account or match on our chosen object of study, is exactly what preoccupies us as researchers. Yet the ironic stance that Rorty encourages in warning against dogma and rhetoric reminds us of the contingency of our truth claims and of the fact that what we have to say can never be the final word on the subject. Accepting this, however, does not mean that clear and powerful arguments should be avoided in responding to the research questions.

The present chapter sets out the particular epistemological concerns I have had whilst shaping my research. The intention here is to show the bases from which both methodology and, later, conclusions were derived. I have made a deliberate decision to separate epistemology from methodology. The former, as presented in this chapter, is mostly derived from various social theories and the philosophical issues underpinning them. My intention is to explain why I did what I did and to give an account of the conceptual terms of analysis used later in the thesis. I do this in order to emphasise their dynamic content. I want to avoid excesses but words used for analysis can appear as a priori narratives or static, reified concepts. This is inherent in the nature of language. The methodology chapter will set out exactly how I carried out the research: the form of data collection and how it was analysed. I will also indicate the way the methodology responds to my epistemological concerns.

The current chapter begins by taking up the theme of theory and practice raised in chapter 1. I do this to
further explore the nature of educational knowledge and connect it with research knowledge. The social theories of Habermas and Bourdieu will be used to raise questions concerning the classification and status of knowledge derived from research. I will use these theories to critique predominant research methodologies and construct my own - more suited to my concerns - which I will term 'structural phenomenological'. The key concepts of the latter will be presented. Finally, I will return to my opening remarks to comment on the status of what I have said and have to say.
2.2.1 Theory and Practice (2)

In chapter 1 the relative status of theory and practice was raised in relation to teacher thinking. I pointed out that the British philosopher Hirst was instrumental in the 1960s in arguing for the foundation of educational theory as distinct from theories derived from the normative sciences:

> the word theory is used as it occurs in the natural sciences where it refers to a single hypothesis or a logically interconnected set of hypotheses that have been confirmed by observation. It is this sense of the word that is said to provide us with standards by which we can assess the values and use of any claimant to the title theory.

(Hirst 1966: 38)

Hirst pointed out that if we judge educational theory by these standards it comes off very badly. Instead, Hirst attempted to redefine educational theory as 'the essential background to rational educational practice, not as a limited would-be scientific pursuit' (p.40). Educational theory for Hirst is less knowledge for its own sake than 'knowledge that is organised for determining some practical activity' (ibid.) Theory, in this sense, is not so much the means by which we can understand and explain practical educational activity, as the way we might make choices to effect and determine that activity in the first place. As Hilliard puts it: 'scientific theory is descriptive, educational theory is predictive' (1971: 42). The word predictive is used in the sense of individuals seen as mastering educational practice by mastering its concepts:
It could be argued that just as physics uses mathematics but results in distinctive, validated scientific statements, so educational theory uses philosophy, psychology, sociology, etc., and issues in distinctive, validated educational practice.

(Hirst 1966: 49)

Such claims are tantamount to arguing that teachers must also be sociologists, psychologists, historians and philosophers, or at least trained in these disciplines, and it is this view that predominated in the design of teacher training courses in the late 1960s, 70s and into the 80s. Hirst clearly intended to move away from empirical investigations, a psychological paradigmatic approach to educational theory, and the consequent applied scientific view of teaching which he felt had predominated until the 1960s (cf. Simon 1990). Moreover, he recognised that teaching was not simply an applied science, and that there was an intermediary level between the natural sciences and teaching that could be established for educational theory; and that this was not a single discipline but a form of thought to which a range of normative disciplines might contribute. Even so, despite claiming a semi-autonomous area for educational theory, Hirst’s scheme remains essentially one of applied science: that empirical data worked on through the normative sciences would provide the basic rationale for what to do with pupils in the classroom.

Vandenberg (1974) turns this scheme somewhat on its head and sets it within a phenomenological-hermeneutic framework. Drawing on an existential tradition and referring constantly to the work of Husserl, Bollnow, Heidegger and Gadamer, Vandenberg initially recognises the importance of the existence of the field of educational theory as defined by Hirst. In particular, he feels that Hirst is correct to underline the autonomous,
though, dependent nature of educational theory. Scientific theory is inappropriate because it implies a level of conceptualisation that allows the formation and testing of hypotheses deduced under experimental conditions. Practical educational experience, on the other hand, implicates many concrete, uncontrolled contexts to which only non-scientific factors are pertinent. However, he criticises Hirst for not providing 'criteria of coherence to unify the educational principles', for the selection of resources from sociology, psychology, history and philosophy. Vandenberg attempts to build a more rigorous view of educational theory out of a 'correction' to Hirst's claim that educational concepts have no logical characteristics of their own:

> It is not a question of examining the logical characteristics that educational concepts may or may not have, as if these concepts existed autonomously in a platonic realm of ideas independently of someone having them in mind, but rather a matter of finding educational phenomena (or facts) about which one will subsequently formulate a theory with concepts that in fact do have the requisite logical - and ontological - characteristics. (Vandenberg 1974: 187)

Such a formulation is proposed by taking Hirst's somewhat hierarchical scheme, which is a kind of theory-into-practice model, and reversing it to claim that practice itself can be the grounding of logical characteristics that make up educational theory. The approach is based on the following model:
This scheme attempts to ground educational theory much more in actual concrete practice. A practitioner's understanding of education is developed through the concrete experience of classroom practice. This 'understanding' might be called 'tacit knowledge' (Polanyi and Prosch 1975: 30), or horse-sense: that sense of what to do that is not articulated. It is when this 'Pre-theoretical Knowledge' (PTK) is articulated in some form that there is the expression of 'Fundamental Educational Theory' (FET); that is, in Vandenberg's terms, 'when the practitioner's pre-theoretical understanding is rigorously explicated by an immanent reflection, i.e., by an interpretive hermeneutic' (p.190). It is through fundamental educational theory that practice connects with practical understanding and formal
educational theory in the form of 'Justifying Educational Principles'. FET is therefore a kind of linguistic precipitation of thought about practice that is partly formed by and partly forms actual classroom teaching. Practice then becomes the 'criteria of coherence' that unifies the amorphous nature of Hirst's educational theory. This practice is essentially personal, unselfconscious, uncritical and contextually bound, but it provides the linking rationale to form a kind of dialectical relation between the various levels of operation in the formation of educational theory. It also offers the picture of practice constituting the motor for the modification of educational principles, and, if the logic of the scheme is followed through, ultimately the parent disciplines in the form of the relevant special sciences - sociology, psychology, philosophy and history.

2.2.2 Phenomenology and Education

Contemporary forms of phenomenology can be understood as arising in direct descent from eighteenth century preoccupations to set individual man as the centre of certainty about what we know of the world. The most important figure of that time was the philosopher Kant, whose work aimed at the kind of foundationalism I spoke of at the beginning of this chapter. For him, there existed 'transcendant categories' of thought, expressed as ideals, which could account for what we know about the world.

This form of subjectivist-centrism had an increasing presence in philosophy in the nineteenth century, where certainties of religion and the state gave way to personal scepticism and collective insecurities. The subjectivist trend was probably pushed to the limit by the founding father of contemporary phenomenology, Edmund
Husserl, who argued that to know what we can know about the world we have to look at the relationship between objects and the individual subjectivities that perceive them. For him, phenomenology was a philosophy and a method. Thinking about the world was intentional and intensional (Hall 1993: 123): the 's' standing for the relational structures that are set up by such thinking. We reveal these structures through phenomenological method: it is these structures that give meaning in the same way that linguistic structures give linguistic meaning. The method will supply us with knowledge about what we know in that it reveals the essential elements of how we know and what we really know. This search for knowledge by focusing on individual thought and perception is extremely subjectivist; indeed, Husserl called his method 'transcendent subjectivism'. But the intent was quite the contrary; the phenomenological method was considered rigorous, objective and 'scientific', in that what could be derived from subjectivities was our knowable foundation of reality.

It is unnecessary to undertake a thorough explanation and critique of the philosophy of phenomenology in the present context. However, I need to give some indication of its essential elements as a basis to the methodological concerns I wish to discuss. By doing so, I intend to further develop the issues of theory and practice contained in Vandenberg's 'triangle', and begin to build my own interpretive scheme for conducting the research.

Merleau-Ponty, in his Preface to 'Phenomenology of Perception' defines phenomenology as the 'study of essences'. The intent is to put 'essence back into existence' by understanding man and the world through 'direct and primitive contact' (1962/1989: vii). As with Husserl, it is not simply a question of noting the
appearance of something, but revealing underlying relational meanings. Phenomenological method aims to go beyond straight descriptions, empirical accounts and theoretical observations to capture something of the ‘lived experience’ (Van Manen 1990) in an interpretive sense. Phenomenology is hence aiming to be descriptive in a way that such methodological approaches as ethnography are not. It does this principally through claiming to be more rigorous in its descriptive techniques and having a heightened sense of reflexivity. I shall say more on this distinction when I consider ethnography in detail, and when I set out my own methodological approach. For the moment, I want to continue with some more specific comments concerning phenomenology and education. Chamberlin describes the effect of phenomenological method on education as follows:

Traditionally educators have assumed that one first works out or adopts a philosophical position and then proceeds to discern its implications for education. A phenomenological approach challenges that deductive procedure. Its method draws educators to look first at the thing itself in careful reflection on the meaning of education.

(Chamberlin 1974: 119)

There is here a search for a level of authenticity, the way that things are rather than a theory robust enough to explain things. This latter would be considered to be prone to control and manipulation. There are then claims to ontologic status in phenomenological writing; indeed, the epistemological is collapsed into the ontological. In its place, there is the ‘being-in-touch’ with pedagogic practice, contact with experience and avoidance of manipulation of facts to fit the theory. However, the questions arises: what is the nature of the knowledge that phenomenological enquiries supply us with? Zaner
(1970: 36 - quoted in Chamberlin op.cit.: 127) refers to phenomenological statements in that they have twofold meaning: epistemic (knowledge about the thing itself) and communicative (inviting others to share in the findings and use it in order to know what to look out for in future instances). Van Manen, who I referred to earlier, has been described as the 'father' of phenomenological pedagogical studies (Pinar and Reynolds 1992: 238). Generally (1979a, 1982a, 1982b), his phenomenological approach to education stresses the communicative aspect of such knowledge in its practical sense: having practical value in an informative and self-evaluative way; providing a deepening understanding of certain phenomenon. All that being said, how do you do it? For Van Manen, the task of hermeneutics or phenomenology is to 'make visible the meaning structures embedded in the lifeworlds which belong to the human expressions under study' (1977: 215). Drawing on the work of Langeveld and the Utrecht school he develops what he terms 'situation analysis', which is less a method than a set of research facets. In an example he provides, the following procedure is set out:

1. First, there is the gathering of 'life experience' material; in this case, a personal account from a workshop participant on fear of the dark.
2. Secondly, this material is investigated for its 'descriptive analytic forms' or ground structures; for example, the structural components of fear of the dark.
3. Thirdly, other experiences and perspectives are collected, in an effort to understand the phenomenon through 'exhaustive description'.
4. Finally, and in this case, recommendations and orientations to practical action are formulated.

(Van Manen 1979b: 56)
The key phase here is ‘ground structure’, which Van Manen interprets as a kind of ‘generative grammar’. In Van Manen’s conception of pedagogy, educational knowledge is like driving a car; an extension of oneself. We cannot express such knowledge as a list of know-how competencies. Rather, what is sought is a map of what contributes to the ‘grammar’, the ‘deep structure’ which makes pedagogic competence possible:

It is through the encounter with examples of appropriate speech in communication that the deep structure of grammar incarnates itself in active speech competence. Analogously, and to this end, education research as lifeworld science may generate objective knowledge of the subjectivity of human experience. Carefully prepared descriptive and analytic accounts of topics or structural aspects of the lifeworld may function as examples of what figures as concrete embodiment of the grammar of pedagogic competence.

(Van Manen 1979b: 63)

Van Manen sees the researching of such structures as a way to gaining a fuller grasp of the meaning of human action and understanding the socio-cultural and historical traditions behind our ways of being in the world (Van Manen 1984: 34).

He is therefore highly critical of those who believe they can create an ideal type of pedagogy, and, incidently, trainers who pronounce on the basis of such ideals. Instead, he refers to the basic pedagogic grammar which is generic and which enables us to know what we ‘are’ and what skills our action ‘expresses’ rather than traits we ‘have’ and which skills we need to acquire.
2.2.3 Phenomenology and Research

So far I have said a good deal about theory and practice, and referred to the way educational knowledge can come into being and exist at different sites in pedagogic practice. Moreover, I have developed some ideas from phenomenological pedagogical studies to indicate a more subtle understanding of what it is 'to know' in education; and the philosophical underpinning to such knowledge formation. Much of what I have had to say can be expressed in terms of the various sites of activity in education. The Vandenberg triangle may be understood as any one individual's relationship to theory and practice in a particular pedagogic context. However, the business of teacher training is a relational activity; I come with my own knowledge, my own pre-theoretical understandings, fundamental theory, justifying principles, as well as knowledge derived from philosophy and the normative sciences. Moreover, this knowledge exists in two pertinent but interpenetrating areas of professional activity; namely, language teaching and language teacher training. In the latter case, my concrete practice is training students, except that to do this I use knowledge derived from my own different sites of activity in the Vandenberg triangle from which various forms and quantities of knowing have been acquired. Moreover, I have a further activity - research - which is another practical activity with its relational forms of knowledge. Indeed, we might present the relationship between student, tutor as trainer, and research as follows:
In each case, positions 1, 2, and 3 relate to the appropriate forms of knowledge given in the original triangle. Each set of 1, 2, and 3 share common issues, but this time related to the area of activity; be it teaching, training or researching. Moreover, their relative positions indicate how different forms of knowledge arise from different forms of activities.

The whole point of Vandenberg’s work, as it seems to me, is to avoid producing narratives that claim to be directly applicable to concrete situations without intermediary processing. The strength of phenomenology, or eidetic, descriptive, research is that it seeks to say something about things as they are rather than interpreted through the conceptual frameworks of various fields of knowledge, whether pure or applied.

Husserl’s work suggests that it is possible to get in touch with these things ‘in themselves’ by ‘bracketing’
the 'natural attitude' (1960), because, as Schütz, a student of Husserl, puts it:

It is only after I "bracket" the natural world and attend to my conscious experiences within the phenomenological reduction...that I become part of this process of constitution of a world.

(Schütz 1967: 37)

The use of terminology is significant. Because the totality of the lifeworld cannot be captured, what can be said about it in a phenomenological method is 'reduced'. 'Bracketing' takes this intention one step further: here, natural thoughts, presuppositions, etc. are put to one side in an effort to get at the thing itself. Of course, such bracketing is always limited:

The most important lesson which the reduction teaches us is the impossibility of a complete reduction....If we were absolute mind, the reduction would present no problem. But since, on the contrary, we are in the world, since indeed our reflections are carried out in the temporal flux on which we are trying to seize....there is no thought which embraces all our thought.

(Merleau-Ponty 1962/1989: xiv)

However, the approach raises the possibility of adopting a stance, in a limited way, that does not necessitate a priori, taken-for-granted knowledge, and is aware of its own presupposition or starting points. Merleau-Ponty calls this a 'radical reflection' (ibid.: 219), or awareness of the dependence on contingency of circumstance at the outset of work which has only partly been made explicit and so is partly unreflected. Such unreflected knowledge would form part of Vandenberg's pre-theoretical knowledge in whatever area; teaching,
training or research.

Phenomenology is a subtle and complex philosophy which has much to say on what is education. However, despite its intricacy of argument, attempts to apply it as a basis for research have led to various problems. Firstly, it can lead to exhaustingly detailed accounts from which few patterns, structures or trends are discerned, as the researcher seeks to 'capture' the complexity of the lifeworld. Secondly, this belief in real life authenticity may lead to a precious attitude towards research data; so that any analysis is considered a mere abstraction. Thirdly is the question of reflexivity and the researcher's position in the research. In order to establish presuppositions or phenomenological relationships, the researcher can be led into a kind of dialogic recurrence as layer upon layer of text is built up in the belief that he or she is getting closer to the 'truth' of the thing. I have already written on reflection in my previous chapter on teacher education. It goes without saying that the issues I raised concerning the 'reflective practitioner' apply equally to teacher, trainer and researcher. However, reflection in a phenomenological approach can lead to a kind of transcendent meditation. Much of the hermeneutic, phenomenological tradition was established by existential philosophers such as Heidegger and Dilthey, as well as those already cited. The former of these went beyond Husserl's 'transcendent subjectivism', beyond philosophers' preoccupation since Descartes, to know how we as subjects gain knowledge of what constitutes the world, to claim a kind of 'transcendent objectivity'; a quality of Being, Dasein, that is the essence of the world, of which we are all a part. In Heidegger's work Dasein seems to take on an almost divine status; something of which is given to us and part of which is never revealed. In very poetical language Heidegger
writes of the essence of Being, of Dasein, lying in its existence (1962: 42). The totality of this existence becomes the objective world about which we can never know everything; although something is always 'given'. Moreover, 'language is the house of Being' (1971: 132). It is through language, what we can say about the world, that this divine Being 'comes forth' (cf. Avens 1984).

There is a tendency by those influenced by such writings to see the world as expressing a level of authenticity that will be violated by abstractions and theoretical analytics. Worse: such philosophical heirs to Heidegger as Derrida and Lyotard turn the whole philosophy on its head. It is not so much that there is a Being 'out there' towards whose mimetic revelation we should aspire, and which is immanent in language, but the opposite: there is no 'Being', no ultimate truth, and language can only ever be transparent and contingent. It is in the nature of language to constantly defer towards a meaning that never 'is' (Derrida 1967). Indeed, Derrida is almost an 'anti-Heidegger': Heidegger without the 'Being'.

Researchers who are influenced by such philosophers take issue with representations of reality for a different reason. For them, language cannot represent reality: it is then a short step to concluding that this is because reality does not exist. This conclusion leads to a kind of hermeneutic nihilism: a black hole of analytics into which all theories are sucked. On the one hand, life is too complex to capture, and what is recorded must literally speak for itself. On the other hand, all that can be said must be deconstructed and shown to represent nothing other than researcher derived narratives. In this case, the research itself is seen as an expression of 'poetics and politics' (Clifford and Marcus 1986). Faced with this dilemma, some researchers have turned in on
themselves; where they, as researchers, and the research documents become the object of research reflection. Others have used a wide range of techniques, including fiction, to capture what has been called the 'experimental moment' (Marcus and Fischer 1986: vii). Yet this perspective to research leads to a kind of relativism that, in many ways, can be seen as the very antithesis of the research project: that, in Popper's words, 'any set of values can be defended' (1976: 116).

Reflection therefore raises questions of the relationship between thought and the objects of thinking. For phenomenologists reflection is a way of accessing meaning, 'of directing one's gaze at an item of one's own experience. This item is thus 'selected out' and rendered discrete by a reflective act' (Schütz 1967: 42). Such an argument seems to go beyond a normative view of knowledge formation as it does not see identity between what is said or thought and what exists in reality. Representation must be understood as relative and subject to degrees of accuracy. In research terms, a distinction would be made between 'representation (image) and the research object; and the similarity of these separate entities' (Woolgar 1988a: 20). However, it would seem to be erroneous to use the lack of identity between the two as an argument for abandoning claims to relevancy. For example, Tyler argues that the object of research is not how best to represent but how to avoid it (1986: 128). In his case, post-modernist knowledge comes about through 'evoking' rather than representing (p.130). This, he argues, frees ethnography from mimesis and the inappropriate mode of scientific rhetoric that entails 'objects', or facts, descriptions, inductions, generalizations, and concepts of truth (cf. 1985). But the way to do this needs literary style rather than technique. One answer to this conundrum is offered by Latour (1986). He distinguishes between meta-reflexivity,
a constant deconstruction of the text, which he sees as inflated method, and infra-reflexivity, deflated method, which recognises the artificiality of the constructed text but still aims to produce the most convincing account possible. In this latter case, accounts are written as if this is the way the world is, but, at the same time, it is recognised that rather more of the researcher will be disclosed than is sometimes acknowledged. This at least implies that the relationship between the researcher and the research is significant. At the same time, it recognises that the object of research is public articulation, not private meditation; indeed, the outcome of research is dependent on the tension between the objective world and subjective experience; what Denzin calls the struggle between the public and the private (1992: xiv).

It is therefore a disappointing outcome of the phenomenological tradition that so much research arising from it can seem overly subjective and lacking in general applicability at a theoretical and practical level. Van Manen’s own work (1984, 1990) in actually presenting data as a basis for analysis can seem subjective and bordering on solipsism. Elsewhere, where research has claimed to work within a hermeneutic-phenomenological tradition, some of it has tended towards general descriptive accounts backed up by assertions based on key phenomenological concepts (cf. Gillette 1991, Hycner 1985). I believe it is possible to produce a methodology that is much more rigorous in philosophical intent and practical application. Such would take the best of the descriptive, reflective elements of phenomenology but combine it with analytic concepts that stood up to structural accountability; in other words, objectified and objectifiable in a range of contexts rather than being sui generis. However, before proceeding with an account of what this might look like for my own practice,
I wish to say a few more words on theory and practice, and the connections between the different forms of knowledge I have discussed.
2.3 Classifying Knowledge

In the previous section I addressed some of the forms that educational knowledge could take; in particular, I referred the schemes offered by Hirst and Vandenberg and discussed some of the philosophical issues underlying the phenomenological approach of the latter. Discussion of the classification of educational knowledge and theory is difficult as each of these exist in various fields - teaching, research and training - and in different forms needing characteristic articulation. Similarly, there are numerous questions concerning the links between the different forms, their sites of activity, and the influence each has on the other. This section addresses some of these issues.

Various writers (e.g. Phillips 1987, Carr and Kemmis 1986) have attempted to classify research paradigms in the social sciences. Mostly, a distinction is made between a positivist, empirical, 'scientific' approach and hermeneutics. There is a risk of caricaturing each of these, and it is not my intention to rehearse or repeat arguments concerning their relative merits. Generally speaking, the empirical-analytic, which is often referred to as nomothetic (a term apparently used by Windelband 1884) since the prefix 'nomo' means lawful, is concerned with the natural sciences; the search for universal laws and explanations through the object study of the world. This tradition implies a degree of 'scientific' neutrality, the control of experimental variables and the application of human reasoning. Seemingly opposed to this is the hermeneutic, a term deriving from the Greek god Hermes, whose job it was to interpret and communicate the ideas of the gods to mankind. Key notions are understanding, interpretation and the acceptance of multiple realities in the world.
It is easy to see how these two approaches fit within the Vandenberg triangle: the positivist, empirical, paradigm would apply mostly to the 'hard', scientific knowledge derived from the normative sciences; the hermeneutic would be more concerned with pre-theoretical knowledge and fundamental educational theory. Both paradigms imply a specific character of knowledge deriving from activity in each of them: the hermeneutic is concerned with the role that language plays in interpreting the world and with methodological pluralism in studying it; the empirical-analytic stands for the experimental, the controlled and instrumentality in research method. Moreover, the status of consequent research knowledge is implicated: the empirical-analytic viewed as publicly accountable and giving rise to theories that are predictively robust; hermeneutic knowledge being expressed best as 'verstehen', a word employed by Weber and philosophers of the neo-Kantian school such as Dilthey and Rickert to denote understanding from within, or empathy, a term that implies affective as well as rational involvement with the object of study.

Habermas (1987) recognised this divide between the empirical-analytic sciences, which he terms 'nomological', and the hermeneutic, which he describes as including the interpretive dimension of human activity. He criticises interpretive versions of social science methodology; firstly, for trying to mimic the empirical sciences by excluding values, or at least aiming for value neutrality; secondly, their often atheoretical stance; and thirdly, for not linking individual action to the macro dimensions of social structure. Habermas' answer is to present a third research paradigm: critical theory. Critical is here defined as pertaining to an 'emancipatory interest', in his case from the oppressive nature of capitalism. This paradigm presents a view of knowledge that is more than an aggregate of the other
two. Knowledge is seen as a social product, the nature of which can be uncovered by a critical reading of its underlying structures.

Structure becomes a key concept in that it can refer to the macro structures of society, both material and ideational, the micro activities of individuals found within them and the language we use to talk about these.

Rorty (1980: 379 - 89) criticises Habermas for adopting an old-style epistemology; for again having neo-Kantian pretensions to account for the foundations of all knowledge. It is true that in subsequent work Habermas drops this tripartite system. Nevertheless, it seems to me to be a useful framework for thinking through forms of knowledge and the way they are expressed. Moreover, Habermas is helpful in pointing out how these forms of knowledge arise from different activities, and how these activities constitute and are constituted by different interests: in the case of empirical-analytic - technical exploitability; for hermeneutic - intersubjective understanding; and for the critical paradigm - emancipatory cognitive interests (1987: 308 - 310).

Furthermore, Habermas heightens the role of language in representing knowledge. Indeed, his work can be read as a shift from the philosophy of consciousness which I referred to earlier, and which seems to have characterised philosophy since Descartes, to a philosophy of language, where it is within the innate character of language that rationality lies. Language and communication here take on a quasi-transcendental role in offering the means by which the emancipatory interest is brought about. Indeed, it is through different forms of communication that experience is expressed and understood (Habermas 1984, 1987).
The essential characteristic of language, besides being communicative, is that it is also objectified and objectifiable; indeed, it is this aspect that makes it innately reflective. Objectification is important as it is by this means that what is said can be scrutinised. All of the three paradigmatic forms of knowledge share this need for articulation; thus communication, and scrutinisation through objectification. To refer again to Vandenberg and the case for education, this character of language implies that not all knowledge, for example some pre-theoretical knowledge, can be objectified. As such, it cannot be the object of research: our concern can be with the unexpressed but not the unexpressible, as the latter will not have a medium of objectification. As soon as pre-theoretical knowledge is objectified in language, it begins to form the basis of fundamental educational theory.

This connection of language with objectification is perhaps a weak form of objective knowledge. A much stronger form is offered by the philosopher Karl Popper. For him, objective knowledge is at the base of scientific theory. Scientific theory is defined as only that theory which can be falsified, and, as such, takes on the status of objective knowledge. To be ‘supremely’ objective is to be ‘without a subject’ (1972: 107 -152), that is, existing in its own right. Such objective knowledge, for example, that derived from the empirical-analytic paradigm referred to above, has independent ontological status; that is it stands alone, can be scrutinised, interrogated for validity and tested for truth claims. The object of such testing will be its falsification, and, it is this possibility that gives it its ‘scientific’ character.

I have already pointed out that educational theory comes off badly when examined for its scientific, theoretical
status. It is for this reason that Hirst and Vandenberg developed their concepts of educational theory in the way that they did. Yet there are distinct similarities in much of Popper’s and Vandenberg’s thinking. For example, Popper also recognises the different status of forms of knowledge. He does this by positing three ‘worlds’. World 1 is the world of things - objects, books, tables, photos, etc. World 2 contains subjective experiences. This world would include pre-theoretical knowledge, or teachers’ thoughts and feelings about what happens in classrooms. But one’s subjective experience cannot falsify another’s. World 3 is the world with which Popper is most concerned. It is the world of ‘statements in themselves’ (Popper 1974: 181). This world includes all problems, theories and critical arguments. Language teaching methods would be included in this world along with generalisations from experience, no matter how small: fundamental educational theory and justifying educational principles in Vandenberg’s sense. The question of the ‘scientific’ status of such knowledge will depend on the extent to which it can be falsified.

The activity of some of the normative sciences is significant in this regard. However, for Popper, the process as much as the product of such an undertaking seems important, in that ‘objective thoughts -that is theories - (are put) before us in a way that we can criticism and argue about them’ (1972: 182). The basis of such criticism for Popper is language, as language can be used in an ‘argumentative function’.

Language, however, can be highly subjective, not simply an objective statement of objectivity. The strength of Popper’s theoretical perspective inversely rests on the strength of this ambiguity. Popper recognises subjective experiences, but believes that our knowledge of these can only arise through objectification; in other words, have the same linguistic representational form as other theories (1974: 138). It might then be concluded that it
is by being objectified through language that subjective experiences acquire the same status as theories. However, there is clearly a continuum in this. ‘Preferably’, Popper feels that theories should be ‘tested’, but this testing proves difficult in educational settings since the criteria for falsification are so context dependent. Such falsification may give rise to an ‘objective truth’ that has the ‘highest value at all’ in the intellectual world (p.195), but a good deal of thinking in education does not reach this level as its criteria for falsification rest on language that is contextually bound. Pre-theoretical knowledge may be articulated in fundamental educational theory in Vandenberg’s sense, and the latter may acquire the status of justifying educational principles, which will feed back through and be fed by concrete practice. However, there is some dispute over whether this process gives such knowledge scientific status. Vandenberg, along with other phenomenologists, would claim ‘scientific’ status for the knowledge based on their methods. Science for both Popper and Vandenberg implies objectification and public articulation. But Popper would want such objectification to undergo tests towards falsification, as a way of gaining scientific status. In this sense, Vandenberg’s fundamental educational theory is weakly scientific. The basis for such tests would, however, be language, and, as Habermas argues, as such is innately rational. It is as if the use of language itself carries with it the possibility of falsification.

The strength of Habermas’ scheme seems to be the possibility of uncovering interests lying beneath the surface of arguments arising from specific activities. The implication I draw from Vandenberg’s scheme seems to be the focus of such activities being determined not only from paradigmatic intent but also from place and time, and substantive intent. For example, rational arguments
can take place in and on education but not in the immediate pedagogic context. We might discuss educational phenomena and pedagogic method, but not whilst engaging in a direct teaching relationship, as the immediacy of the latter precludes considered reflection in action. Talk about teaching can normally only take place away from the teaching context. Talk, objectification and theorising are, hence, time dependent and situationally located. But this issue of time points towards the kind of relativism Popper objects to. Indeed, he sees such time-dependency as the root source of poverty in historicist theories (cf. Popper 1957). Yet, a sort of falsification can also seem to take place in practice. For example, a training teacher may have a number of personal perspectives and concepts about what it is to teach. It is in discovering the limited success of their application through consequent practice that they are modified. Practice thus provides the criteria for falsification of such perspectives and concepts. In other words, personal knowledge is ‘disproved’ which give rise to its modification. It seems possible to me, therefore, to argue for a hermeneutic application of Popper’s philosophy in a broad sense. Such falsification could apply to both pre-theoretical knowledge and fundamental educational theory, but what make the latter ‘theory-like’ is that it is articulated, or at least expressed in some manner. Ultimately, knowledge from such a process becomes generalisable through articulation in language, as it is here that we seek ‘to grasp a world 3 object or to produce it’ (Popper 1974: 191). This articulation necessitates a communicative act which, being inherently social, points towards the founding of a critical community in the way that Popper envisages.

Hirst, (1983) later revalues his own work and acknowledges the extensive powers that practitioners’ already possess in formulating what he terms ‘operational
educational theory’. He recognises that practitioners are embedded in practical contexts that impinge on practice and offer opportunities of practice. Hirst refers to these contexts as ‘appropriate practical discourse’ (1983: 26) and reverses his previous stress on theory to emphasise practice as the fundamental principle to educational knowledge. He also draws on the work of Habermas in suggesting that rational consensus between practitioners depends on the supposition of an ‘ideal speech situation’, characterised by its rationality and its intent towards equality of chances in assuming roles within the dialogue (p.27–28). To see such communication between individuals in this discursive mode is to suppose an ‘argumentative discourse’ within which subjects know how to act in practical situations. The aim of theorising about such practices is to render explicit the underlying rules and structures of such discourse. Theorising is then the form of communication in which truth and validity claims can be raised and recognised. Drawing on the work of Thomas McCarthy (1978), Hirst consequently argues for the activity of theorising to be governed by the reconstruction of a ‘species competence’, in this case, of pre-theoretical knowledge of practitioners, and a search for a formal pragmatic expression of the constituents of such knowledge. The mechanism for this expression is again to be found uniquely in language.

In this section I have discussed the different paradigmatic forms of knowledge in the social sciences, to relate these to my earlier comments on educational theory and show how the different forms may be expressed in practice. I see the issues to be as important and significant to the pedagogic act as the activity of researching it. However, for the rest of this chapter I shall focus exclusively on research methodology and the epistemological concerns that underlie my own present research context. I shall do this by briefly considering
the form and content of qualitative methods in educational research and then set out the scheme on which my own work is based.
2.4.1 Qualitative Research Methods

In chapter 1 I discussed some of the existent literature on teacher education. I noted that a wide and diverse range of qualitative methods had been used in this tradition, although much of it was broadly ethnographic or derived from symbolic interactionism. In this section I will briefly address some of the issues of the two approaches.

2.4.2 Ethnography

Educational research and research in the normative sciences related to education such as psychology has given rise to a large corpus of literature which has been set within an empirical-analytic paradigm. Burns (1982) notes how this was certainly the case up until the mid-1960s. Since then, what he terms the logical-empirical tradition has been waning, yet the two other paradigms he derives from Habermas, critical and hermeneutic, have yet to offer a credible replacement. I have already noted the rather undeveloped applications of phenomenology to educational research. What has arisen, however, and especially in the light of the foundational disciplines identified by Hirst in the 1960s, is an increased use of qualitative and ethnographic methods. Ethnography has been described as a 'culture studying culture' (Spradley 1980: 13), which pertains to its anthropological origins. It hence proceeds with the notion that it is possible to study groups and individuals within their natural contexts and make meaningful representative statements about what is occurring. Even so, in an opening chapter entitled 'What is ethnography?' to a book on the subject the authors (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983) do not seem able to give a precise answer. Instead, they note general disagreement over ethnography’s distinctive features; be
they the elucidation of cultural knowledge, the detailed investigation of patterns of social interaction, or the holistic analysis of societies. They also note that sometimes ethnography is descriptive and at others it is seen as giving rise to, and the testing of, theories. After offering a critique of the positivist-empirical approach to study in the natural sciences, they conclude that the essential feature of ethnography is the dimension of reflexivity:

the fact that we are part of the social world we study...by including our own role within the research focus and systematically exploiting our participation in the world without placing reliance on futile appeals to empiricism.

(Hammersley and Atkinson 1983: 25)

Such a statement seems to hint at the level of reflexivity I alluded to earlier. Certainly, ethnography is more interpretive, if not strictly hermeneutic. Yet it does not aim for the descriptive exhaustiveness that characterises phenomenology, or express its reflexivity in philosophical terms. Indeed, there appears to be some ambiguity as to just what is involved in carrying out ethnography and the degree to which the researcher can and should be reflexive.

How do ethnography and phenomenology differ? Ethnography traditionally provides insider accounts and employs methods of participant observation in order to get information on other people. Good ethnography can make claims to authenticity of representation: that there is a single reality to be captured and presented. Phenomenology takes a different philosophical stance. Given a similar descriptive account, phenomenology sees interpretation as a relational event. The element of reflexivity draws attention to the interests of the
observer, and their criteria for selection. In this case, the observer is much more visible in the data analysis in a way that is not true of ethnography. No phenomenologist would take the research back to the researched for authentication, and the separation and variety in foci is an essential element in the method: that different people produce different accounts in different ways.

The paradox for ethnography is that although a reflexive approach is advocated, the final outcome is often couched in the language of the natural sciences. Hammersley does this. In a recent work he sets out the tension between realism, what I earlier called representationalism, and relativism:

The first involves unacceptable assumptions about the asymmetry of explanations of true and false beliefs and of actions based on them; the second leads to all those problems that usually follow from the adoption of a relevant epistemology, notably internal inconsistency.

(Hammersley 1992: 54)

Hammersley’s response to this tension is to call for a ‘subtle realism’, which appeals to notions of plausibility, credibility and acceptance of the limited predictive aspect of a lot of ethnographic research. Yet this acceptance is grudging, there appears to be a nostalgia for the security of the natural sciences, and the impression that ethnography has failed to come up to the positivist mark:

The crucial question, it seems to me, is: how can the fact that a theory has ‘emerged’ from the data justify our belief that the processes it describes were operative in the case investigated, and (more important still) that they represent universal
principles. Unfortunately, today...we are left with an appeal to intuition.

(ibid.: 19)

2.4.3 Symbolic Interactionism

This general tension between hard scientific fact and individual reflexivity and intuition also besets symbolic interactionism. This tradition, arising from America, has been described as the study of ‘how human beings act toward things on the basis of the meaning that the things have for them’ (Blumer 1969: 2). Essentially, the approach concerns the way meanings arise out of social interaction, and the way different individuals interpret them and how they change through self-reflection and interaction. This research tradition can then also be regarded as interpretive. Once again, however, there exists a plethora of forms: Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical; Wiley’s (1979) phenomenological; Denzin’s (1989) interactionist, etc. Each make use of a vast range of research methods: ethnographic and qualitative techniques; for example, biography, fiction, journals, questionnaires, observation schedules, structured and semi-structured interviews, etc. Much of it represents a search for a method that incorporates the subjective features of human behaviour in a valid ‘scientific’ way. Yet, as Denzin concludes, this can lead to interactionists clinging ‘to a pragmatism which produces a crippling commitment to an interpretive sociology too often caught in the trappings of positivist and post-positivist terms; validity, proposition and theory’ (1992: 20). A good example of this is the ‘grounded theory method’ of Glaser and Strauss (1967), which, through saturation with the data, aims for the emergence of categories from which mini-hypotheses can be formed.
which will lead to theories which can be tested against further data. Where this is not the case, as in more broadly ethnographic work, there is a preoccupation with 'thick descriptions' (Geertz 1975) and the formation of mini-concepts. Perhaps, it is not surprising that a writer such as Hammersley bemoans this fact and comments on the 'dismal performance in the case of theorising' (1986a: 179).

There appears to be a conflict between rich descriptions that try to present the totality of social interaction in all its complexity, and abstract, general theories that cover the underlying processes. Clearly, there are two different orders of knowledge at stake here. On the one hand, there is a search for and the testing of theory in the same way as might be expected from the nomothetic research paradigm described earlier; a search for transcultural, transcendent universals expressed in abstract generalisations, and somewhat akin to the 'etic' described by Pike (1954/64) as an external approach to research. On the other hand, there is the 'emic', the study of experience from within, with which ethnographic and symbolic interactionist approaches seem to share more features. The latter, however, aspires to the former; and the former makes claims on the latter.

Symbolic interactionists share with ethnographers the same concern for reflexivity, particularly on the part of the researcher. Denzin (1989: 7) begins his book on 'interpretative interactionism' with a quotation from C. Wright Mills' the 'Sociological Imagination' (1959/1975) calling on researchers to 'develop a point of view and a methodological attitude that would allow them to examine how the private troubles of individuals, which occur within the immediate world of experience, are connected to public issues and to public responses to these troubles'. Later, C. Wright Mills (ibid.: 116) warns
researchers not to split themselves from the world but to use life experiences in intellectual work. Denzin’s interpretative interactionist method attempts to do this by making ‘the world of problematic lived experience of ordinary people directly available to the reader’ (1989: 7). In particular, he highlights ‘epiphanies’, or transformational moments, in which personal character is manifested and made apparent. He is therefore clearly against the positivist case, with its assumptions of objective reality, linear causality and value-free enquiry. He sees the same pretensions in ethnographic methods that take strips out of recorded data, and moments of social interaction, without setting them within the fabric of what occurred. His own method is based on rich description in an almost phenomenological sense, part of which involves the researcher laying bare their prior conceptions of the research phenomenon in question. It is this aspect that gives a critical interpretive level to the analysis as it recognises the underlying relationships between the researcher and the researched; which forms a direct link with hermeneutic philosophy, where, in Heidegger’s words, ‘inquiry itself is the behaviour of the questioner’ (1962: 24).
2.5.1 A Theory of Practice

So far in this chapter I have been concerned to explore issues relevant to the various research paradigms identified. Of these issues, the question of the role and status of theory is of principal significance. A theory of research practice must be robust enough to respond to the various claims and counter-claims of empiricism, scientism, representationalism and relativism. I do not believe that we can make a claim for epistemological foundationalism; that is statements about the ultimate grounding of our research knowledge. Yet I do believe it is possible to be epistemologically precise; to at least make clear statements in response to the issues raised; for example, the collection and presentations of research data, its forms of analysis, the derivation of the conceptual tools used, and the place of the researcher in all this. I now want to provide a theoretical response to these by considering the work of the French social theorist Pierre Bourdieu. I do this as I believe that ethnography is essentially a participatory activity, a culture studying a culture, as I wrote earlier: and I also believe that Bourdieu’s theoretical account of culture is particularly rich and helpful in making sense of what a culture is and how its mechanisms of operation exist in different fields. Moreover, my own reading of the tripartite system of knowledge, attributed to Habermas but in fact implicit in much of the debates on the relative status of scientific, critical and hermeneutic knowledge, is to try to understand it in terms of a subjectivist/objectivist dichotomy. Again, I find Bourdieu’s response to this particularly helpful in rethinking the issue of this opposition in a way that partly solves many of the problems which are consequent on the dichotomy.
2.5.2 Culture

In chapter 1 I referred to the teaching profession as a culture. In this chapter I have similarly discussed ethnography in terms of a ‘culture studying culture’. Culture is a key word as it refers to the world of knowledge, ideas, objects that are the product of human activity; in other words, knowledge and other ideational, ideological products. Thus, Popper’s World 3 would form part of culture; but culture might also include the objects of study, individual taste and language. Bourdieu identifies two traditions in the study of culture: the structural tradition, which sees culture as an instrument of communication and knowledge, as a ‘structured structure’ made up of signs based on shared consensus of world meanings; and the functionalist tradition, which sees culture as an ideological force or political power for imposing social order (Bourdieu 1968). The first tradition is probably best represented by Levi-Strauss, who, throughout the 60s sought to uncover the universal structures of culture inherent in such products as language and myth, where the meaning of any unit is defined through a system of contrasts with other units. The second tradition is more akin to the positivist.radical tradition referred to in chapter 1 as essentially functionalist in its approach to knowledge formation. For these, human knowledge is the product of the social infrastructure. Bourdieu criticises both these traditions: the first for its tendency to describe the structured structure in synchronic, anthropological terms, with an over emphasis on primitive societies; the second for reifying ideology as a pervasive force in maintaining social control, in the positivist tradition, or imposing the ideas of the dominant class, in the radical one. Bourdieu attempts to reconcile these two traditions; to use what has been learnt from the:
analysis of structures of symbolic systems (particularly language and myth) so as to arrive at the basic principle behind the efficacy of symbols, that is the structured structure which confers upon symbolic systems their structuring power. 

(Bourdieu 1971: 1255)

This proposition is seen as representing an initial 'break' with objectivism, particularly anthropology. However, a second break is required to restore the notion of practice to human activity. This argument necessarily involves the whole objectivist/subjectivist debate, at the interface of which Bourdieu constructs his theory. Indeed, he calls the traditional opposition between these in the social sciences as 'most artificial, fundamental and ruinous' (1980a: 43). For him, if culture and material relations form a state of objective reality, this latter is only expressed and reproduced in 'practice'; through a practical sense. When he begins his book, 'Outline of a Theory of Practice' with that now famous quote from Marx criticising any materialism that does not take account of human activity as 'sense' activity (1977: vi), he is insisting that objective structures are only revealed in the nature of individuals' practice. They are not simply inculcated as a reflection of material relations. Such human sense activity as social products arise historically in time but are revealed in individual action.

The debate focusing on the relationship between material, objective structures and individual agents' mental activity is central to the social theoretical tradition. But Bourdieu wants to break with objectivism and subjectivism by making:

a science of dialectical relations between objective structures.... and the subjective dispositions
within which these structures are actualised and which tend to reproduce them.

(1977: 3)

Bourdieu calls this 'science' the dialectic of the internalisation of externality and the externalisation of internality, or simply incorporation and objectification; terms I have noted elsewhere (Grenfell 1992) resemble those employed by Berger and Luckmann (1971) in defining their social construction of reality. Bourdieu insists on going beyond what he calls the opus operatum (structured structure) to emphasise the importance of the modus operandi (the productive activity of consciousness):

one must remember that ultimately objective relations do not exist and do not realise themselves except in and through the systems of dispositions of agents, produced by the internalising of objective conditions.

(1968: 105)

Social agents are incorporated bodies (an echo of Merleau-Ponty), possess, indeed, are possessed by structural, generative schemes which operate by orientating social practice. Practice, praxis, is consequently a cognitive operation; it is structured and tends to reproduce structures of which it is a product. Evolution and change in practice then occur not so much through the replication of action but its reproduction, which implies both variation and limitation in what is and is not possible in the behaviour, thought and physical action of social agents.
2.5.3 Habitus and Field

In this theory of practice, human action is constituted through a dialectical relationship between the objective world and individuals' thought and activity. Bourdieu uses the concept of structure to mediate between the two. Structures remain the final methodological unit of analysis; but not structure in the traditional structuralist intent of uncovering transcultural patterns, but structure as a dynamic cause and effect; as a structured structure and a structuring structure. The site of the operation of structure in this dual sense is habitus:

The notion of habitus....is relational in that it designates a mediation between objective structures and practices. First and foremost, habitus has the function of overcoming the alternative between consciousness and unconsciousness...Social reality exists , so to speak, twice, in things and in minds, in fields and in habitus, outside and inside agents. And when habitus encounters a social world of which it is the product, it finds itself 'as a fish in water', it does not feel the weight of the water and takes the world about itself for granted.

(Bourdieu in interview with Wacquant 1989: 43)

The concept of habitus derives from an effort to create a methodological construct that will give sufficient representation to the dynamic of structure in and through social reality as expressed in and through human knowledge and action. It is this structural view that postulates 'practice provoking dispositions', or the dispositions to act in a certain way, to grasp experience in a certain way, to think in a certain way. But habitus goes beyond a simple formulation of biographical determinism. If habitus is ontologically specific,
epistemologically universal, it is only actualised through individual, and individuals' instances. In other words, social action has time and place. For Bourdieu, if individual aspects of habitus lay in individual consciousnesses and unconsciousnesses, the constituent effect of these in and through human practice is actualised in an objectively defined 'field':

I define field as a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by their present and potential situation (situs) in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field, as well as by their objective relation to other positions (domination, subordination, homology, etc.)

(1992b: 72 - 73)

Bourdieu has referred to the relationship between field and habitus as one of 'ontological complicity' (1990: 194), and:

the relation between habitus and field operates in two ways. On the one side, it is a relation of conditioning: the field structures the habitus, which is the product of the embodiment of immanent necessity of a field (or of a hierarchically intersecting sets of fields). On the other side, it is a relation of knowledge or cognitive construction: habitus contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world, a world endowed with sense and with value, in which it is worth investing one's practice.

(1989: 44)
Bourdieu has been accused of excessive materialism and idealism, not to mention determinism. But, in the above, I have tried to show how his theory of practice is constituted by a theory of knowledge that seeks to build a dialectical relationship between human thought, action and objective surroundings; except that these latter will also include social 'things' expressed in a cultural, ideational sense.

There seem to be two intentions: firstly, to found a 'scientific' theory of social praxis, in particular, as a research epistemology; secondly, and most predominantly in his work, to use this to study the manifestations and processes of social distinction and differentiation. Thus, the principle behind habitus as a structuring structure is the same as that behind the division of social groups into socio-economically based classes:

Structuring structure which organises practice and perception of practice, the habitus is also a structured structure; the principle of the division into logical classes which organises the perception of the social world is itself the product of the incorporation of the division in social classes.

(1979: 191)

Because the principle of social action, and the meaning we give to it, is the same as that behind the division of labour in society, such action is liable to the same processes toward hierarchy formation. This means that knowledge and action have objective value subjectively perceived in the course of human activity. As culture is a product of mental activity, and this latter is in some way shaped by objective relations, then it follows that culture contains symbolic systems which have value because they are valued according to the same underlying principle as that of social differentiation, which
ultimately implies a scarcity of social resources. Bourdieu terms this 'symbolic capital', another concept used to give a material base to an ideational reading of social action (1980b: 2 - 3). The concept of symbolic capital is a useful one: it allows Bourdieu to differentiate between types of capital, for example, social, economic and cultural', and map configurations and systems of accumulations onto various social groupings. He thus uses quantitative terms as a symbolic representation of individual social class trajectories.

2.5.4 Developments

I have taken some time to set out the theory of knowledge that underlies Bourdieu’s sens pratique. Clearly, it continues a tradition of modern thought that runs through from Weber and Durkheim to Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty and Foucault. In this sense, Bourdieu is modernist rather than post-modernist, structuralist rather than post-structuralist. Unlike Habermas, Bourdieu is not attempting to advocate human action in terms of rational norms based on ideal speech acts. Neither does he see language as being innately rational or emancipatory. Indeed, he constantly refuses to be tempted by the Kantian tradition, the existentialists, and, ultimately the post-modernists to see individuals as ‘free’ subjects with potentially transcendental knowledge. Action and knowledge are always symbolic for him; derived from the practice provoking dispositions embodied in individuals and brought into being in particular contexts. However, we can use language to uncover these processes, as a way of ‘restoring to men the meaning of their action’ (1962: 109). Moreover, the language that is used to express these processes can be objectified as a way of reflecting on the contingency of formulation. But Bourdieu never moves into the post-modernist world of seeing language as
so extremely relativistic that it never really ever signifies anything; as being so unstable as to constantly defer meaning. Bourdieu’s theory attempts to give a dynamic, dialectical reading of practices that are necessarily contingent but still accountable. He attempts to do this by combining the sensuality and subjectivism of phenomenology with structural accounts and concepts that are objective and thus generalisable. It is why his method may best be termed ‘structural phenomenology’. However, structure, although being at the core of his work, is used in a subtle way. It is therefore to this term that I now wish to turn.

2.5.5 Structure

Structure has been at the base of the dominant philosophical paradigms of the post-war periods. But structure is often a pervasive and amorphous term. Piaget (1971) claims that structures are observed identities that embody the idea of wholeness, transformation and self-regulation. Wholeness in terms of internal coherence; transformative in a generative sense; and self-regulative in the sense of being closed to external reference. Structuralism can hence be seen as ‘fundamentally a way of thinking about the world that is predominantly concerned with the perception and description of structures’ (Hawkes 1977: 17). In its most overt form, for example in the work of Levi-Strauss, it becomes a method for the synchronic description of language, myths and legends, and the illustration of slow structural transformations. This is in part the structuralism against which Bourdieu is reacting. For him, structure is dynamic and dialectical; manifest in links at and between the objective and subjective levels of human contingency; links which are structural and structuring.
I previously noted that structure can be viewed phenomenologically. Indeed, it is possible to locate the basis of Bourdieu’s understanding of structure in the phenomenology of Husserl. Here, being in the world would be viewed as a differential. Differentiation implies a structural relationship. For Husserl (1982), this differentiation is characterised by two structural forms of consciousness: noematic and noetic. The ‘noema’ is everything that one knows about an object of thought; the noesis represents individual ‘moments’ of perception, where not everything is brought into being, is brought to mind, but what is known at any one instant is the product of the relationship between what is already known and new sense data. There is a constant interplay between the noematic and the noetic: but this does not take place in a liberal realm of platonic ideals or individual freedom. Indeed, the constituent knowledge is also the product of ‘doxa’; i.e., the sense of reality which is orthodox. Bourdieu pushes this line of thought to its logical, sociological conclusion in seeing ‘doxa’ as a social derivative. Interestingly, Husserl, in later writings, seems to suggest that this doxa itself will be interpreted through individual ‘habitualität’ or habituality (1960: 68), in language that echoes Bourdieu’s concept of habitus. What Bourdieu has done is to make these phenomenological acts essentially social; and thus symbolic.

The explication of these phenomenological structures attains scientific status by being objective and objectifiable. The means to do this are to be found in language, which echoes my previous discussion on theory, practice and the way the two can be linked through language. Language is the route to discovering what is there, is perceived, but not yet objectified. Language itself is structured; indeed, Bourdieu’s structuring and structured structure echo Merleau-Ponty when he writes of
a spoken word and a speaking word (1962: 197). This linguistic structure essentially implies differentiation; as the post-modernists have noticed in seeing language as being characteristically based on 'différance' (Derrida 1967). However, not only is meaning deferred, it is also constantly 'supplemented'. Language has the capacity to constantly bring meaning forward as well as to lose it. For Bourdieu, however, such meaning is saturated with value derived from its social contingency; which can be subjectively and objectively perceived, and therefore negotiated and contested.

I would argue that Bourdieu’s social theory should be seen as a derivation from phenomenological philosophy. However, although he emphasises the structural property of sense data, he is equally interested in establishing homologies of form, and value and thus symbol, between this and objective structures identified in the course of human activity. In this respect, he is an anthropologist in essentially targeting groups, and the behaviour of groups, in what he calls 'fields', for the object of his analyses. Indeed, phenomenological anthropologist may be a good label for him. In this system, language stabilises and thus allows for objectivity. Bourdieu’s work can be seen as an argument for replacing traditional structuralism (the continental version of anglo-saxon empiricism) with a pragmatic and reflexive objectivity based on the 'engagement' of the researcher as a social participant.

2.5.6 Bourdieu and Research

Bourdieu’s theory of practice, or sens pratique, is grounded in a theory of knowledge that prioritises the social nature of human activity. It has been described as 'empirical existential analytics' or as an ontologically
informed research programme (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1993: 35). Certainly, Bourdieu’s own work is empirical and phenomenological to the extent that it is based on a large amount of research data and adopts reflective approaches through the use of complex and sophisticated language in analyzing it. He argues that his terms of analysis - symbolic capital, habitus, field - have been sufficiently rethought and reconceptualised to avoid schematic, a priori, determinism. Indeed, the terms themselves ‘embody’ the dynamic, dialectical, structural phenomenology that is at the basis of his research praxis. Language used, however, never collapses in on itself in the way that it does in much work within a broadly post-modernist approach; for example, in proclaiming interpretations of research knowledge to be based on linguistic relativism and therefore constituting no more than ‘meta-narratives’ (Lyotard 1979).

To return to the three research paradigms quoted earlier, Bourdieu’s theory goes beyond the hermeneutic; it does not stop at phenomenological description or inter/intra subjective interpretation. In fact, it provides stable, though dynamic, formal analytical concepts such as habitus to give solid ontological bases to research. The theory represents knowledge and behaviour as an embodiment of life skills expressed in and through habitus and social fields. In this respect, Bourdieu’s work connects with Heidegger’s expression of ‘being-in-the-world’, Wittgenstein’s ‘social practices’ and Merleau-Ponty and the ‘in-corporated’ body. For Bourdieu, however, the dynamic connections between habitus and field allow for a two-way representation and representation between rules, demands and events of surrounding experience, and individual action and perception.
However, claims for the objective, scientific status of his analyses are questionable in the conventional, 'non-continental' sense. Bourdieu clearly understands that for there to be normal, normative science, there must be specific universal claims; and that these need to be tested and anomalies investigated in future research. A theory that rests on homologies between structural sense activity and identifiable forms within groups and fields would have difficulty achieving scientific status according to Popper’s definition. Bourdieu is closer to critical theory than hermeneutic or nomological research paradigms in that his theory tends to be revelatory of underlying processes and structures. This revelation is achieved by rational argument through language rather than the falsification of theory in a Popperian sense (notwithstanding the linguistic demand also put on Popper to establish criteria for falsification). It may be that the claims to scientific status are therefore overstated; indeed, this may always be the case for the 'life sciences'. Nevertheless, Bourdieu has provided a robust and rigorous form of analytics.

Bourdieu’s own focus has been on social differentiation. It is my contention that although this is the case, the issues raised by his work are pertinent and applicable to broader fields within the social sciences since they share common epistemological concerns. It is the intention of this thesis to explore these concerns by developing a research methodology that has as its primary focus the initial professionalisation of modern language teachers not social distinction itself. In the following chapter I shall set out how this appears in my own research practice. However, before doing so I shall conclude by returning to my introductory remarks in this present chapter.
2.7 A Final Vocabulary

I began this chapter by quoting from Richard Rorty and warning against a preoccupation with epistemology; and then spent the rest of the chapter discussing it. I stated that I was aware of the ironic stance in doing this. Rorty describes an ironist as someone who fulfills three conditions:

Firstly, she has radical and continuing doubts about the final vocabulary she currently uses, because she has been impressed by other vocabularies, vocabularies taken as final by people or books she has encountered; secondly, she realises that argument phrased in her present vocabulary can neither underwrite nor dissolve these doubts; thirdly, in so far as she philosophises about her situation, she does not think that her vocabulary is closer to reality than others, that it is in touch with a power not herself.

(Rorty 1989: 73)

Irony then becomes a kind of 'playing the new off against the old'. Hall sums it up quite nicely when he states: 'The vocabulary is final in the sense that it forms the final court of appeal when accounting for one's values, choices and actions. Since it cannot be grounded in anything more fundamental, either internal and external to the person, the vocabulary can only be justified by invoking some portion of itself' (1994: 129). It is in this spirit that I have offered these remarks, as a way of limiting claims and avoiding dogmatism. Like Rorty, I am more impressed by the ironist than the metaphysician, as the former has a more pragmatic attitude; and pragmatism must be finally the governing principle of education. Similarly, irony is characteristic of the reflective practitioner in their ironic stance; as one
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who is prepared to engage in dialogue rather than assertion. I therefore concur with Rorty when he sees hermeneutics, especially in its post-modernist extremes, as just another way of coping (1980: 356). In this respect, I am as suspicious of those who claim this is the way the world is not, as those who make claims about how it is. Similarly, I am tempted by Habermas' substitution of communicative reason for the subject-centred reason of modern philosophies, but I fail to grasp the innate foundational rationality of language. Yet, language is our means of discourse or way to argumentation. My own present final vocabulary has therefore been produced through a phenomenological reading of Bourdieu's social theory. I recognise that it goes beyond his intent but feel that the synthesis of objectivism and subjectivism, and what this offers me in terms of analytic tools (language), my own sense of being a reflective practitioner as researcher, and the bases of my research design, is the best I can presently do. To echo Rorty, to adopt such a stance is to drop questions of getting in touch with 'mind-independent and language-independent reality' and to replace it with questions concerning the limits of what we know and to see objectivity as a form of intersubjectively shared communal solidarity; not in its liberal, relativism but in terms of rigorously, explicated argument. The intent of this research, as any, is to contribute to such. Both Habermas and Popper meet on this point: that such argument is articulated through language by a (research) community. Language provides the basis for a shared agenda of criticism and piecemeal (pragmatic) reform and development over issues included on it. This is a 'harder', more 'scientific' position than Rorty's but consistent in pointing towards the aim of shared consensus through critical dialogue, and this necessarily includes the post-modernist debate, as the grounding of objectivity in communal solidarity.
2.8 Summary

This chapter has addressed my methodological concerns. The nature, form and expression of educational theory has been discussed and a phenomenological interpretation of the latter presented. Various philosophical issues have been alluded to and their implications for research practice considered. The principles of predominant research paradigms have been addressed both in theory and in their practical application in qualitative methodologies. Finally, a theory of practice derived from the work of Bourdieu was set out and some of the implications for research identified. For much of the chapter, the emphasis has been on presentation rather than in-depth comparative discussion. This approach has been deliberate as the main objective of this chapter has been to make explicit the particular epistemological concerns that have guided the researcher in the course of carrying out the research. The chapter has highlighted a need for a reflective approach in conducting research, and these comments should be read as an example of the researcher as a reflective practitioner. Indeed, the whole chapter has been framed in an ironic mode that has tried to establish a kind of contrapuntal reading to the created text as a way of making clear the intended status of what is being claimed and the various levels of argument within the discourse.

Much of this chapter has been theoretical. In the following chapter, I shall link these theoretical concerns with the actual research methods employed. I shall then develop a framework for the analysis of the data deriving from the study. In so doing, I aim to be true to the epistemological guiding principles I have just now discussed.
Synopsis
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Chapter 3 sets out precisely how the research was carried out. Details are given of procedure and techniques used - Interviews, Questionnaires, Diaries, Case Studies - and each of these discussed in terms of their salient strengths and weaknesses. The research approach is considered in the light of the epistemological concerns raised in chapter 2; specifically in terms of the work of Bourdieu. By alternating practical and theoretical discussion, the methodological approach to the research is presented in the dynamic, developmental way it shaped data collection and analysis. A 3-level approach is finally derived from this discussion and considered as an analytical framework. The relationship between research theory and practice concludes the chapter.
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Research Plan

'One observes in order to see what one would not see if one did not observe'.

(Wittgenstein 1977: 61)

3.1 Introduction

The structure of the chapter is complex. It is complex because it is attempting to synthesise a number of strands of thinking and intentions:

1) It presents the practical form that the data collection and its analysis took.

2) It discusses these in terms of the epistemological concerns covered in the previous chapter.

3) It connects the social theoretical and philosophical to both a justification for the research methodology and the analytic principles employed in responding to the research question.

4) There is an attempt to capture the chronology of the developing methodology, to show how basic approaches were adapted and applied in the light of carrying out the research.

5) Some representation is given to the time-consuming and meticulousness of the tasks adopted in working with the data.
6) A number of objections are anticipated and responded to.

This chapter is a crucial link between theory and practice, between what I did and the significance I understand of what I did.
The nature of any thesis is that it has to be read in a linear way: from start to finish. I have ordered the separate chapters in order to construct an academic text; to provide what is expected of 'empirical' research. Both the present and the previous chapter are set out early in the thesis in order to construct a methodological framework for what comes after. As such, it creates a false impression of causality; that the epistemological and methodological concerns were settled before the data collection and analysis was undertaken. This was not the case. Whilst I started with interests, impressions, hunches and ideas, the detail of the epistemological direction in which I was working, and the methodological implications of this, emerged whilst working on the project. In this case, my methodology was shaped by my developing epistemological understanding and vice versa. The structure of this chapter, more than any other in the thesis, attempts to capture this dynamic.
In the chapter 2 on methodological concerns I discussed my epistemological guiding principles. In this chapter I shall set out exactly what I did in planning and conducting the research; how the analytic approach arose and the form it took.

The first section will deal with data collection and the methodological formats adopted. There then follows a major consideration of the character of case studies since these are at the empirical heart of the thesis. I will then discuss the creation of case studies in terms of the theory of practice outlined in the previous chapter, focusing on the processes involved. The same theory of practice will be used to establish an analytic framework for use with the case studies. I will then demonstrate what this meant in practice and draw upon raw data to illustrate the procedures I followed. Finally, I will conclude with some reflections on the various activities involved in conducting the research and draw attention to the relationship these have with each other.

I shall start by recapping the methodological principles I drew attention to in my previous chapter.

1) Language itself has arisen as central to the philosophical concerns I have addressed. For many contemporary philosophers (eg. Merleau-Ponty, McCarthy, Husserl, Habermas, Popper), language has an innate rationality, has a quasi-scientific status. This rationality is ‘scientific’ in the sense that it leads to communicative discourse; offers the possibility of objectification and reflection. Moreover, there is a phenomenological and representational link between language and knowledge: meaning may be deferred in a post-modernist sense but it is also endlessly supplemented.
2) Separate activities – whether in the fields of teaching, training or research – give rise to characteristically distinct forms of knowledge. Such contingency can be objectified through introducing the dimension of place and time into the different processes and activities of research.

3) Phenomenological rigour aspires to rich description in research. Such description goes beyond the ethnographic as it foregrounds the relationship between the researcher and the researched rather than positing correspondence between what is observed and what exists in reality. Such descriptions may be dialogic; in other words, layered writings of texts upon texts. Part of the process of engaging in this activity may be to ‘bracket’ presuppositions, or at least objectify them. In either case, this process is never complete. Some caution must be exercised in order to avoid collapsing into hermeneutic nihilism, where the researcher becomes more the focus for research than the research itself.

4) Events may be uniquely experienced but there can be generalities of process.

5) One can be epistemologically rigorous but claims for connecting with absolute truth should be avoided. This requires the conceptual tools of analysis themselves to be objectified and interrogated in terms of their content. Moreover, what we have to say might be regarded somewhat ironically as the latest ‘final’ vocabulary.

6) There has already been some consideration of reflection and the reflective practitioner. The guiding principle of the present research emphasises the need to foreground time and place in understanding not only what we do but what we can and cannot do as contingent of the particular circumstance. This claim applies as much to
training to teach as it does to conducting research into it.

It is with these methodological issues as backcloth that I shall proceed to describe how I planned and conducted the data collection and the successive analyses which I carried out.
3.2 The Research Plan

The research methods used in this study have a mixture of systematic and ad hoc design. Schatzman and Strauss (1973) argue that a methodology should emerge from the process of the research rather than be designed prior to it. However, this seems to be only partly true or possible. It would be impossible, for example, for me to claim naivety in approaching the research and the questions it addresses. I cannot claim to be a disinterested party in this research, still less to be a non-participant in the very processes I am researching. Neither can I claim to have no prior knowledge of social theory, to have come across it by accident in the course of discovering the ‘truth’ behind what I had observed. However, much social theory addresses social differentiation and is concerned with the causes and consequences of modern, capitalist democracies. As such, it is not directly applicable to my own research topic: the processes of modern language initial teacher training. I have wanted to avoid constructing a discourse through which other voices of class, gender, race, etc. speak in the way I referred to earlier. Instead, I have wanted to use what social theory tells us about knowledge formation and apply it to broad research methodology and a field of activity that is not particularly preoccupied with sociological themes. It follows that both my own theoretical understanding and its applicability to the research topic in question have had to partly grow out of working with the empirical data gathered. The alteration of context focus away from social differentiation to the processes of teacher training has involved reapplication and developments based on the philosophical and epistemological. To this extent, the methodology in its practical application has been formed by the processes of carrying out the research themselves.
A primary aim in conducting the research was to give as full and as rich an account as was possible of a group of students training to teach, irrespective of any analysis which may be applied to such an account. It is a peculiarity of the research that I was intimately implicated in the very processes I was researching; in that I designed, administered and taught the course of subject application for students, as well as organising and visiting them in the course of their teaching practice. Such an involvement runs the risk of prejudice, excessive subjectivity or a priori conclusions being made. However, I would argue that my position in the research gave me unique access to areas of each student’s work as well as the richness of my own insights as a trainer closely involved in what the students were experiencing. I wanted to make use of my privileged position; I did not want to research myself.

Choice was involved: I could not capture everything. I wanted to get some feel for the group as a whole; their thoughts and experiences at key points in the course. Yet, I also wanted detailed accounts from individuals, and to provide a variety of medium for them to express themselves. I wanted personal statements made by them, but to also record data from more interactive encounters. It was also important for me to record what I saw them doing in practice; within schools and teaching in the classroom. As previously stated, time and place were important dimensions in conceptualising the research. I was, therefore, keen to ‘capture’ something of the students from before the course started to their very last days.

The data was gathered throughout a one year post-graduate certificate of education during the 1990 - 91 academic year, where there were 26 students in the modern language cohort. The course was principally a traditional sandwich
type, comprising one term mainly university based with one day per week placements; one term block teaching practice; and one term again university based with day school placements. The format of research techniques was varied throughout the year as was appropriate or practical at that particular stage of the course. The data gathering process was hence naturalistic, in that most of it arose from the normal activity of the training course, where students are required to reflect, write and discuss, both on their own and in groups, or with me.

I also needed to conduct myself as trainer rather than researcher for much of the time. I was keen, therefore, to ‘bracket’ my theoretical ‘research’ knowledge and to engage with the students in as naturalistic way as I could. The data was collected but I did not begin to analyze it in any detailed way at all during the year’s course, since this would have altered my position with regard to the students and thus radically changed the context I was researching. To offer me the opportunity to reflect as researcher, a journal was kept during the data gathering process where I noted theoretical connections, incidents that had struck me as being significant or revelatory, and my own thoughts about the strengths and weaknesses of the research techniques being employed. Finally, the following data was collected:

1. A pre-course questionnaire was sent to all students for their written responses.

2. A diary was kept by students during the autumn term, where they were asked to write out their thoughts and experiences based on the course at the university and their placements in schools.
3. A semi-structured interview was carried out with each student at the end of the autumn term, and recorded onto audiotape.

4. Student diaries were continued in the spring teaching practice term.

5. A series of lesson observation notes taken by me during visits to students in schools. In all, each student was visited 4 - 5 times throughout their main teaching practice. Basic observation and recording techniques were employed for each lesson observation: times, class details, main activities, resources, pupil/teacher interaction. Each observation was followed up by debriefing interviews; notes on which were subsequently written up immediately after the meeting.

6. Written questionnaires were posted out to students at the end of the teaching practice term and just prior to the final term based mainly at the university.

7. A final interview with each student was conducted during the last week of the PGCE course. An open format was adopted and each interview audio-recorded.
3.3 Preliminary Analyses

I was keen not to aggregate my findings and present them in decontextualised forms; but rather I wanted to offer something of the lived experience of individuals in the course of training in a quasi-phenomenological sense - to give voice to personal experience. The questionnaires did give opportunity for some aggregating across the group but I was interested in the mundane and the particular experiences of individual students. Building up an account of these is lengthy and time-consuming. It was, therefore, not possible or appropriate to use data from all 26 students. By the end of the PGCE year I had full questionnaire replies from the whole cohort of students and data as listed above from half of them, which represented my share of the students for tutoring during teaching practice.

At the end point in the year, I had collected data with very little analysis, save my own personal journal. As stated, I avoided data analysis during the collection period because I wanted it to arise from my normal course activity as a trainer with the students; I did not want my activity as a researcher to intrude on the normal events involved in working with the students. Initial preliminary work on the data took place during the summer following the end of this year’s PGCE, and involved analyses of the written questionnaires. Replies to each question were grouped together, studied using protocol analysis and findings collated. This analysis entailed grouping commonalities and differences and writing them up in terms of the apparent trends within the group prior to the course, and at the end of teaching practice. The whole group of 26 students was included in these analyses, and provided a picture of the initial positions of students (views, attitudes, ideas, etc.) with regard to a number of issues selected.
Once this analysis had been completed, and in order to fulfil my intention to present something of individuals’ experience of training to teach, I decided to concentrate on five particular students. For each of the five I decided I would construct five case ‘stories’. I used the word ‘story’ in this instance, not to imply any fictional element in what was included but to acknowledge respect for the fact that I constructed each from source data with the intent of recording and presenting what was there rather than analyzing and commenting upon it at this initial stage. I chose the five from the group of 26 to represent some of the main categories of student: mature students, native speakers, mothers returning to a career, those changing careers, fresh graduates, those with one or two year’s commercial experience who wished to return to their academic subject. These also included both successful and unsuccessful students, and represented broad working classifications I had myself constructed in working with students in previous years. Of course, none of these classifications existed in a pure form, and certainly boundaries between one and another normally crossed and overlapped; especially if age, gender and nationality were added. The five were not chosen with the intent of offering a predetermined classificatory scheme, but rather to provide a limited, varied range of experiences from different categories of students.

The five case ‘story’ students for the present study were selected during this immediate post-data collection period and chosen according to the following ‘groups’: a ‘successful’ student, an ‘unsuccessful’ student, a native speaker, a student changing career, and a mature mother coming back into work. In terms of the successful and unsuccessful student, these terms were used quite loosely on the basis of my working with them in the spring term. The successful student was one who had a range of good
experiences and outcomes over the course of the year. The unsuccessful student did not fail but struggled in a number of respects, and finally did not look for a teaching job.

For each of these students, I began to construct a 'case story'. This involved writing something of their biographies from information supplied on their application forms. I also copied out the diaries of each, grouped their questionnaire replies, re-wrote my lesson observation notes and post-lesson comments, and transcribed the two interviews I did with each of them. I found this process to be necessary for me to take ownership of the data, to re-live it and reflect upon its content. This was a reflective activity, and I deliberately avoided any systematic analyses at this stage. The reflections, thoughts and ideas that did come to mind during this process were recorded in the main body of the text in order to situate or embed them in their emergent place. These comments were made using the upper case to indicate which was my own language and which from the student. The following example is taken from a diary comment:

The Head of Department in my school does not have fantastic material but she does have a very up-beat style. Her way of presenting things has that sense of urgency.....urging pupils along, etc. And that is great when they are willing to work for you; you really feel that you are getting somewhere. I keep wondering if they will work for me. AGAIN, IT IS ALL IN THE PERSONALITY. SOMETHING THAT CAME UP BEFORE. BUT - DOUBTS HER OWN PERSONALITY AND THEREFORE LOOKS FOR 'THE' ANSWER IN THE MATERIALS.

The outcome of these preliminary analyses was a data bank of some 250,000 words: the two questionnaires and the
full research data for the five case students. Even restricting my research to five particular students had produced an unmanageable amount of material. I therefore decided to construct five condensed case stories, each containing 8 - 10,000 words. I termed these 'non-critical' case studies as my main intent was still to present the ranges of thoughts and experiences of each of the five students in their own words as far as possible, and without analytic comment from me. In this sense, I 'bracketed out' my own analytic terms of reference and attempted to provide an empirical account of students' training lives during their PGCE. These accounts were, of course, 'reduced' from primary data; this was done by omitting repetition, unnecessary detail, informal remarks and the complementary language of discourse (cf. Hycner 1985). Finally, I would argue that these 'non-critical' case studies are not simply narratives but closely present the significant, essential features in the experience of training to teach languages for each of the students. My own original reflections were retained in the upper case where linked to a particular event or thought in order to remind myself and the reader of the point of emergence of my own ideas, my relationship to the students' writing and the text I had created.

The culmination of this work - the questionnaire analyses and the five 'non-critical' case studies amounted to a data bank of some 70,000 words. It is a rich and very full document which offers an extensive, ethnographic account of five student teachers in practice.

It is this data bank that then formed the basis for my principal analyses. Moving from a role as the recorder of thoughts and events to analysis of them requires a mental leap and a change of relationship to the data. Before I give details of this, I would like to add some more discussion about the methodological formats employed.
3.4.1 Methodological Formats

I have presented my research approach in terms of the activity undertaken in order to provide a range of responses for the creation of a rich description of the students during the course of their training. In this section, I want to add a few brief notes on each of the research formats used: Questionnaire, Interview, Diary and Case Study.

3.4.2 Questionnaire

There are some problems in using questionnaire techniques. Spradley (1980: 32) warns that a good deal of social science research is based on questions that come from outside of the researched culture, and that this distorts. Collingwood (1970: 31) comments that any question delimits the range of possible answers; as if answers coming out of the study are conditioned by the form and the character of the questions put in. This phenomenon arises from the innate logical character of language. My own questionnaire questions do indeed delimit in this way. However, they do represent questions arising from the culture of which both the students and I form a part. Furthermore, the format of the questionnaire enabled students to 'make of it what they will'; and responses did indeed vary incredibly in length and style. To this extent, the questionnaire was open-ended.

The aim of the questionnaire was to be complementary to other sources of data knowledge. For this reason, and to preserve the naturalistic approach, neither questionnaire was piloted. (cf. Youngman 1982, Munn and Drever 1991). Piloting is, of course, important as a part of a researcher's work: Youngman calls it 'an integral part of any research' (op.cit.: 26). However, at this point my prime interest was to collect data as it arose. In many
cases, there was only one opportunity to gather data at that moment. Repetition of formats based on piloted and reformulated questions would have undermined the naturalistic approach I was trying to adapt. I wanted to capture what was there without detaching myself too much from my normal course of activities as teacher educator during training. However, much time was taken ‘getting the questions right’ (Munn and Drever 1991: 19ff.) by redrafting them in the light of in-depth discussion with colleagues, and attempts to classify the potential content of each question (Grenfell 1994).

Some writers have cautioned against generalising on the basis of questionnaire data, as this implies a ‘uniformity of nature’ (Hamilton 1980: 86). In other words, semi-quantitative and descriptive, statistical techniques open the door to the positivist, scientific interpretation of results referred to in my previous chapter. This tendency is especially true of survey analysis. It is misleading then to draw firm conclusions on the basis of over interpreted generalisations. In the present context, the questionnaires gathered information on no more than trends in responses of students to the areas of interest I had selected. As long as statements are not taken as declarations of positivistic truth, that is, having universal validity, it is possible to ‘aggregate instances’ (Atkinson and Delamont 1986: 39) in a way that retains sensitivity in the analytic process.

The first questionnaire supplied information on a range of issues pertaining to areas of experience and expectations of becoming a teacher. The following are the questions which were presented to students:
Please respond freely to the following questions;
1. If you were asked to do so, how would you define 'language' succinctly?
2. What have you got most out of learning languages?
3. What do you think are the major problems individuals face when learning languages?
4. What makes a 'good' language learner?
5. What makes a 'good' language teacher?
6. What advice would you give to someone wanting to learn a modern language?
7. Why do you think that learning languages is important?
8. How do you think languages fit in with other school subjects? Are they different in any way?
9. What do you hope to get out of being a language teacher?
10. What is your main concern for the future as a prospective language teacher?

The second questionnaire provided data on the students’ immediate thoughts on their teaching experience and asked them to reflect on such pertinent issues as grammar, use of target language, printed materials and intra-departmental relations, etc.:

Please respond freely to the following;
1. Autumn Term
Looking back at the autumn term:
i) Which component was most useful to you in preparing for teaching practice?
ii) Which component was least useful to you in preparing for teaching practice?
iii) Any other comments?

2. Teaching Practice
i) What were you happiest with during teaching practice?
ii) What was the most difficult part of being a student-teacher doing teaching practice?

iii) How do you feel you changed over the term?

iv) What were your thoughts and feelings about tutor visits?

v) Any other comments?

3. Pupils

i) What do you think pupils found most difficult in language learning?

ii) What do you now feel about the mistakes pupils make?

iii) Any other comments?

4. Comment on the following:

i) The communicative approach.

ii) The need for grammar explanations.

iii) Use of target language.

iv) The work of the department you were in.

v) Planning and preparing lessons.

vi) Published teaching materials.

5. i) What advice would you give to a student approaching teaching practice?

ii) What do you think makes a successful language teacher?

In both my questionnaires, a distantly administered form was necessitated by the fact that I wanted to capture a snapshot of student views at particular times of the course; namely, when they had not yet started, and before they returned to the university after teaching practice. Examples from the questionnaires analysis can be found in Appendix 1 and are discussed more fully elsewhere (Grenfell 1994).
3.4.3 The Interviews

The interviews represent my attempt to explore student opinions and experiences in more depth. An interview approach was hence most appropriate (Powney and Watts 1987, Wragg n.d.). This change in data collection format also made for a more spontaneous approach. Two interviews were conducted, each of which differed in format. The first interview, at the end of the autumn term, was semi-structured and audio-recorded. Questions covered were as follows:

1. What are your feelings about the term?
2. What have you found most useful?
3. What has been least successful for you this term?
4. What do you think of the language teaching approach we have tried to develop?
5. Do you think that methodology affects language learning?
6. How do you view the books you have read?
7. What do you think about the materials you have used?
8. Which experience in school this term has been the most memorable for you? (best/worse?)
9. Do you think that your own understanding of what language is all about has changed in any way over the term?
10. What are you looking forward to most next term? (least?)
11. What do you think will be most important for you in the classroom?
12. How do you think that language learning is changing in schools?

Despite adopting an informal approach, the impression I gained here was one of constructing a spoken questionnaire. One of the great advantages of this
research was that it was largely based on the relationships I was able to build up with the students during the course, which included degrees of trust and spontaneity. This personal relational element was compromised as soon as an interview situation was contrived and recording equipment used. It became clear to me that some of the most revealing and insightful parts of the interviews came at the very end when the recording equipment had been switched off. This was also true of debriefing sessions following on from lesson observations. Because the agenda was open, and the format casual, students were more at ease and developed their thoughts much more explicitly. For post-lesson comments I found that the best way of dealing with these was to make detailed notes following the conversations. I was mostly able to remember the content and style of expression on a number of issues; all of which were noted as part of a data gathering journal.

It became clear to me that, for the purposes of disclosing underlying thoughts and feelings, the most satisfactory interviews were indeed informal and personal, as conversation was more spontaneous, open and frank. Indeed, it was conversation that arose from our relationship. I was then very much a participant in the construction of ideas, although, in most cases, this did not lead to conformity of students' views to my own but clarification and elucidation of what they were feeling and thinking.

I was so impressed by the richness of the data gathered on such occasions that I decided to adopt a totally open format for the final interview, with no pre-set agenda or list of questions. This approach allowed the conversation to cover present preoccupations. These interviews were less successful than the debriefing conversations. However, more time was taken than either the previous
interviews or some of the debriefing meetings. Certain themes did develop, which pertained to overall evaluation of the course, thoughts on teaching and future prospects. Again, these were recorded for later analysis.

3.4.4 Diaries

Diaries have been used for a number of years in research as a way of getting individuals to catalogue their experiences. For example, Parkinson and Howard-Richardson (1990) used diaries written by second language learners to quantify entries according to focus and sites of activities noted. This technique allowed them to list classroom related and non-related entries and analyze them in terms of anxiety control strategies. Hanson and Herrington (1976) also used diaries kept by probationary teachers to give an account of the initial year of teaching. However, this is a research tradition that is rather ad hoc and no specific methodology for the implementation of diary techniques in the research process has gained prominence.

Creating the diary is clearly an interpretive act on the part of the diarist. Compared to the questionnaire, whose strength and weakness lie in its ability to offer general pictures, the diary is the creation of a particular individual. It is the result of direct involvement, not only with events, thoughts, feelings and experiences, but of engaging with these and their articulation into written form. As such, it is most inappropriate to ask questions about authenticity and honesty. It is even less appropriate to question whether an event happened in this way or that in reality. What is more significant is the fact that the diarist perceived it this way or that and chose to express it in this form. As Bailey and Ochsner refer to Butler-Wall’s comment; 'it is not what you
write, but the fact that you write at all’ (1979 quoted in Bailey and Ochsner 1983: 192). Moreover, what is left out may be just as significant. From such inclusions and omissions, it is possible to build up a picture of who the writer is, what motivates them and how they understand what is happening. The following notes were given to students to guide them in constructing their diary. It is evident that the notes are quite open, and encourage the writer to adapt the format to their own style and intent; although there was some effort to encourage them to focus on issues of modern language teaching, and responses to their surroundings:

The idea is that you should keep a diary of your thoughts and experience throughout the year. A diary is normally a personal, subjective account of various thoughts and feelings, and we hope that this one will be just that. It would obviously help if you could keep these notes in an exercise book, although loose sheets in a file would do. There is no need to make notes at the end of each day. It may be better to sum up a whole week’s work. In some cases, you will want to expand on particular points. On these occasions, short notes and key words/phrases will be enough. It would be useful to date the week and refer to the topics covered in the sessions in the autumn term. A number of issues will have arisen and it is important that you note these along with your own thoughts, doubts, etc. and questions to consider as a follow-up. On some occasions, you may find that things have been said by the tutor or your fellow students that you do not agree with. Other times, you could find you change your mind in discussions or discover something you feel is extremely important. Try to note all of these. Use an Activity, Evaluation, Action Plan scheme when you feel it is appropriate. Sometimes
you may feel that a more open-ended approach is suitable.

Similarly, it is important that you note down your school visit experiences. There is the opportunity, as part of the assessment, to write a detailed account of an observed lesson. Your diary should therefore include first impressions and how these are confirmed or otherwise in the course of the term. In particular, how does what is said in sessions at the university accord with reality? How does the theory of language teaching correspond to actual practice? What works and what doesn’t? Why? Do your observations and experiences alter your understanding of how languages are learnt? There will be a lot of issues involving management, discipline, etc. arising from your observations. Whilst these are crucially important, we would like you to keep language learning and teaching as a central focus to your comments. So, for example, if, from your experiences, you conclude that resourcing is vital for effective teaching, try to relate this to the case of the language learning you have observed.

Two Final Points:

This can only work if you are open and honest in what you write. Try to guard against writing what you think you should be thinking rather than what you really are. The more honest you are about problems, the more you can address them and find ways of solving them. This is not to say that everything you write should be problematic! It should rather be a catalogue of your developing understanding of issues involved and how they relate to your practice.
Finally, the content of what you write will not be used as an assessment.

(Spring Term Teaching Practice) You should continue to keep a personal diary. This should not, however, be a burden but useful for you to give an account of how things are going. A weekly digest should be the norm. You may want to illustrate with particular examples from lesson you have taught or incidents in the school, and referring to particular classes/pupils. Try to focus on how you think you are developing. Take as your base line the skills and knowledge you have gained from your work in the Autumn Term. These obviously operate on various levels: theoretical, experiential, personal, etc. Try to explore these in an open and personal manner in the light of your teaching practice experience. What do you conclude about language teaching - theory and practice? Try not to get too preoccupied with classroom management (discipline) issues, although these are obviously crucial in what you are trying to achieve. Where you locate issues, try to develop them. If you feel there is a strength, try to think through the implications for theory and practice, and how you might build on it. If you identify a problematic area, again explore the implications in terms of what you know. Try to design strategies to support areas of weakness.

Again, a diary must be an open and personal account. Academic rigour and objectivity are not necessary, but your own (unique!) thoughts and feelings about your developing skills and awareness in being a language teacher.
Diaries were kept by students throughout the entire course, but only those from the autumn and spring terms were used in the research. As I have previously stated, diary entries for these periods were re-written as part of my preliminary analyses. Subsequently, grids were drawn up which allowed the timing (i.e. the week) of entry to be made explicit.

The students were clearly aware of the fact that I was the audience for the diaries; which means that some personal reflections may have been omitted. The dynamic of writing is such that some of what students are experiencing is bound to be revealed. It is on the basis of this that essential processes which are directly unobservable become apparent. Furthermore, the writing itself formed part of the training process, as writing provides a source of objectification of subjects’ thoughts and an element of reflexivity (Walker 1985) in a way I alluded to earlier.

3.4.5 Case Studies

As previously suggested, once a data bank had been constructed using the various methodological formats as source material, this data was analysed through an adapted form of protocol analysis. This entailed firstly reading transcripts, diary entries and questionnaire replies and noting areas of comments. These comments were logged under theme headings; in addition, diary entries were re-expressed on grids in terms of the time of writing. Such grids enabled the dimension of time to be present in expressing the data. The following analytic categories were used:
An example of what the grid looked like for one particular student (Janet) is given in Appendix 2. The grids and tables were then used as a basis to drafting the non-critical case studies.

Case study research is often employed to investigate policy implementation, administration of organisations or the conduct of communities. It has been claimed to be 'the preferred strategy when 'how?' or 'why?' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context' (Yin 1984: 13). They also offer us opportunities of exploring 'new ways of understanding' (cf. Simons 1994). In this case, the strength of the methodology is also its weakness. A case study can provide a rich description of a particular research focus, but it may be overly long, unstructured and have little scope for 'scientific' generalisation. As I have previously noted, my principal, initial intention in the present context was to 'tell five stories', but this was less to do with fictive accounts than with expressing the fieldwork information in a condensed form that would allow something of the individual personalities and life experiences of the students to be present. In this sense, a case study format was
particularly applicable. Case studies also provided the possibility of incorporating spatial, temporal dimensions into the fieldwork (i.e. what comments were made, when, and where), as well as allowing me to signal my own reflective thoughts during the initial stages of data analysis; which are themselves temporally dependent. However, case studies are prone to the criticism of being imprecise, of meaning anything to anyone. It is also often very difficult to separate out the accidental from the essential in case studies. Atkinson and Delamont (1986: 33) have written of case study workers as being ‘anti-intellectual and lacking in scholarship’. Their claim rests on two principal issues: the degree of generalizability possible in case study research, and, related to this, the degree to which an adequately formulated theory or body of knowledge can be constructed from case studies.

Generalizability really applies to the extent to which case studies in particular, and aggregates of them, can produce something that is applicable to other incidents of the "same" type; what Tripp call the ‘need for a classificatory system quite independent of the individual case’ (1985: 38). Such phenomenological-hermeneutic writers as Dilthey also thought that it was possible to discover general universals through the study of many particulars. The question of generalizability from case studies is based on the issue of the way findings from case studies are analysed and presented. If a case is to be anything other than particular, some sort of general inferencing must go on which can in some way be expressed as theoretical; be it fundamental, or ‘scientific’ in the terms I earlier addressed. Hammersley lists three justifications for theoretical inference:
1. That insights have validity whose value can be judged by the reader.
2. That some universal claims can be made from the study of a single case that exemplifies a type.
3. That such universal claims can, on the basis of hypothetical-deductive methods, be tested, and thus the truth or falsity of such laws be inferred.

(1992: 91)

He also feels that a distinction needs to be made between empirical generalisations and theory; and between establishing the validity of generalisation or theory and deciding on its usefulness in making sense of a particular case. On the one hand, there are again aspirations toward hard, 'scientific', theory; on the other, general validity and usefulness. Too often, it seems, the latter only gains status in social science research by paralleling statistical generalisations characteristic of the positivistic sciences. Yin (1984) draws a distinction between two types of generalisation - statistical and analytical - and argues that only the latter are relevant to case studies; in other words, conclusions drawn from qualitative analytics.

Atkinson and Delamont (1986: 40) state that the unintellectual, unscholarly character of case study research can be freed by developing 'formal' or 'generic' concepts as a way of using such analyses for explanatory and comparative purposes. It has been my intention to do this in the present research through the application and developments of the general epistemological approach I have derived from philosophy and social theory, and, in particular, the analytic concepts originating in the work of Bourdieu.

Atkinson and Delamont are seeking to balance a formal analysis against the caricatures of scientific
positivism. They want to generalise in a way that is intuitive and empirical - somewhat echoing what I earlier referred to as reflexive and pragmatic - that is, using observed phenomena as a basis for comparative analyses, but in a way that relates them to an 'adequately formulated body of theory or methods' (p.42). Without this, they see practitioners substituting 'one variety of atheoretical findings - based mainly on observation and interview - for another - based mainly on test scores'.

Mitchell (1983) also argues that case study analysis should be less about scientific claims to representing social reality than about validity. He believes that case studies force the researcher to look at the group structures and their unit of growth rather than fall back on trait analysis alone as many qualitative researchers do. Such an approach allows for developing configurations rather than generalizable relations between aspects of cases. I believe that the 'structural phenomenological' approach I have adopted does this by seeing such configurations as subjectively constituted but, procedurally, objectively 'constant'. The manifestations of such processes are constantly in flux; the underlying logic of them remains constant. In order to do this, case studies need to be analysed in terms of their relational content.

Yet inferences are often sought in the same way and style as those arising from statistical analysis. Both Mitchell and Yin criticise this. Statistical inference, Mitchell argues, involves the analyst drawing conclusions about the existence of two or more characteristics in some wider population from some sample of that population; whilst logical inference involves the process by which the analyst draws conclusions about the essential linkage between two or more characteristics in terms of systematic explanatory schema - some set of theoretical
propositions. He concludes:

In analytical thinking based on quantitative procedures both type of inference proceed pari passu, but there has been some tendency to elide logical inference with the logic of statistical inference: that the postulated logical connection among features in a sample may be assumed to exist in some parent population...I argue that the process of inference from case studies is only logical or causal and cannot be statistical and that the extrapolatability from any case study to like situations in general is based on logical inference because such analysis is unassailable.

(1983: 199 - 200)

He goes on to quote from Znaniechi, who argues in a similar fashion that there is little difference between enumerative and analytical induction as a practical as against logical procedure, because, just as in the case of enumerative practice, analytical induction indirectly involves the study of cases in which the phenomenon they are interested does not occur. Generalisation is then again defined in terms of the underlying theory to which the case study is related. It is the explanatory power of such analysis that gives case studies their usefulness. Any prediction that goes on will be theoretically rather than empirico-scientifically based.

The upshot of this for the present research seems to be threefold: firstly there is a need for a general fit, as Schofield calls it (1993: 221) between the situations I have studied and others to which I might be interested in applying my concepts of analysis; secondly, the logic of this latter needs to be grounded in a theoretical perspective that is robust enough to be responsive and adaptive to such changing circumstance. I want to argue
that it is the theory of practice that I outlined earlier that is capable of doing this. Finally, there is the question of the relational content of the case studies. Generalisations cannot be made simply by locating two or more common components, but the structure of the ‘parent’ population needs to be analysed; both within and between case studies. I want to show how this operated in practice. Different processes were involved in the construction and analysis of the research data. However, before setting out the precise scheme for what I shall call my ‘Secondary Analysis’ I want to return to Bourdieu’s theory of practice and discuss some of the implications it has for actual research practice.
3.5.1 A Theory of Research Practice

At the heart of Bourdieu’s theory is a concept of knowledge formation. It is this theory of knowledge that I wish to use as the basis to my research. Indeed, as both training to teach and researching the processes involved in this are concerned with knowledge formation, it might be argued that there exists epistemological commonalities between the researcher and the researched. In other words, the epistemological framework I am constructing implies homologies between the field of knowledge formation of the student teachers and my own field of activity in relation to them.

3.5.2.1 Participant Observation and Participant Objectivation

My own research has to be regarded as ‘participant observation’, in order to indicate my own involvement within the processes I am researching. Bourdieu on one occasion notes that ‘participant observation’ is almost a contradiction in terms (In Wacquant 1989: 28). In this case, he is drawing our attention to the rather naive claim that becoming more involved is one way of getting closer to object reality; without acknowledging the relational aspect between the researcher and the field of study, which is the object of research; and essentially Bourdieu does see the necessity of studying objects as part of the fields they occupy. This understanding is important, not only in terms of the researcher’s effect in carrying out the research, which is the normal social science phenomenon of the influence of the observer’s presence, but the very knowledge and schemes of thought involved in the researcher’s relationship and conceptualisation of the object of study. Such can be viewed as a warning against forming research conclusions as ‘hard’ facts, as a form of excessive objectivism.
However, the logical response to this avoidance does not necessitate excessive subjectivism, for which I have criticised some broadly post-modernist writers. In the place of excessive objectivism and subjectivism, Bourdieu’s seems to advocate engaging in the research as a kind of ‘epistemological experiment’ (Wacquant 1989: 33), which will allow work in a dialectical, dynamic relation to the research in question. Indeed, he encourages us to ‘think relationally’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992(a): 196 ff.). The ‘experiment’ continues the efforts to operationalise a double break from subjectivism and objectivism, from structuralist form and hermeneutic ‘formlessness’. The resultant method is expressed through complex language that, in Bourdieu’s case, makes use of an energetic play on words. The guiding principle of this method is to make the subjective objective and the objective subjective. If research involves the objectification of social processes, this objectification must also be objectified (cf. Bourdieu 1980a: 51 - 70). Such objectification of the objectified entails more than a simple reflection on the categories of analysis that the researcher uses, which is common in social science research, but also requires ‘objectification of the objectifying subject’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992(a): 175 - 185), which he refers to as ‘participant objectivation’ (1978). Such an objectification seeks to go beyond a normal preoccupation with constructing concepts of analysis, which seems often to say less about the object of study than about the relationship of the researchers to the object of study. Such tendencies can be seen in some researchers’ ambitions for positivist transcendence, which Bourdieu understands as an effort towards ‘crushing one’s rivals’ (Wacquant 1989: 35), of reifying forms of analysis and presenting them as statements of truth. In its place, there is a subtle difference:
any adequate model of reality must take into account the distance between the practical experience of agents (who ignore the model) and the model which enables the mechanisms it describes to function with the unknowing complicity of the agents.

(In Wacquant 1989: 34)

In other words, there is a gap between theory and practice, between the representing and the represented, and it is partly the business of research to objectify this gap. Such might point towards the highly reflective ethnography or post-modernist research. But Bourdieu is highly critical of these and never allows his deconstruction to collapse into personal solipsism or extreme linguistic relativity:

The kind of social research I advocate has little in common... with the self-fascinated, and a bit complacent, observation of the observer’s writing which has become something of a fad amongst American anthropologists (Marcus and Fisher 1986), who, having become blase with fieldwork, turn to talking about themselves rather than their object of research. This kind of falsely radical denunciation of ethnographic writings as 'poetics and politics' (Clifford and Marcus 1986), which becomes its own end and opens the door to a form of thinly-veiled nihilistic relativism... that stands as the polar opposite to a truly reflexive social science.

(In Wacquant 1989: 35)

What must be objectified is not the individual who does the research in their biographical idiosyncrasy but the position they occupy in the academic space and the biases implicated in the stance they take by virtue of being 'out of the game' (ibid.). The reflective, practitioner researcher should be understood in structural terms,
including the phenomenological, in the dialogic processes of conducting the research. It will later be necessary to show how this 'participant objectivation' can be translated into an expression of the structural position of the researcher with regard to not only the research, but the data arising from it. However, I want to conclude this section on a theory of research practice by developing the notions of habitus and field in order to adapt them for the purposes of the present research.

3.5.2.2 Habitus and Field

I previously set out two major analytic concepts: habitus and field, which I explained in 'structural terms' as respectively objectively constituted subjectivity and subjectively constituted objectivity; as structuring and structured structures. The basis of structure was explained as phenomenological differentiation. For Bourdieu, the basis of such differentiation is social, and, because he is concerned with the form of modern capitalist societies, social distinction. However, in the present context, this preoccupation with essentially the division of labour in society is not appropriate. Yet, to regard training in the same epistemological light is to see students as distinguishing and differentiating in their practice, in their life experience, on the basis of who they are and the contexts in which they find themselves; which is another way of expressing their habitus and the field(s) of training. The phenomenological logic of their training practice is differential in that students enter fields which will interact with their own individual habitus. It is similarly the structural homologies and antinomies between these two that will result in practical behaviours, which can be regarded not as totally pre-determined but practically disposed towards certain actions, reactions and the interpretations of these. For
Bourdieu, the division of labour in society constitutes the study of social classes, how they are formed and maintained. The present research is, however, concerned with the differential outcomes of training. It is the forces and forms of organisation and experience constituting such outcomes that make up the processes of training. In order to go beyond biographic determinism, I shall employ the concept of habitus, but, in this context I will limit its application to the field of knowledge formation in teacher training. The resultant analytic tool will be referred to as 'pedagogic habitus'.

Pedagogic habitus shares with habitus the same epistemological and philosophical assumptions that were set out earlier, but, in this case, will constitute a subset of the totality of habitus; in other words, those features which are pertinent and applicable to the pedagogic field: linguistic background, learning experiences, nationality, age, education, previous professional experience, etc. Pedagogic habitus is the character of practical sense that is constituted partially by previous experience and partially by the structural, generative forms of perception and thought brought into play in the presence of the living moments of becoming a teacher. These moments do not exist in isolation but are part of networks of relations and activities that make up the field(s) of training.

Bourdieu argues that individuals are not mechanically, socially pre-determined to act in a certain way in a certain situation. But, given an individual habitus and having that individual enter a field that may be spatial-temporally unique but is structured according to social differentiation, they are 'predisposed' to act in a patterned, principled way according to the homologies and affinities (and 'disaffinities') that are set up. Similarly, in training, it is not that students are predetermined to react in a certain way at various times and places on the course. But, given the field of
training in the way it is set up between schools and the university, the practice in these, and the theoretical content encountered, the outcome for specific student responses will arise according to their pedagogic habitus and the teaching concepts, ideas, etc., and their value, immanent in the structures in which they find themselves.

This research is concerned with pedagogic habitus and field and the interrelationship between the two in the context of training to teach languages. But the act of researching this process is also a relational act. In the following section I want to express how the theory of research practice set out above can be used to interpret the actual form of research practice adopted in the present context.
3.5.3 The Form of Research Practice

I earlier connected Bourdieu’s work to phenomenology. In particular, I noted the resonance between Bourdieu’s claims for the ‘scientific’ status of language and Husserl’s distinction between what is known and what can be known at any one instance, and that this was the basic differential, structural unit of perception. Moreover, there exists a similarity of approach between Bourdieu’s structuring and structured structures and Merleau-Ponty’s spoken and speaking word. The consequence of such an understanding for the present research is to see the construction of the non-critical case studies as going beyond simple ethnographic description of students in training to teach, on the basis of which comparisons might be made. The creation of the case studies and the data bank amounts to an objectification of lived moments. To objectify this objectification is to establish my own relationship, intention, avoidances and personal voice as part of the process of creating the data bank and the case studies. I have attempted to do this in the earlier sections of this chapter.

The process of framing and writing the case studies can be seen as a structuring structure, which results in offering a longitudinal view of a dynamic process in action. It is a representation of the process of training viewed over the time. Having done this, there exists an object, namely the data bank or individual case studies with which to work. These studies are now structured structures from which categories of analysis may be derived or applied. Such categories are dynamic but have been caught statically. The case studies, as structured structures, are the outcome of an arrangement of occurrences. As such, they can be operated on; the outcome of the case studies, the relationships within them, can be observed, isolated, described and compared.
This is a cross-sectional view. The following diagram seeks to illustrate this:
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Figure 3: Structure in Case Studies.

This discussion offers a meaning in this context to the notion of objectifying the objectifying subject. Such an objectification is expressed in terms of stance or view; in other words, the way of observing, and where and when, the directions of the researcher's intentional thinking; and, thus, spatial, temporal positions within the object of research.

Furthermore, there is a homomorphic relationship between the processes of training themselves and the process of carrying out the research. Thus, for example, the writing (structuring structure) of the case studies (structured structures) can be regarded as having a similar relational form to that involved in the process of training, where students lives (structuring structures) encounter the form of training (structured structure) present in the designed course and the locational characteristics of school life. Clearly, simplification is involved, and one element or category isolated in the case studies might represent numerous elements in real life, but the procedural relationships are homologous:
Train to Teach

Figure 4: Structure in Training.

For example, during the course of students’ own language learning they may have been taught by highly structural, traditional grammar-translation methods. How they feel about this, and their assessment of its effectiveness will have constituent results when they encounter the less formal methods characteristic of the training course. Moreover, such methods are differentially represented in schools and the university. The structural relations between the latter, as present in the PGCE course, interact as a structured structure encountering the structuring structures of students’ lived experience brought to life in practical dispositions immanent in what I have referred to as pedagogic habitus. The resultant knowledge formation is dependent on the ‘affective affinities’ between the two; in other words, experience is value laden which involves choice and deliberation, which is present both consciously and unconsciously and manifest in thoughts and action.

In this section I have given some indication of the logic of practice underlying the collection of research data and preliminary analysis of it. However, having constructed these non-critical case studies it was necessary, in order to explicate in a more objective form
the nature of the processes of training to teach, to proceed to a secondary analysis of their content. Yet, at the same time, I needed to remain epistemologically consistent with the theory of practice which I was developing. In the next section, I shall show how my levels of analysis were carried out. However, I shall first add a few more words concerning the theoretical rationale and background I adopted for these secondary analyses.
3.6.1.1 Secondary Analysis: Theory

I have explained that the case studies I produced should be considered as containing within them a structured account of the processes of teacher training, and that these processes can be understood as being temporally, spatially located. It is the object of research to isolate these processes; to make them explicit, objectified, generalizable according to the theory of knowledge I have set out. Individuals vary, the processes are constant. As I understand it, the theory of habitus and the concept of field implies a two-way process: the field structures habitus, which is the product of the embodiment of the 'immanent necessity' of a field, or fields; the habitus contributes to the constituting of the field as a meaningful entity, endowed with sense and meaning. Two things follow from this dual relation of conditioning and knowledge:

firstly, the relation of knowledge depends on the relation of conditioning that precedes it and fashions the structures of habitus; secondly, social science is necessarily a 'knowledge of a knowledge' and must make room for a sociologically grounded phenomenology of the primary experience of the field or, to be more precise, the invariants and variations of the relation between different types of fields and different types of habitus.

(In Wacquant: 1989: 44)

I take this latter to be the topic of this research. If habitus can be understood as the sum of individually embodied, structurally constituted practice provoking dispositions, these are actualised in practice, within a field. Field, it should be recalled, is defined as a network of configuration of objective relations: their locus and the structure of the distribution of power
within them.

In the present context, an example of field would be the concept of profession or professionalisation into teaching. It is worth taking a little time to reconsider these terms first raised in chapter 1, as they are the heart of previous research into initial teacher education. Bourdieu (In Wacquant 1989: 37 - 38) refers to the problematic nature of the term professionalisation himself; which he sees as being a 'dangerous' concept because its flavour of neutrality. Clearly, he is targeting trait theorist and the positivist/ radical 'functionalists' I referred to in chapter 1 when he warns that the professionalisation concept has become too real a concept by trying to express a mental and social category at one and the same time. In particular, one should guard against using it in a socially determined, quasi-scientific manner. This reification of a dynamic process occurs when it is not regarded historical, as constructed and representative of a particular group. Such reification risks obliterating all kinds of differences and contradictions inherent in it. The way to avoid doing this is to 'deconstruct' the construction as an object of analysis itself. When this is done, the concept is undone and analysed. I have tried to do this for my own conceptual tools of analysis; by detailing the content and derivations embodied in analytic terms. By doing this, it is hoped that such terms become more authentic instruments of analysis, because the dynamic structure of the terms themselves is revealed. This is exactly what much of the research on teacher education and teacher thinking does not do, but instead employs conceptual terms that seem to arise from either a pre-existent theory, the metaphoric nature of which is passed over in its claims to representativeness, or utilitarian notions emergent in the head of the researcher with little grounding in the problematic nature of theory or
practice, of what it is to engage in the process of teaching, still less the experience of researching into it. When Bourdieu treats the term ‘profession’, he studies how it presents itself in practice and consequently reconceptualises it as a field (In Wacquant 1989: 38). He believes that by doing so, it is possible to break with the notion as a reified object, and reintegrate it into a model of the full reality it pretends to capture. Again, I believe that this type of break is exactly what I have attempted by trying to capture some of the full reality of training, in its messiness and including contradictions, for certain individual students; and by providing an account of the epistemological bases of the methodology used in the present research, as a way, above all, of countering charges of schematism and determinism. In other words, I have attempted to avoid pre-set narratives that contain deterministic phrases and instead represented the fields of training and research as dynamic locations for knowledge formation, the character of which can be studied through structural phenomenological methods. I have done this by using Bourdieu’s theory of practice in a weakly social derivative sense and applied it to the mundane events of training to teach modern languages. The derivation is therefore social theory; the application is more broadly epistemological. Generalizability and validity arise at this epistemological level; one in which static terms are used, but these themselves are based on a dynamic theory of practice. This adaption has required modification of the methodological framework used by Bourdieu. I now want to explain what this amounted to in practice.
3.6.1.2 Habitus and Field: 3-level Analysis

To regard 'profession' as an instrument of analysis and a field, is to consider individual students in terms of their locations within objective relations and their responses to them. These responses and locations have been theoretically expressed as habitus and field. The field of training is in fact a field within fields, as it is integrated with the various objective relations of the teaching profession; for example, school, university, national associations, professional INSET organisations, etc. The focus of the present research, as embedded in the case studies, is the relationship between field and habitus: the temporal, spatial locations of training and students' responses in them in terms of their individual habitus. The processes of training are inherent in this interaction between habitus and field, but how should a study of this interaction be carried out? Bourdieu actually gives a method for the study of a field which is helpful as a starting point:

1. Analyze the position of the field vis-à-vis the field of power.
2. Map out the objective structure of relations between the positions occupied by agents who compete for the legitimate forms of specific authority of which the field is the site.
3. Analyze the habitus of agents; the system of dispositions they have acquired by internalizing a determinate type of social and economic condition. (1992a: 80 – 81)

This scheme can be seen as a layered analysis from the objective (macro) to the subjective (micro): the structure of the field within the totality of fields; the intra-field structure; and the individual subjectivities that make them up. Of course, Bourdieu sees structural
homologies between these three levels because he sees a match between objectively identified trends of activities and the individual cognitive schemes of thought as both constituted by social differentiation. As I have already argued, it is necessary to shift the basic epistemological tenets from the issues of social differentiation to the differential nature of experience during training in order to readapt it to the context of the present research. The phenomenological aspect of doing this makes differentiation not only social but human; as innate to 'practice', praxis, human action. The issue of social groups and classes is 'bracketed' so that human action can be understood as affective, personal and sensual in response to the world. Such responses are value-laden, are discerning and differentiating in a way that is not simply rational and logical but includes the affective and empathetic. Personal response, and how it values and is valued, is hence a basic human condition. Moreover, this response is constituted by concrete contexts that might be understood as having time and place. Time and place imply proximity in terms of a measure of influence within the relationship between people (agents), objects and the ideas in which they are represented. People, time and sites can be understood as differences of kind; proximity as differences of degree.

It is now possible to extend the scheme Bourdieu has given for field analysis to the methodological approach to research in the present context. To work systematically and analogously, the three levels quoted earlier can be re-expressed in terms of the field of training:
1. Analyze the position of training in the totality of education.

2. Map the objective structure of relations between the positions occupied by people who have authority within the field site.

3. Analyze the habitus of the people and the system of dispositions they have acquired.

Again, analogously, if we take the first level to be the end point to this study, we are less interested in the actual position of the field of training within the field of education than the nature of the links between the two, and, by implication, the processes of teacher training themselves as present in those links. Level 3 can be interpreted as the biographies of the students themselves and the range of their experiences and dispositions in the course of training. Level 2 needs to be re-expressed as the structured course of training; the objective relations included in this and the patterns of students’ responses. Once these modifications have been carried out, and we turn the scheme on its head in order to represent it in the chronological order the present analyses were carried out, it can be expressed as follows:

1. Analyze student biographies, experiences, events, thoughts and feelings.

2. Map positions in terms of those involved, when and where: for example, tutors, schools, timing of events.

3. Analyse the character of the processes of teacher training.
These levels can similarly be understood as integrated expressions of the macro/micro, objective/subjective levels of training, as long as this separation is not taken to be anything other than a convenient form of supplying an in-depth account of training. Ultimately, the three levels are co-terminus.

In many ways, the levels might also be understood as arenas for theorising, as activities giving rise to different forms of knowledge. They might also be taken as congruent with the multiple interrogation of research data encouraged by writers who have been influenced by post-modernist philosophies (for example, Henriques et al. 1984). As I have previously noted, such writers seek to avoid the way the search for structure becomes a self-fulfilling act; a way of perpetuating a priori structures by presenting them in an objective, scientific fashion. Instead, they want to interpret and reinterpret events from the perspective of different 'voices' in a way that is reminiscent of phenomenological dialogics. However, the scheme I have developed does make use of the concept of structure as a way of ordering events and avoids an endless dialogic recurrence of open-ended re-objectification that tends towards the hermeneutic nihilism I referred to earlier.

By offering the analysis on three levels, the terms are formally changed as a way of providing different degrees of insight into the research data. They are presented as 3 separate levels, and thus 3 separate chapters, but, of course, this is merely a methodological nicety, as what happens in them should be understood as happening simultaneously; as the events and the underlying processes constituting them.

I have already described the case studies as structured structures, as static pictures of fluid events. The
purpose of the secondary analyses was to illuminate these structures and identify the semi-permanent processes underlying them. It is probably worth making absolutely explicit that I do not believe that what I have argued for represents a pre-determined narrative; although I do think the epistemological issues to be constant, along with the practical methodological challenges they imply. Moreover, even in the course of working with the 3-level scheme for analysis, it was necessary to adapt and modify it in the light of findings, and, indeed, the character of the research and the research questions. I now want to explain exactly how the secondary analysis proceeded.
3.6.2 Secondary Analysis: Practice

As I have indicated, the five 'non-critical' case stories were constructed through an adapted form of protocol analysis. This involved constructing grids in which to tabulate comments under a number of headings (Appendix 2). In the case of the diaries, entries were also made according to the specific week of the course and the locale that was referred to. The full range of interviews, diaries, lesson observations and questionnaire replies was used in constructing these studies, and the whole set out in each student case whilst respecting the chronological sequence of the year of training.

The preliminary data analysis and the construction of the case studies took approximately eighteen months to complete after the end of the PGCE course that year. Each study represented a reflective reading of the student’s experiences and thoughts, along with my observations of them actually teaching. As I have emphasised, the principal aim in constructing these studies was to tell five 'stories'; to let the students' experiences 'speak for themselves'; to give a thorough account of what happened to them individually and what they had noted. My own comments on writing this out were added to the text in the upper case to indicate my thinking at the time of constructing the stories. Apart from this, my comments amounted to simple inference - for example, unhappy, crisis - when events indicated that this was the case.

These case studies were to represent my level 1 analysis as set out in the previous section; namely, student biographies, experiences, events thoughts and feelings. My task was then to move on to level 2: map positions in terms of those involved, when and where - tutors, schools, timing of events. In other words, to work on the
stories as objectified structured structures, and, in some ways, to begin to make general statements about the processes of training. At this stage, I was aware of having made great efforts to engage in a quasi-phenomenological way with the data; in terms of the descriptive detail given, the way I had at least partly attempted to bracket my presuppositions and the way I had rigorously stating my position and relation with it. Moreover, I had gone to great lengths to present the students' stories as clearly as possible and without my own analysis. My 250,000 words of data had been reduced to a 70,000 word data bank including questionnaires and case stories. I had not dealt with each in a systematically critical way other than to record my immediate reflections in constructing them. This is why these case studies were referred to as 'non-critical'. One of these is presented in the appendix to this thesis. It is as thorough and as brief an account of a student training as I could make it. The following is an extract from it. It will be noted that my entries often sum up a general state and her following response to it. It comes from the section on teaching practice:

There is then a half-term break. In week 7 that follows this, Janet’s spirit is flagging: 'I’m in a so-what mood. I’ll do it; get on with it; get these four weeks over without getting moved'. Classes are clearly again very demanding, and, as well as needing a lot of time to rest, she resents this: 'I don’t see why I should try hard for a class that is disruptive and reluctant to participate'; although she does feel that it would be a good idea to look up some activities in her course files. SHE SEEMS CAUGHT IN A VICIOUS CIRCLE. LESS EFFORT IN LESSON PLANNING, FINDING ACTIVITIES, ETC. SAPS HER ENERGY. ALSO MOTIVATION. VERY TIRED. By week 8, she is eagerly looking forward to the end of her teaching
practice. In week 9 she is off ill again until Friday, but is pleased when she sees that the pupils are happy to see her back. While she has been away, the department has been inspected, and subsequently received a poor report. There is a down feeling because two members of the staff must go. A MEASURE OF THE DEPARTMENT. NOT THE BEST FOR HER. I GET THE FEELING SHE CANNOT WAIT FOR THE TEACHING PRACTICE TO END. For the last week she is relaxed and her classes go well, even partying with one group. She is sad at having her last lessons with groups but pleased when the end eventually comes. THE CATHARSIS IS STRONG. RELAXED AT LAST SHE IS ABLE TO ENJOY HERSELF, AND WORK BETTER WITH GROUPS.

(Janet - Non-critical Case Study - Thesis pp. 464)

Working with the case studies meant that the form of their presentation started to evolve. Moreover, the actual activity of writing - copying the data, constructing the non-critical case study - formed part of the analytic process. Having produced five of these non-critical case studies, I became aware of the fact that there was more to say on each one of them as they stood. I had gone to great efforts to let each speak for themselves, but there were many things for me to say on each as researcher. Before going on to the level 2 analyses, therefore, I constructed five ‘critical’ case studies. In this format, each represented my own critical reading as researcher of the studies and the conclusions I could draw from each of the students. In a sense, these critical case studies still represented a level 1 analysis, as essentially they were based on individual student biographies and experiences. Yet, they were not simply accounts of these but drew some conclusions and inferences from them on the basis of my analyses as researcher-trainer. For example, I concluded in Janet’s case that one of the sources of her attitude and
motivation problems came from the fact that she did not spend a year in France, and was consequently linguistically weak. This lack of linguistic competence in the language she wanted to teach hindered her relationship with that language and thus how she might build up a pedagogic relationship with pupils in it. The following are pertinent extracts from her critical case studies:

Sociability and relationships with people were important factors for Janet.....Her reference spoke of her finding French ‘a not particularly easy subject....(in her TEFL teaching) the most valued experience for her was noted as gaining the trust and the confidence of the students....The difficulties she saw in language learning were not social or cultural but getting to terms with the ‘grammatical terminology’.... Clearly, she had gained some confidence to communicate by learning languages, but literature was also cited as something she particularly enjoyed. Indeed, without having lived in the country itself, this would be Janet’s major contact with its culture and ideas. She cites the importance of knowing the people and country but this is exactly what she had not been able to do....’Discussion back at the university. Our’s was in French - gulp - not used to speaking so much’. This lack of ability in French clearly undermines her confidence to contribute. This has a negative effect on how she is able to integrate into the group....‘I don’t know anything about French culture because I got it all through literature’...It is probably this feature that was finally decisive in Janet abandoning language teaching; for her the language had never become a real experience.
Faced with having to create that real experience for pupils, she did not have the experience to draw upon.

(Janet - Critical Case Study - Thesis pp. 189, 190, 208)

In the critical case study, I also connected this unreality of language for Janet to the formulaic way she seems to approach lessons. In the critical case studies I began to mount arguments based on my reading of them as a trainer-researcher. These sorts of critical conclusions were drawn from the non-critical case studies where entries were simply reported:

In her application, she claimed that her experience in teaching EFL students had persuaded her to go into education. She found this her most valued work experience as it had involved gaining the trust and confidence of the students...She had made progress but had found French 'a not particularly easy subject'....She raises the question of her position in the group: 'Discussion back at the university. Our's was in French - gulp - not used to speaking so much. Then a big circle for all of us - feeling much more confident to speak'. Week 4 is the first point of crisis for Janet as she is ill....'For me language teaching was detached from the real world... I could teach PE in schools but not French. It's too square: the classroom, the bell, the timetable and assessment. It's just not for me'. I wondered why she did not go for PE teaching initially: 'Both my sisters have done languages and have come out with the reasons of why and what they have gained. I see the relevance and the importance but I didn't feel my skills go in that direction.

(Janet - Non-critical Case Study - Thesis pp. 453, 457, 475)
In part, these separate levels of analysis can be understood as examples of 'phenomenological reduction', in that each one is a further objectification of the data as an objectified and objectifiable object; a dialogic, a further removal from primary data; although, more conventionally, the main bracketing and reduction occurred in the act of collecting the primary data and its primary analysis. There are then two forms of case study: the non-critical version is phenomenological to the extent that there is a reduction of student experiences in teacher training, everything else, for example, my views as a trainer are therefore bracketed out; the critical version of the case studies are a phenomenological reduction of the process of teacher training. Here, the focus is broader, and my view as a trainer is present. The second version contains less of the phenomena of teacher experience because these are only now seen in relationship to the teacher trainer and the course itself rather than exclusively looking at and recording the student experiences. Version 1 is what it is like to be a student; version 2 is a more holistic representation of the processes of teacher training, is more than just what the student experiences. This is why phenomenological reduction also implies addition in a hermeneutic sense, as interpretation adds to the phenomenon as well as taking away from it. The collection, recording and sorting of prime data was called a preliminary analysis, as it constituted a recording and representation of students' training lives. Secondary analysis, according to the 3-level scheme I have set out constitutes commentary on these lives as data. The move from non-critical to critical case studies represented the first move in this direction.

Due to limitations on space, I cannot present all five non-critical case studies along with their critical
versions. The entirety of the five critical studies is offered; and one corresponding non-critical version in Appendix 3. I have done this to establish a narrative base and a level 1 presence in the main body of the thesis, and to include the non-critical version from which it was derived in order to indicate the difference between the two and how one was derived from the other. The other case studies are in their critical form only, although each was derived in the same way as described and demonstrated for the case of Janet. I do not believe that my conclusions drawn in the critical versions should be considered as simply inferred; rather they have been formed from a rigorously explicated phenomenological relationship with the data. It is worth emphasising how the data included in the thesis represents only a tiny portion of that worked with in order to produce what is offered. Bourdieu has used this method, producing a text which he describes as 'ascetic' (cf. Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992(b): 64) in terms of data. I echo him in wanting to avoid a kind of positivistic exhibitionism in not including the enormous quantity of backing data I have drawn on for evidence in presenting my conclusions. Nevertheless, a distillation of the essential data is given as an indication of primary sources for the discussion I offer. My attempt has been to break with abstraction and de-contextualised material; to avoid dry positivism, but also to avoid self-preoccupation and subjective relativism. To do this I have chosen to present real events in training and to show how these are understandable in terms of concrete underlying processes; but to do so through recourse to literary sensitivity in my writing; to construct an academic discourse for such a combined form to find expression. I believe that the abstractions I eventually make are grounded in the mundane and the particular. In my level 3 analysis it will be necessary to say something about the macro-characteristics of the field of training; in level 2, I
want to describe that field in terms of their structural configurations, students locations in these and the consequence that these have for knowledge formation in training. In level 1, however, I am concerned to set out training as a lived experience, and indicate the individually based patterns I conclude as trainer-researcher in particular students’ lives in training. However, before proceeding with setting out my three levels of analyses in the next three chapters to this thesis, I want to conclude by again taking up the theme of theory and practice, this time in terms of the research as it was carried out.
3.7 Theory and Practice (3)

The corollary to the epigraph to this chapter is that when one observes, one does not see what one would have seen if one had not observed. In other words, when one observes, one only sees what one can see from observing. In this sense, I take observation to be that intentional relationship or 'gaze' that is raised by phenomenologists. What is objectified in this observation is necessarily a 'reduction'. It is not the totality of what might be seen, as, any preconstructed interest or intention will, in some way, determine a classification. Observation is never synchronic with experience, and the researcher cannot live another's lived experience. By being 'in' an event, the participant knows things about that the observer never can. My answer to this has been to capture as much as I can and write down everything that happens as I observe it and as students record it. There is, however, a shift in observing, not the events themselves, but the recording of these events, either from myself or the students. Observation is a particular way of seeing but so is participating. But the two are mutually exclusive: participation is 'in', observation is 'out'. There is, for example, a difference between thinking about language teaching, observing language teaching and language teaching itself. The latter is as it is a thing 'being been' to adopt Heideggerian language. However, this thing 'being been' also includes people 'being'. There is thus a diadic relationship between a teacher and teaching, a trainer and training. The introduction of someone observing produces a triadic relationship: of an observation of a teacher teaching or a trainer training. Both these diadic structures, of things happening or 'being been', and triadic structures, of the observation of these events, are situationally implicated; in other words they have place and time.
In the previous chapter, I described teaching as 'concrete practice', which was partly constituted by 'pretheoretical knowledge'; objectively articulated in 'Fundamental Educational Theory'; and generalised about in order to eventually form 'Justifying Educational Principles'. Moreover, I expressed this as a triangular relationship, both within individuals and their concrete practice, and between different individuals engaged in different fields of activities. My main point here was that such activities need to be expressed in relational and situational terms. For example, I interconnected three triangles to show the same hermeneutic links applied for student to trainer to researcher; that the concrete practice of one was the concrete practice of another from a different perspective. So observing a student teacher teaching as a trainer, or talking to the student after the lesson, is the concrete practice of training for the trainer. I have now constructed (a practical activity) five case studies on which I propose to work (another separate practical activity). The outcome of this latter is to gain fundamental data from which general statements about the processes of teacher training might be made. But this latter move, from the fundamental to the general, is again a practical activity, with its own objectification; in this case, of the process of conducting research in this way, which are based on generalizable epistemological principles. The following diagram may help to elucidate this dynamic:
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Figure 5: The Principles and Process of Objectification in Constructing Case Studies (By analogy with Vandenberg 1974).

In this diagram, 3 refers to the theoretical underpinning of the activity involved. 1 and 2 involve action or acting. For example, in the first diagram, 2 is a critical objectification of the non-critical case study. Each of the points - 1, 2 and 3 - in the two triangles refer to 'viewpoints'. The case studies I construct contain all sorts of information concerning these individuals (e.g. gender, age, etc.) that is not dealt with in my analysis. Instead, I focus on the processes of teacher training. The right hand side of the diagram
express the methodological process of objectifying that is involved in firstly constructing critical case studies and then objectifying the process of this construction.

The left hand side of the diagram is more concerned with objectified, scientific 'things': firstly, in terms of the processes of teacher training (in the upper triangle) I am exploring; and secondly, in stating the theoretical philosophy that justifies the research methodology I have employed. Points 3 are the sources of principles and frameworks for the objectification I have undertaken. These are both the static outcomes and formations for further analysis both in terms of epistemology and its relational effect on the processes of training it is being used to examine.

The arrows can be understood as points of travelling: a practical, dialectical activity between viewpoints.

It is not my intention here to become involved in the hermeneutic nihilism I criticised earlier. At the same time, I have wanted to indicate the bases to the structural phenomenological method I have used in this research. There is no need to get caught in a kind of recurring objectification. However, and as I have consistently argued, there is a need to be as epistemologically explicit as possible, and thus to make distinct various activities and their relationship to each other. I do this in order to indicate the ways in which my research theory and practice is homological with the theory and practice of professional knowledge constituent to the field of modern language teacher training.
Summary

In this chapter I have sought to make explicit what I did and why. I have described how I proceeded with planning for and collecting the empirical data and how this was recorded. Some discussion was entered into on the methodological formats used and key issues of generalizability and validity were raised. I then returned to the theory of knowledge and practice set out in my previous chapter to address the principles underlying my own approach. This approach might be called 'structural phenomenological' as it attempts to reconcile the tripartite system - analytic, critical, hermeneutic - set out in the previous chapter. The extent of this reconciliation depends on the epistemological tenets underpinning the social theory of Bourdieu. I have adapted these to a non-sociological context; namely, the initial training of modern language teachers. I have explained how non-critical case studies were constructed and how these were used for the construction of critical versions of the same; and how the move from one to the other can be interpreted in terms of the structural phenomenological method I have developed. The adaptation from social theory has required a refinement of Bourdieu's 3-level scheme for analysis of field, and moves, with increasing phenomenological reduction, through various layers away from primary data. These moves also constitute degrees of dialogic objectifications of individual student experience and biography in order to identify the configurations and characteristics of the structures of the field of training, the resulting responses in it, and the general underlying training processes. I have concluded with a further reflection on theory and practice; this time more explicitly in terms of the approach I have adopted for the present research.
The 'space' between theory and practice is enormous: so is the gap between raw data and analysis of it. It is possible to construct language, a linguistic discourse that has its own internal logic and referents that, autologically, justify the arguments raised and responses made to them. The introduction of raw data disrupts this internal logic, and there are questions of a priori knowledge, research issues, the authenticity of findings and the validity of conclusions. There is, consequently, a subtle balance to be struck between raw data with its phenomenological authenticity and what is made (and how) of it in order to achieve objectivity and generalizability. This chapter has sought to strike this balance and to make it explicit how. I recognise, however, that some readers may find my theoretical considerations an irrelevance or indulgence. Others may view my empirical content as having neo-positivist pretensions. My aim has been to avoid excesses: to be theoretically robust but also empirically relevant. This balance is highly problematic and requires constant acknowledgement of the precariousness of the position occupied.

The following three chapters follow through the three levels of analysis I have posited in the present chapter. Chapter 4 presents the five case studies of the students selected for the research. Chapter 5 and 6 uses the studies to analyze the field of training and the nature of the processes it includes. I have already made it clear how my level 1 analysis was adapted to include a greater critical element deriving from myself as researcher; a more analytic coverage of each individual student rather than a straight reporting of their lived experiences. In the course of chapters 5 and 6 it will be necessary to further develop the scheme set out here in
my 3-level approach. The developments will be explicitly stated as they arise. However, next it is necessary to consider the five student case studies in detail.
Synopsis

Chapter 4: Level 1: 5 Case Studies

Chapter 4 represents level 1 of the 3-level methodological approach adopted. Five student case studies form the core of the chapter. Brief details of how the students were chosen are supplied. A synopsis of each case study is offered together with the full version on coloured paper. Each case study speaks for itself. However, in concluding the chapter comments are made on each by way of summarising the main features they display. The status of the information so far presented is addressed in terms of the research literature on teacher education; in particular, initial modern language trainees, and the bases it provides for further analysis.
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Chapter 4

Level 1: Five Case Studies

4.1 Introduction

This chapter includes different sections by way of presenting the five case studies that form the empirical core of the thesis. The studies represent a level 1 analysis according to the framework set out in chapter 3.

As I previously noted, the original data bank of raw material collected in the course of carrying out the research was initially used to construct five case studies in which the thoughts and experiences of the students were recorded along with my preliminary reflections on these. The studies were subsequently termed ‘non-critical’ in order to indicate the absence of systematic or critical interpretation of the data. These studies were then used to provide a critical reading of each individual student experiences in the course of training. These critical readings gave rise to five ‘critical’ case studies.

The critical case studies represent a vastly reduced account of the original data; approximately one tenth of the total wordage. The sheer bulk of material has raised questions of representation. I wanted to give some indication of the difference between the critical and non-critical studies, but to include both in the thesis would be unrealistic and ultimately fatiguing for any potential reader. At the same time, it is necessary to supply enough detail of procedure and findings on which my other levels of analysis are based.
My proposed solution has been firstly to offer a synopsis of each student’s case study. Then, the five critical case studies are included in the main body of text, but separated out by being printed on coloured paper. The non-critical version of the first case study is then also supplied in the appendix. I have done the latter to demonstrate the differences between the two and to indicate how one was derived from the other. Each case study represents the particularities of individual students. I have wanted their experiences to speak for themselves and the students individual thoughts to be given voice in the main body of the text. Of course, I figure in the analysis, and I have wanted to objectify this position at each stage of carrying it out. However, I am not foregrounded, since I am researching others, not myself.

The chapter begins with a brief re-consideration of how the five students were chosen. I then present each student and offer a brief synopsis derived from the critical case studies. The full critical case studies then follow. The chapter closes with some concluding comments on the contents of the case studies.
4.2 How the Five Were Chosen

As previously stated, 26 students started the training course in the year in which the research was carried out. All of these were questionnaired and carried out diary work as part of their training.

For the purposes of teaching practice supervision, this group was divided between myself and a colleague. I therefore had 13 students with whom I formed a close supervisory role during the year. It was this group who were interviewed by me at the end of the autumn and summer terms and whose lessons were recorded.

From previous years’ experience, I had been aware of certain broad categories I had used in classifying students: mature students, native speakers, mothers returning to a career, fresh students, those changing careers, others with one or two years’ commercial experience. There were also successful and less successful students.

I selected five of these categories and chose a student who would loosely fit each one. This was done, not so much with the intent of accounting for each category in a biographic, deterministic manner, but as a way of offering a wide range of student experience by selecting different types of students.
4.3.1 The Five Case Study Students (Synopsis)

The five were chosen to correspond to the following groups: a successful student, a student with problems in training, a student changing career and a mature student mother coming back to work. In terms of the successful and problematic student, these terms were used quite loosely on the basis of my working with them in the spring term. The successful student was one who had a range of good experiences and outcomes over the course of the year, and was constantly enthusiastic about teaching; the problematic student did not fail but struggled in a number of respects and finally decided not to go into teaching.

Who they were:

Janet - 'Unsuccessful' Student
Jill  - Mature Mother
Marie - Native Speaker
Jackie - 'Successful' Student
Carol - Student Changing Career

Their names have been changed in order to protect confidentiality.

The following is a brief synopsis of each student derived mainly from their critical case studies included in this chapter. I have added a few brief biographic details in order to enhance a sense of each student as an individual.
4.3.2 Janet

Janet was 23 years old when she started the course. She had a degree (III Class Honours) in P.E. and French Combined Studies from a College of H.E. Her P.E. work was allied to an involvement in general activity pastimes. She had been a teacher in a children’s holiday centre, and had also been an officer cadet at a University Officer Training Corp. At school she had assisted physically handicapped pupils in free lessons. Before joining the course she had worked as an occupational assistant for a year at a City Hospital. She had not spent a year abroad in France, but she had experience in teaching EFL students, which she had enjoyed. In her application she wrote of the importance of Europe, 1992 and her desire to teach pupils to communicate. She also wanted to combine French with P.E. She was recommended as sociable, likeable and responsible, although it was pointed out that she had not found French a particularly easy subject.

She showed herself to be a pleasant and easy going student. She got on well with student and school colleagues during the year. However, right from the start she obviously felt rather out of place on the course; either because she did not connect with the level of discussion in group work, or because it was in French, or because she did not find the particular activity of value. Her experience on the course was characterised by disruption; for example, at key points in the autumn and spring terms she fell ill. Her absence seemed to fragment her momentum on the course, and each time she states how it was difficult to settle back in afterwards. She also commented that she was unsure if she made herself ill as a way of avoiding a particular experience, or whether she really was ill. She questioned the communicative approach used in the training programme at the University and had
some good insights about balance and appropriateness of various methods. However, her spring term teaching practice was not successful. The school in which she was placed was not particularly easy, although it had worked successfully with other students in previous years. This year the department was unsettled: a situation not helped when it was inspected and heavily criticised. The staffroom too was rather dispiriting generally, and conversations were recorded between Janet and certain teachers who commented on the hopelessness of trying ‘progressive’ methods with their pupils. Very early on she concluded that she did not like language teaching as it was ‘unreal’. The lessons that were observed were competent but regimented; an application of the given method in a routine way. Still, she liked and got on well with the pupils. She enjoyed her P.E. lessons and, later in the TP, scored a success with the ‘vocats’: low ability and poorly disciplined pupils, who had been removed from normal lessons and had their own set of vocationally related activities prior to leaving and gaining employment. Planning and preparation was exhausting, and Janet was frequently at a loss for ideas. She felt disaffected on a day back at the University, because, although many fellow students were having difficulties, they wanted to share and discuss them. Because Janet was not enjoying the experience, she felt that she could not join in. She also resented the time spent by her fellow student flatmates in talking about teaching, pupils and lesson plans. Once her position became evident, the course did not offer her very much more: assignments were done to a minimum standard, and she did not get much out of her final term’s experience in a VI Form college. In final interview, she had good insights into both language teaching and why it was not for her. She contrasted herself with a friend, who had spent a year in the foreign country, was enthusiastic about it and still maintained numerous contacts there.
This enthusiasm was a motivation to passing it on to others. Janet did not have it, said language teaching was unreal and decided not to apply for a teaching post. After gaining her PGCE she sought and obtained a job as an assistant in a geriatric hospital in Wales. She was my 'problem' student. I have presented her first, as, with many 'problem cases', her experiences reveal sources of difficulty and hence significant pedagogic structure in a way that a more 'rounded' student's successes do not.

4.3.3 Jill

Jill applied late in the summer of 1990 for a place on the PGCE course. She was 37 years old at the beginning of the course and was married with four children. She had a BA (2.2) in French from a University, and, apart from her assistantship in Paris, had sporadic employment of a few months in EFL and as a freelance translator/interpreter in local government. She worked mostly on her own at home. She described her reasons for wanting to teach as a mixture of altruism and self-interest; in other words, the need for a career that would fit in with her family commitments. On her interview form I commented that she was 'cool and sophisticated', and one who had knowledge and experience of the ups and downs of working with children. She was recommended as being co-operative, willing, trustworthy and responsible, and had experience in supervising children and pupils from local schools and FE colleges.

The striking feature of Jill's first term at the University was her relishing being back in an academic environment. She was always ready and enthusiastic to join in discussions about language teaching. She immediately set up the dichotomy between the communicative approach and more traditional methods, and this became a key dialogue for her throughout the year.
She repeatedly stated that she had always felt that learners should be made to listen and speak as much target language as possible, but she also felt that they must be taught how the language works. Besides joining in, 'critically', with group discussions, Jill was extremely critical of the lessons she observed during the autumn term; she felt behaviour was often poor and methods rather idealistic. Yet her own lessons, both in microteaching and in her school, were uninspiring. She was rather cool and detached at the front of the class and blamed pupils, schools, materials for the inadequacies of lessons. Clearly, there was some frustration in this. She said that she was really a 'doer' rather than someone who makes things happen. She was placed in a rather traditional school for her spring TP. She did not settle in well, and found the department both gossipy and methodologically archaic. Her lessons were again not impressive: she often appeared rather isolated at the front of the class and there was much noise and misbehaviour. She enjoyed producing her own materials, but these were not always used to good effect and classroom dialogue was full of pedagogic tensions. In one particular incident, my intervention had resulted in her being upset, although she seemed to exaggerate my criticism. She frequently noted the contradiction between what I was supposedly advocating and what the school were doing. She accepted the school got good results but became increasingly critical of their traditional methods as well. Back at the University in the summer term she continued to be involved and applied herself well to assignments, and VI Form experience. She also continued her dialogue on teaching methods restating her original position; that learners should speak and listen as much as possible, but also learn the structures. She passed the PGCE and went on to obtain a teaching post locally to her home. She was chosen as a 'mature mum'.
4.3.4 Marie

Marie applied in good time and was interviewed and offered a place on the PGCE course late in the autumn of 1989. She was 24 years old at the beginning of the course and was single. She was a French national with a Licence in English from the Université-Paris-Nord. She had graduated in 1988 had spent the rest of the time living and working in England, first as an exchange student and then as an assistant in secondary schools. At the time of interview she was undertaking MA research. She claimed on her interview form that her time as a foreign language assistant had confirmed her choice of career; she wanted to pass on her love and feeling for the French language and culture, and she had enjoyed planning lessons and making materials for pupils. In interview, she seemed extremely thoughtful in her replies. She was recommended as willing to take advice, although she might have initial difficulties with less academic pupils.

Marie was a serious, thoughtful and conscientious student in the autumn term. She did not contribute very much to whole group sessions at the University, but in small groups she worked well. She did, however, form a solid relationship with another French national, and there was occasionally an aspect of them seeming apart; speaking French concerning their own interests and concerns. Her autumn term diary, however, was full of points, reflections and questions. She was placed in a rather traditional private girls school during this term, and she clearly found the experiences there rather confusing, especially as their methods relied on a high degree of grammar learning and vocabulary memorisation. She was happy not to be in such a school for her main teaching practice, as she felt the pupils had lost their child-like spirit. Still, she had some success there, and got the pupils speaking good French. She continually noted
things for herself to remember, insights into methodology and anticipations for her main TP. This took place in an average comprehensive school. The main feature of her TP was the way her diary became almost too reflective. She constantly made notes to herself, but these were mainly self-critical. She was continually negative about her own teaching skill, and was frustrated that she was not able to do more. She also did not seem to know how to behave in the school, and integration only came slowly. In short, she seemed a little overwhelmed. The lessons of hers that were observed were a mixture: initially, they were very good, with a high level of French language. Activities were well planned and executed. She seemed 'herself' in the classroom, and referred to herself as Marie with pupils. Diary entries commented on the exhaustion she experienced in planning lessons; she also felt that planning with the activities made lessons too 'bitty', and she found it difficult to choose what to do. The last lesson observed was lacklustre and aimless. Verbally, she reported that she was becoming 'like all the rest': the department who spoke English all the time and stuck to the textbook. Throughout the entire year Marie seemed to take an intellectual attitude to all her work and experiences; she described this as maintaining distance and thus control. Finally, she criticised the teacher training programme, suggested another, more student centred approach, and said she enjoyed 'destroying' the communicative approach. This academic reserve was perhaps characteristic of her French training. Still, in practical group sessions and in certain lessons, Marie showed herself able to be humorous and imaginative. Her course assignments were good. She passed the PGCE well and obtained her first teaching post in a school locally. She was chosen as a native speaker.
Jackie was 25 when she started the course. She had a combined (2.2) degree in French and Media Studies, but had spent the previous three years working as an administrative assistant and projects officer for British Gas. This had involved staff support, customer account management and developing training resources. Despite this, she claimed that every initiative she had taken had consolidated an early desire to teach. She felt her experience with British Gas were valuable and applicable to teaching, and she had also done some EFL and private work. Her application was full of management language; thus, she wrote of her ability to communicate enthusiastically, to learn and adapt quickly, evaluate circumstances and individual training requirements, to manage change assertively, to work within a budget and make efficient use of resources. She felt that teaching needed ‘confident managers’ with ‘strong interpersonal skills’. She was recommended as a lively extrovert with a strong sense of responsibility.

It was for her sheer enthusiasm and positive application that she distinguished herself on the course. She was never less than totally committed to the idea of teaching; every experience was looked at for its learning insight, even when problematic, and she never questioned the good intentions of those she came across. To say that she loved teaching would not be an overstatement, as it is something that she noted repeatedly. Her autumn term diary was a very comprehensive account of the course with precis, lists and annotations. The diary itself was presented creatively with gold highlights, cartoons and numerous humorous asides. She was constantly checking herself, making notes of things to remember and commenting on observations and experiences. In school, she was critical but not overly so and applied the
principles discussed at the university. She also did a
lot of teaching herself which she found exhausting, but
it gave her lots of ideas for future practice. She
created a dialogue for herself between her thoughts and
experiences. This seemed to provide the basis for her
teaching. At the university she was totally enthusiastic
and positive about what was organised. She had only minor
criticisms of the content of the course, but was rather
more critical of the attitude of some of her fellow
students who she found occasionally dogmatic and
inflexible.

Her TP spring school was exactly the one in which she had
always wanted to teach. She was as enthusiastic in
teaching practice as she was in the introductory term.
Her diary comments burst with comments about how much she
was enjoying the experience. She was self-critical and
made notes concerning what she should do next time. There
were problems, and particularly with one third year group
she struggled to maintain discipline. Even here, however,
the impression she gave from her diary was that the
problem was helped by her taking on extra-curricular
activities to meet the pupils in an environment that was
less academically demanding. The lessons observed were
well structured and she spent a good deal of time
preparing. The lessons were fairly standard, but she
quickly noted how the character of activities could be
employed as a means of class control. She was eventually
most complimentary about her own lessons. Criticism was
almost brushed aside, and sometimes, there was the
feeling that problems were dealt with by sheer force of
willpower. She had a crisis at one point through
exhaustion and the effort of maintaining order with one
group, but she soon bounced back and referred to herself
as an 'old trouper'. Too good to be true? Certainly, from
her own comments, some around her found her rather hard
to take. However, the school were clearly impressed by
her and she was offered a full time post there for the following year. She was delighted and looked forward with relish to the prospect of teaching in her ideal school. Back at the university in the summer term, even she noticed that she has gone off the boil, but she again criticised some of her fellow students for their rather apathetic attitude. Her assignments were good and she enjoyed the VI Form teaching experience. In final conversation she showed some insight into teaching language and the processes of training. She was mostly satisfied and happy; in particular, she made some interesting comments on my role as course tutor, noting how I had allowed the students to question more in the summer term. She found this 'brave'. Mostly, however, she was pleased to be teaching and looking forward to her first year with relish. She was my successful student.

4.3.6 Carol

Carol was probably the most atypical of the whole group of students. She was just over 34 years old when she joined the course having originally taken a 2.2 in Modern Language at a University. After completing her degree, she launched herself in industry. She had obviously built up experience and expertise as a sales representative, press/public relations officer and training manager in the cosmetic industry. She was on a top executive salary and had, in her words, ‘made it’. Yet on her application form she spoke of being increasingly dissatisfied with the value and purpose of her profession. In short, she wanted a change. She said she was at home in an instructional situation and wanted now to work in schools. As interviewer I found this to be incredulous, and pressed her on the ‘real’ reason for wanting to join the course, but she insisted that what she had said had been the truth. A personal joke between us had been at what stage I would be able to say ‘I told you so’ as she
withdrew from the course. I have not yet been able to say it, as she continues to teach. She was recommended for her energy, initiative and sociability, although her linguistic skills were extremely rusty. She had applied very late for the course, but, as there was a place vacant, was accepted on the basis of interview and recommendation.

The aspect that characterised Carol most was her meticulousness. Everything was done thoroughly and exhaustively. She quickly socialised into being a student: the designer make-up and clothes were replaced by jeans and pullovers, and she showed herself to be sociable, enthusiastic and conscientious. In group discussions at the university she immediately engaged herself in the debate between traditional approaches to teaching languages and the communicative trends. Obviously, grammar had worked for her, so she was unable to shake off the idea that the 'basics' had to be learnt. Her autumn term diary was full and detailed. She wrote in small, tidy handwriting, cataloguing first what had occurred and then the points and principles to be extrapolated from the content of the experience. For example, she managed to complete twenty pages in her diary on the second week of the course alone. Her initial visits to her autumn term school showed her offering a principle-based critique of what she observed. She constantly found the new direction in language teaching wanting in imagination, spontaneity and indeed explicit teaching of the mechanics. When she eventually did teach, she struck an ironic pose, attempted a pattern practice lesson, but found the pupils lacking in the necessary analytic skills. She really felt the communicative trends were not demanding enough for pupils, and she noted a sense of guilt in discussing grammar in lessons.
Despite this Carol would not have described herself as ‘anti’ the communicative approach, and there was much that she approved of in terms of personalising the language and the transactional emphasis, but she was concerned that one method was not applicable to all groups, that German needed grammar, and, if writing skills were thought important, then a degree of greater accuracy was called for.

Carol approached her spring term teaching practice with the same sense of detail and meticulousness. Her lessons were beautifully prepared, and she claimed to spend up to six hours each night making materials. These were produced to a very high quality; she had many authentic materials, multi-coloured OHP foils and numerous worksheets. That being said, the lessons observed were disappointing. She seemed to shy away from engaging with the pupils. Her attitude towards them was sardonic and there were frequent attempts to be rather too familiar. Good behaviour and work was bought with treats, the promise of games and flattery. Projects were used with difficult classes. This allowed for free, unstructured lessons where the pupils set their own pace. Throughout this, she continued to keep meticulous notes in her diary. These became class and pupil centred, and it was clear from these that Carol was rather disappointed by the degree to which she had to be authoritarian with groups. She was ill on occasion, and the impression was sometimes that it was all too much for her. The regime of work and preparation must have been exhausting. Contrary to her initial thoughts, teaching proved to be quite different from training. It was the discipline side that was crucially different. She maintained a certain scepticism for the communicative approach, and made notes continuously as to where more didactic methods should be used. Finally, she succeeded, however, and was offered a place at her teaching practice school for the following
Carol continued her meticulous approach to the end of the course, as she did denying her antipathy with the methodological techniques of communicative language teaching. She insisted, however, that she was generally sympathetic; she renamed it the 'use it' method, which she extrapolated from the fact that personal experiences in Italy had meant that her Italian was better than her French.

When asked again about her change of career, Carol described a bleak picture of her previous job: there was a nice house but you are never there, weekends are spent recovering, competition in industry is destructive. In this respects, she did not regret her change of career. She was included in my case studies on the basis of someone who was changing her career after having established a previous one.
4.4.1 The Critical Case Studies

The critical case studies are offered here on coloured paper in order to give presence to empirical data in the main body of the text. I have provided a synopsis in order to give a brief overview for those not wanting an in-depth reading.

The critical case studies are more narrative in character than the non-critical case studies, which simply report in a descriptive fashion what was said, written and occurred. This difference should become evident from a comparison of the critical and non-critical versions of Janet's case study; the latter of which can be found in Appendix 3. Empirical details in each critical study are treated in a more holistic, longitudinal, comparative way. Details from lesson observations are also integrated with the data collected from the students. The result is intended to be a representation of the students' thoughts and experiences during the course; not so much in their own words and from their viewpoint, as seen from the 'outside' position of me as researcher/course tutor.

Students respond differentially in training. I have responded to these differences in terms of individual students. Each case study therefore highlights particular aspects of that student. Nevertheless, there are certainly commonalities of theme; for example, the students' relationship to language, the 'communicative approach', to their own prior experiences of learning and teaching, to grammar, the influence of the school and other teachers, the relationship between theory and practice, how they used materials, how they viewed pupils, their thoughts on the training course.
I present a picture of each individual student as I saw them in relation to these themes on reading their non-critical case studies. Consequently, each case study has a different emphasis and internal structure which reflects the relative importance of each particular aspect for any one individual. In Marie’s case study there is an emphasis on insights into her thinking about language and about her changing relationship to the communicative approach, reflecting the detailed introspections in her diary and interviews, and her anxiety about being observed working in the classroom. Carol’s case study, on the other hand, includes relatively little about her relationship to language itself but does reveal much about her struggle to re-apply her existing, well-formed theories of learning in this new situation of language teaching and about the importance she gave to materials. Jill’s case study is all about her views on theory and practice, the influence of others, the communicative approach, pupils and me as tutor. Janet’s case study also highlights her relationship to language, on what this was based and the consequences for her attitude to communicative language teaching and her relationship with pupils and colleagues. Jackie’s case study shows the strength of her personality, her relationship to the practical and how little influence came from outside, including the course and pupils. Indeed, the differential influence of past experiences, schools and family pervades all five studies.

Because the critical case studies were derived from a critical reading of the ‘non-critical’ version, there is a question of style, tense, etc. Generally, I have used both present and past tense: the present referring to a direct reading to something existent in the data, or as a way of placing myself back in-the-moment in order to
relive the events and present them as realistically as possible; the past tense, as a means of adopting a more interpretive mode, to comment and reflect on the content of experiences and thoughts expressed by each individual student during training.
4.4.2 Janet

**Introduction - Beginning the course**

Janet started the course with a positive profile for going into teaching. Her reference spoke of her as being sociable and likeable, and she had dealt with others with tact and politeness in her work experience. She was active: her degree course was joint with Physical Education, and she had also been involved as an officer cadet at Liverpool University training corp. Sociability and relationships with people were important factors for Janet, and she extended this to her leisure and professional activities. At school she had assisted physically handicapped pupils in her free periods, and after leaving college but before teacher training she had worked as an occupational assistant in a local hospital.

One deciding factor for Janet in choosing teaching as a career was her experience in TEFL. She had enjoyed this, and eventually took a TEFL diploma as a correspondence course. Here also, however, what she had valued most about the experience was 'gaining the trust and confidence of the students'. The main disadvantage she had was her competence in French. As her degree course was joint honours, she had not spent a year abroad, and her reference spoke of her finding French 'a not particularly easy subject' and of her being of 'average' academic ability. In fact, she had a third class honours degree.

Janet's answers to the first, pre-course questionnaire were short and unelaborated, indicating, perhaps, someone with undeveloped ideas about language, teaching and becoming a teacher. She noted the need to use the language functionally, insisting that someone learning a language should use it and get to know the country and culture as soon as possible. The difficulties she saw in language learning were not social or cultural but getting to terms with the 'grammatical terminology'. Janet's limited success linguistically suggests that she had not yet mastered this. Clearly, she had gained some
confidence to communicate by learning languages, but literature was also cited as something she particularly enjoyed. Indeed, without having lived in the country itself, this would be Janet's major contact with its culture and ideas. She cites the importance of knowing the people and country but this is exactly what she had not been able to do.

My own notes on Janet refer to her as being well meaning, if appearing distracted and preoccupied; sociable yet rather diffident and withdrawn. Despite starting the course with positive intentions and some commitment to teaching, her diary notes give a picture of someone who was somewhat swamped by aspects of the course from the word go. Her very first comment demonstrates this:

Try to get to grips with everything, who are all these people? Why are they here? Are they all in the same boat as me?...Easy to feel swamped. Felt overwhelmed yesterday with the move, new people, etc.

Very quickly it is clear that Janet felt out of her depth in some of the group situations:

Discussion back at the university. Our's was in French - gulp - not used to speaking it so much.

Her lack of ability in French clearly undermines her confidence to contribute. This has a negative effect on how she was able to integrate into the group. In week 4 this is compounded when she is ill; she manages to attend but describes herself as 'sitting back and listening, not feeling like participating and questioning'. The following week she does not understand the work of the group, which further adds to her feeling of being marginalised:

Our group's lesson plans not clear to me. Don't really get much out of group discussions - no clear points emerge. Good working group but I had switched off.
During this first half of the autumn term she does open a dialogue on communicative language teaching:

Need to communicate to use the language. Need to communicate. When young, acquisition - grammar comes later. Teach words, phrases, then later teach why, tools for communication. Traditional method was stereotypical...CA may not be compatible with teacher and pupil.

However, this sympathy with a communicative approach is not reinforced by practical experience. In visiting school she is 'shocked' at the low level of the pupils and the sloppiness of lessons. Her comments here, indicate the sort of priorities she had picked up from sessions at the university. Thus, there is too much English and settings are not set. Janet's later lessons were particularly strong in the opposite direction. This depressing picture in terms of methodology contrasts with what Janet sees as good teacher/pupil relationships, suggesting that the two aspects of teaching are clearly represented as being separate at this point; one can exist without the other. If relationships are seen as the most fruitful aspect of teaching, and these can develop irrespective of methodology, it is not surprising that methodological matters become unreal when they do not connect with the individually valued features of teaching. There are positive experiences in her autumn visits, but, generally, the picture is depressing for her.

Her commitment to writing the diary itself falls away, and it is reduced to oblique statements concerning such topics as HMLSDP (Hampshire Modern Languages Skills Development Project), 'not overwhelmed by it', and target language, 'fine if children understand it'. By this stage Janet seems to be seriously disaffected from various aspects of the course. Her school gives her a positive view of working with pupils but not lessons. Moreover, she only teaches unaccompanied in the last week of the term. A positive response here is undermined by the fact that it is pointed out to her that she teaches an incorrect French gender. At the university she feels out of her depth and hence somewhat isolated. Feeling low about all this is
compounded by her illness. She also comments on how her involvement in outdoor pursuits had left her exhausted and unable to teach.

This sense of detachment from the course is also evident in her end of term comments. When asked about which aspects she found most useful, Janet replies:

Nothing has been extremely useful. A mixture of everything I suppose.

This suggests that Janet has not really responded very much to her experience of the course content, although she does take away various impressions. She again accents the social aspect of teaching:

I want to spend time helping every pupil but the system doesn't allow for this.

Her work in the university had been the reverse. Still, before starting teaching practice, Janet did have some fairly developed views on language teaching:

(The communicative approach) It's not perfect and it's not brilliant but it's on the right track. The way I learnt it, it was a nice balance of both which worked well for teacher and pupil. So that is what I am going to do eventually - a bit of the traditional side, give them the reason behind the language.

In this sense, even without positive reinforcement from university based group work and school experience, Janet has an image of language teaching to work from. This was based on her own learning experience and her involvement with TEFL:

I geared it around communication but I do see the importance of going back, once you've got the grips of it, and saying this is how you build on it, otherwise they just get a phrase and they can't build it into anything.
Teaching Practice

Janet was placed in an inner city school for her teaching practice term. It was not known as an easy school; there was a large proportion of 'difficult' students. The department itself was unsettled, with an acting head in a caretaker role, and a staff used to following their own approaches to teaching which tended to be traditional; mostly to take account of the disciplinary problems of some classes. At one point, the department is inspected and heavily criticised. All of these factors had a negative influence on Janet. During her first week's observation she notes, 'not much evidence of the communicative approach', and wonders consequently how to approach her teaching: 'do I carry on simulating their style or do it my way/will this disrupt the learning of the pupils?'. In her second week she starts teaching and finds it 'hard, challenging and... rather draining'. At this stage she feels she is getting the balance about right, although the pupils are wary of her new methods. She also reports herself and her department to be disorganised. At this time her first lesson is observed:

Lesson Structure (70 mins., Year 10, French)

1. Oral Work - Flashcards
2. Pair Work - Brochure
3. Homework - Write-up

The lesson started with the roll being called; Janet in French, the pupils in English. Without further ado, Janet launched into the lesson requesting and getting the date in French. She then started the lesson proper with a group of flashcards of various parts of the town:

T: Aujourd'hui, nous sommes à Southampton
(With Flashcards)
Où sommes-nous?
P: L'information
This continued with various parts of the town, with Janet eventually questioning about what there was to see in Southampton:

T: Est-ce qu’il y a un musée  
P: Tudor House  
T: Est-ce qu’il y a un jardin  
P: En centre ville

Some answers were not so detailed. A question asking if there was a station might be answered by a simple ‘oui’. Others might elicit ‘oui, est-ce qu’il y a un musée’. This exercise was followed up with Janet giving out brochures on Southampton in French. An explanation in French was given that told pupils that they had been given £50 for the day; they had to write down what they wanted to do:


With reference to the brochure on Southampton, Janet continued with points concerning places:

T: (Ocean Village) Qu’est-ce qu’il y a à faire?  
P: Le cinéma, les magasins...  

At this point Janet was some forty minutes into the lesson. She had some success in relating the materials to the pupils and, indeed, eliciting answers based on the personal knowledge of pupils. There were ‘translation into English’ techniques being used to check understanding but the lesson had a dialogue flow. Eventually, she went into English, partly as a result of pupils fatigue to set up the following activity:
T: Voilà les hôtels mais j'ai seulement £50
Maintenant écoutez, décrivez votre journal. Qu'est-ce que c'est en Anglais?
P:...........
T: Right I want you to describe your day in Southampton the way I just have. Don’t forget you only have £50 O.K. Voilà les dépliants. Décrivez votre journal.

It is perhaps not surprising that pupils became fatigued. The language in this last sequence is being used organisationally, managerially and demonstratively. The check in English sets the next activity going with pupils working on the brochures. The activity goes well for five minutes but increasingly pupils disconnected from the task and began to chat generally in English. Basically, despite Janet troubleshooting, there is not enough support in the last thirty minutes of the lesson for the pupils to remain on task. Moreover, despite the initial presentation input, pupils had not had extensive practice in written or oral French on the language they were to produce. Hence there were many syntactic variations. Basically, however, there were many positive elements in this lesson. Janet had clearly picked up a lesson structure that was based on oral presentation and written production. She had also provided a context that related to pupils - in this case, Southampton - and used some real-life materials. Her use of target language was insistent, and she had managed to engage in dialogue with some pupils. Even so, persistence had led to pupils becoming fatigued. The main weakness was in the move from oral presentation to written production. Here, pupils did not have enough familiarity with the language to complete the task accurately. The context was also too open ended, with no real specific aim or goal; for example, information that would allow pupils to know when they had completed the task, and a personal context for them to relate to and connect with their fellow pupils. But the lesson was based very much on the model used at the university: oral presentation, questioning, written consolidation, authenticity, attempts at personalisation. Commenting after the Janet confessed that she had planned it well because I was coming. She was clearly not happy with the group, who, she thought, were disruptive
and had been negatively influenced by their previous teacher. However, at this stage Janet claimed to be working from an ongoing model of language teaching:

We are aware that the communicative approach represents an ideal towards something we may not teach...it's a question of sorting out where we are at and then working towards it. I hope I can do this in future.

If this is the ideal situation Janet would like to be working from, other entries in her diary suggest growing disaffection with teaching. In week 3 she is ill and off school but comments:

'can't decide if I have made myself or really am ill'. She notes that she is not enjoying teaching and it is difficult for her.

By now it is clear that Janet is becoming increasingly dispirited and disaffected. A day back in the university only seems to highlight her isolation; she finds it difficult to talk about her experiences as she is not enjoying herself. The presence of other students who are discussing their problems only seems to make Janet feel more detached from the training experience. It is as if there is no-where to turn to; school, university, fellow students. The following week she is reluctant to go into school, but does so, and has some success; she feels her lesson planning is coming together and she is able to be stricter with some pupils; it is possible to have fun with her year 8 classes. Yet the pressure of her thoughts about teaching and the lack of opportunity to express them causes her to break down in tears with the Head of Department, with whom she is able to share her feelings and increasing doubts about teaching. The most significant event coming out from this is that she starts going to classes of pupils with special needs and helping with the 'vocats', a group of students that have been removed from mainstream lessons and following an alternative, pre-vocational curriculum. This is a significant move, as, increasingly she sees positive experience in teaching as working with these groups and her physical education classes. Even so, things seem to go better with her classes; she gets clearer strategies for
discipline and some lessons go well. At this stage a second lesson was observed:

**Lesson Structure** (50 mins., Year 8, French)
1. Oral Work - Flashcards
2. Pair Work
3. Sondage
4. Tape - oral questions

This lesson commenced in a similar way to the previous one, with Janet calling the roll, then asking for and eliciting the date in French and setting the context: 'Nous sommes dans la chambre'. Flashcards were presented orally eliciting pupil responses. Clearly, this was revision:

T: Qu'est-ce que c'est
P: Une table
.....etc.
T: Où se trouve la chaise?
P: La chaise est sous la table
T: Où se trouve l'armoire?
P: L'armoire de sur le lit
T: L'armoire est sur le lit, oui

The grammatical accuracy of the first part of this sequence is only achieved by an occasional pupil. Others are corrected in the way indicated in the latter part. This revision start is followed by a taped exercise. This exercise is based on a tape describing where various objects are to be found in the bedroom. Pupils had prepared the exercise for homework and had various examples written in their books. After fixing a picture of a bed to the board and playing the tape with the descriptions, the classroom sequence went as follows:

T: (To pupil) Viens ici
Qu'est-ce que c'est? (With Flashcard)
P: Une chemise (Sticks Flashcard on the board)
T: Ecris où se trouve le lit
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Other examples then followed involving various items. This was a straight dialogue with very little managerial or organisational language. When a number of items were written on the board, Janet went through and asked one pupil to read them out. Interestingly, even though the verbs were written in, the pupil missed them out, seeming to focus on the semantic information of item and location. It is also interesting that Janet, presumably following the printed exercise in the book, used 'se trouve' whilst the pupils were required to reply with 'être'.

After checking the score of correct answers, Janet attempted to personalise the topic:

T: Est-ce qu’il y a une armoire dans ta chambre?
P: ....
T: Repeats
P:......
T: Oui ou non
P: Oui
T: Il y a une armoire dans ma chambre
P: Il y a une armoire dans ma chambre.

This is a good example of Janet using 3-stage questioning techniques to create a dialogue with a pupil without recourse to English. 'Oui, il y a' and 'non, il n’y a pas de' was then written on the board, and Janet used it to ask every pupil if they had these items in their room; the answer being invariably affirmative. After getting pupils to write various object items in their books, Janet set up the following pair/group work activity:

T: O.K. maintenant, avec un partenaire, demandez si il ou elle a une chaise, etc. dans la chambre (Demonstrating with ticks and crosses)

Pupils do this in pairs and then in groups of four. Finally, Janet asks individual groups; for example:
T: Quelle est le plus populaire?
P: L’armoire et le lit

This is also done as a whole group activity with numbers calculated from the group:

T: O.K. levez la main si le meuble est le plus populaire après le lit est l’armoire (etc.)

This section gives Janet the opportunity to use quite a lot of French and to elicit individual responses from the pupils.
The final sequence of the lesson is based on a tape of someone describing her room in terms of animals in it, and followed by questions from Janet about what is in the room:

T: Est-ce qu’il y a des souris?
P: Oui

The structure of this lesson is rather classic; indeed it contains various classic activities; flashcard presentation, group work, sondage. This along with a high use of target language enable Janet to present a highly formulaic lesson. Language and exercise certainly do connect, but it is not likely that Janet is engaging with this structure, and, having partly mastered it, is ready to problematise and extend it. Indeed, in one sense it is acquiescence to a given model, rather than a critical application of it. This comes out of her diary notes and her after lesson comments. These indicates the dilemma in which she finds herself:

I enjoy the teaching, it’s all the rest I can’t stand.

However, this is only partly true; she likes the pupils but not language teaching:

The problem with language teaching is that it is all about preparing materials and giving to the pupils without getting anything back.
Besides this neither her home nor school environment are comfort to her:

(At school) the atmosphere in the staff room is really weird, even the head of department says he hates the politics and just gets satisfaction from the kids.

(At home) a group of us came back to the house (after the day at university) for coffee and it was more of the same thing. It’s just a bit off if you’re not having such a marvellous time. It’s not that I’m having problems with the kids, I just don’t want to be talking about it all the time. At the moment it’s 7.30 in the morning until 9.30 at night.

At approximately the half-way point of the term, Janet has had her crisis and clearly has great reservations about teaching languages at least. Still, she is starting to relax and enjoying her work with the ‘vocats’ and PE groups. Despite not liking the course books, some of her language classes go well and she comments that one day was ‘enjoyable’ as (she was) able to channel excitement of the children into the activities prepared. Two significant events then happen. Firstly, her uncle dies which results in her taking time off school to attend the funeral. Secondly, there is half term. The combined effect of these two seem to remove the beginnings of a more positive feeling about teaching. Following half term she comments on her attitude to the rest of her teaching practice and pupils:

I’m in a so-what mood. I’ll do it; get on with it; get these four weeks over without getting moved....I don’t see why I should try hard for a class that is disruptive and reluctant to participate.

Notes in her diary again dwindle out, with only the most sketchy references being made. There is some evidence that she does not put a great deal of effort into lesson planning, which means that a vicious circle is created; poorly planned lessons result in poor lessons which result in deterioration of attitude which results in less
effort being put into lesson plans. A final lesson is observed in week 9 of her teaching practice; after she has again been off through illness and is eagerly awaiting the end:

**Lesson Structure** (50 mins, Year 8, French)
1. Oral Work – Flashcards
2. Pair Work 1
3. Pair Work 2
4. Tape exercise
5. Tape Follow-up
6. Homework

The lesson then loosely repeats the formula used in previous observations. Thus, oral work based on visuals, pair work, tape exercise, written consolidation. This again suggests that Janet has internalised this formula. There is the question of to what extent she uses it all the time, and to what extent it is a 'demonstration lesson' for the purposes of being observed. There is very little change in the formula throughout the term, suggesting a non-critical relationship with it. Despite all her comments on the time-consuming nature of lesson planning, the unreality of materials and her disorganisation, none of these are particularly evident from the three lessons she chooses to teach for observation purposes.

The lesson again starts with her applying her formula for beginning the lesson: roll, date, and setting the context. The structure follows the plan given to students and the one Janet has used before. For this lesson the context is food in the fridge, although beyond this there is no relation to the pupils or a story line that might create a purpose for the topic. In fact, the lesson is really a series of vocabulary exercises:

T: Bon encore nous sommes dans mon frigo

The absurdity of the literal meaning of this sentence is missed by Janet and the pupils. Having stated the context she gets pupils to come to the front of the class and choose from a series of flashcards
depicting foods and drinks:

T: Choisis quelque chose
Qu'est-ce qu'il y a ?
Qu'est-ce que c'est ?
P: Du lait

This activity was clearly a revision of vocabulary, as pupils gave the various items quite successfully in French. Janet then moved on to an oral consolidation exercise which she attempted to set up in French. When this is not successful, she reverts to English:

T: Maintenant, tombez sur la page 110
You're working with a partner. One of you chooses the fridge and the other one guesses which one it is.....Well, for example, you have to ask 'est-ce qu'il y a de la biere dans ton frigo' and your partner says either yes or no there isn't.

From this extract it is possible to see how the language to set up the activity does not arise from the classroom discourse. It is as if it is operating on two levels: simple questioning sequences can be dealt with as essentially they are semantically simple. However, when organisational moves are required from pupils, Janet must explain explicitly in English. This raises the question of what devices, both structurally and metalinguistically, are used by experienced teachers and not yet part of the novice teachers repertoire. For example, rehearsal techniques.

The next activity is set up in French, and Janet again requires pupils to talk to each other; this time moving around the class and finding a partner with an identical cue-card:

T: Maintenant je vais vous donner une feuille de papier avec 3 choses dans le frigo. Alors maintenant écoutez. Il faut trouver votre partenaire parce qu'il y a deux feuilles comme ça.
Different features make the setting up of this pair activity more successful: firstly, Janet is able to physically use two pupils as an aid to gesture in conveying her sense; secondly, she has the cue-cards, and represented on the OHP, so that pupils have a visual support to her French with Janet demonstrating; thirdly, it is clear that the pupils have done this type of activity before, cue-cards therefore indicate a 'find-your-partner' activity. Her follow-up suggestion that the exercise is repeated is clearly not understood by pupils, indicating it is the type of exercise rather than the language that fires the pupils' comprehension. What is also clear from the tasks is how little Janet is actively engaging with the pupils; rather the objective of the lesson from her point of view seems to be to move the pupils on from one exercise to the next. Some thirty minutes into the lesson and, apart from the opening revision sequence, Janet has mostly organised pupils to work with each other. In neither exercise does Janet follow-up in a way that demonstrates that one exercise connects with the next. In other words, the structure of the lesson conforms, almost overly conforms, to a suggested model given at the university, but Janet seems to be using it to occupy pupils and distance herself from engaging with them rather than developing language in a constructive way. In this sense, the lesson appears as one large practice exercise. There may be various reasons for this; pupil control, the desire to present a 'model lesson' for observation, the need to economise on energy and input into the lesson. The model lesson requires another skill activity, and Janet chooses a listening text. This is based on a waiter taking an order from four individuals; pupils list in a grid what each chooses to eat and drink. The display of the grid on the board offers support to Janet's explanation in French, along with the conventional mode for the exercise. Pupils therefore carry out the exercise as a convention. The activity also has the advantage of requiring silence from the pupils as they listen to the French. There is some reason to feel therefore that the choice of activity can perform functions other than the purely linguistically pedagogic. The follow-up activity has Janet requesting answers to the question 'who
This sequence indicates the way that Janet continues to limit her own discourse with pupils to eliciting the correct answers from various exercises. In this sense the lesson is interrogative. Where pupils work on their own Janet does not pick up on this work to engage with what they have been speaking and therefore to use it to build another exercise. This lesson follows the formula approach of all three observed classes. In many ways, they share common features of the model: an attempt to sustain target language, standard entry and exist activities, oral presentation followed by pair work and consolidation exercises. However, taken as a group they seem to be characteristic of the attitude Janet has expressed elsewhere in her diary; that she will do the minimum to get by and to get to the end of term. There is no real sense that she is actively engaging with the problematic features of the model. Neither is there a strong indication that the model has evolved much for her over the term.

Further comments indicate the way that she had orientated herself towards the relationships she was able to establish with pupils outside of her modern language lessons:

Well, I'm really enjoying my work with the 'vocats' and the Special Needs because you have more of a physical progression, but they are not as confident as this lot. So you teach them a few of the life skills and that's good. With modern languages it just doesn't seem to have much to do with them and they get bored..... Working with the 'vocats.' is great... when I go up there they say 'do you want a cup of coffee Miss?' it's like a little suite up there and these kids that normally mess about.
have decorated it really well and made it comfortable.

There were clearly features in this that linked with Janet's previous experience as an occupational therapist, which she stated 'seemed to connect with real life'. Similarly, 'I really liked my work with handicapped children and I think that's more what I would like to do. Language teaching on the other hand 'was detached from the real world - For me I can understand others' way of thinking, but I can't adopt it'. Even having successfully completed the course, therefore, Janet decided not to become a language teacher. The reasons for this seem to be a combination of her background, and the positive and negative attitude towards teaching which arose from her teaching experiences. The actual school she was placed in was one causal factor for her decision:

(Becoming a Modern Language teacher?) I've lost interest in that through teaching. I think I shouldn't have gone to that particular school. It didn't help.

The environment is clear from the comments above and descriptions of Janet in the school:

Break is a fairly isolated experience. Janet sat and drank coffee, almost in a dream. She had very little contact with the other teachers. Many of them seemed similarly isolated; a norm for the school.

On another occasion, a conversation was recorded that gives some indication of the influence on Janet:

One Teacher: Fundamentally, it's all very well for people to say that you can do this or that active, participatory type lesson, but you don't stand a chance unless you have discipline. What can you do if the pupils are crawling up the wall and don't want to learn? So, as a student you try something active and it doesn't work because the kids misbehave and you feel bad. So you try something more traditional and
they get bored and they don't work either. So you still feel bad. You try to do something more active for your tutor to see to get a good mark. But it's bad when it doesn't work. It does get easier - but not much (laughter)

Janet: Yes, that is where I am at.

Janet certainly refers to discipline problems:

I plan some things but then abandon them because I know there would be a riot.

Preparing and planning materials was also 'shattering'.

The situation described is one where modern language teaching has all the disadvantages and is the root cause of her problems. Despite all these negative comments on pupils, Janet still states that the 'relationships she built up' were the aspect of her teaching practice she was happiest with; presumably outside language work.

The department was divided in its attitude to use of target language, etc., which means that Janet did not have an unambiguous commitment or support for the approach. The physical environment also had a negative effect on Janet:

If I want to use an OHP I have to book it the day before and most of the rooms don't have screens anyway so I go and write on the board. And the rooms are so small. Even if you're half way down the room you seem to be nearer the back. I feel confined to one room. Anchored on the spot but really I like to get out and about.

Janet's developing negative attitude perhaps leads to her exaggerating the difficulties presented by the school e.g. needing to book an OHP is a far from ideal situation but is not unusual in many schools or unique to Modern Languages departments. Janet had had some successful experiences with language teaching and shows insight into what is intended in communicative methods:
Some occasions it does not work, but I found that with one year 8 class it worked very well. The Head of Department took them and kept trying to do a lot of target language with them so they were not panicked by it......

Well, I know what different people have said along the way, and there was a bit of a debate last week apparently...What I think you're saying is that this is a method that is geared towards GCSE and you've got to employ it in a way that suits you, the class and the school. If you gave someone a set of lesson plans and told them to teach it, their personalities would still come through.

Completion of course

In response to a reference that some in the group felt that I was 'imposing' a method on them, Janet commented:

People on the course are learning how schools want to teach, and you are trying to tell us that, not because it's the way you want us to teach but how someone higher up is thinking. Some people, I think, cannot see that. People think you're telling us because you're a dictator.

(The communicative approach) is still not quite right but it is in the right direction.

But by this stage Janet has disconnected from the arguments. During my end-of-course discussion with Janet she asks me to give her a clue what I want her to say. She then describes what a successful language teacher might be like and how this contrasts with her own case:

Someone who has links with the country, which I haven't Someone who is integrated and organised enough to get authentic materials, which I am not...The people I know like Karen are always on the phone speaking Spanish all the time. She sees Spanish in a daily situation. She loves the language. And if anyone can speak, it she can help them, she gets a real buzz out
of it. So for her teaching Spanish is great and puts her on a high. But for me I enjoyed the literature and didn’t spend a year abroad and so didn’t get anything. I don’t know anything about French culture because I got it all through the literature.

It is probably this feature that was finally decisive in Janet abandoning language teaching; for her the language had never become a real experience. Faced with having to create that real experience for pupils, she just did not have the experience to draw upon. Although she was able to teach through formulae, and show some academic insight into the principles of language teaching, for her real relationships could not be formed through classroom interactions. What was real for her was extra-curricular. By the end of the course, she could see that she had gone into it because of the influence of those around her:

Both my sisters have done it. Most of the people I know have done languages and have come out with the reasons of why and what they have gained. I see the relevance and the importance but I don’t feel my skills and qualities go in that direction...I could teach PE, but not French. It’s too square: the classroom, the time table and assessment.
4.4.3 Jill

Introduction - Beginning of course

After interviewing Jill, I described her as someone who was cool and detached. She had certainly enjoyed being back at the university and seemed to relish the theoretical discussions. Yet, there were signs that for her practice and theory were two totally different experiences. She engaged in a lively dialogue in the university with the pros and cons of the communicative approach but her practical experience was not so positively received. Finally, in the autumn term, she says that 'having sat around and done the theory, you feel you want to have a go at it, put some of it into practice', but this does not seem possible for her. She is able to engage in very thorough critiques of what she observes and offer some theoretical suggestions on how things might be improved; as where she notices that another student in microteaching presumes prior knowledge rather than presenting and then questioning, but there is little evidence that she is able to operationalise these suggestions for herself. She has nightmares all weekend about the microteaching and her own teaching in class seems to revert to reliance on structured teaching. At another point she says that 'good teaching comes down to individual appeal', a thought that she finds 'awesome', as she is lacking in confidence. All this suggests that for her theory is a form of protection; it enables her to explain a situation; it also enables her to deflect problems by analyzing what causes them. Certainly, she sees her own personality as being important in this, but there is a sense of mounting difficulties over her teaching. Nothing at this point in time seems to have convinced her of the possibility of teaching successfully in the way encouraged. At one stage, she thinks she has 'cracked it'. This is not a metaphor that suggests a developing relationship with pupils; but one that implies success as the result of finding a solution to a problem. She had adopted some of the surface behaviour of the approach, but could not yet engage with it; she rather tried to reconcile what she 'knew' to be true and successful with the types of activities given to her.
Teaching Practice

There are, naturally, fewer comments in her diary on the theory and principles of language teaching during the teaching practice term.

In my first observation of her, there were many elements of a good lesson in what she planned, and the structure itself was in keeping with the example plan used at the university. Thus, there is a topic; birthdays, flashcard materials, and an oral presentation and practice of related language.

**Lesson Structure (35 mins. Year 7 French)**
- Oral Presentation - Flashcards
- Writing - Copying Vocabulary: Board
- Pair Work
- Writing - P -> Board
- Homework

The opening sequence shows a pattern practice activity:

T: Qu’est-ce que c’est ?
Ce sont des cadeaux
Anna, viens ici
Quelle est la date de ton anniversaire?
P: Le 6 novembre
T: Aujourd’hui, c’est ton anniversaire
Voici un cadeau
On t’offre un cadeau (opens present)

This sequence was repeated with different pupils before Jill introduced: ‘on m’a offert un parfum’, which was repeated to lead onto eliciting: ‘on m’a offert un tricot’. Clearly, the teaching point is the perfect tense of ‘offrir’ used with the preceding indirect object pronoun, but there are confusions in the sequence. Firstly, there is a combination of real and imaginary situations; thus, the pupils are asked their real birthday, which is the only genuine language response from them. They are then asked to assume
that this date is indeed the day's date, and that they are being
given a present. This is not explained and the pupil response is not
individually based but limited to repetition. This assumption is
implied by the language with the initiative remaining with the
teacher. Secondly, there are repetitions that involve the class, and
others that are individuals only. In either case, it is not clear
that the pupils have grasped the sense of what they are saying. This
is especially true with the rather forced use of 'on t'offre', 'on

t'a offert' and 'on m'a offert'. The tense is not clear from the
context, nor is the sense as it does not arise from the structure of
the situation set up.

After this sequence Jill instructed the class to copy a list of
written words, along with corresponding pictures. She had made an
effort to stay in target language, even to the point of asking and
answering her own questions. Thus,

T: Qu'est-ce que c'est ?
T: C'est du parfum

Other instructions are given in English. These instructions are
clearly for scaffolding:

T: Quiet please
What do you say after 'Bon anniversaire'
P:........
T: C'est voici un cadeau

In this statement it is not clear if the pupils would see the 'c'est'
and the 'voici' as being in different clauses, and, indeed, that the
'c'est' in this case is part of scaffolding language. This mixture of
English and French, and for different uses, suggests that she has
difficulty seeing target language use from the pupils' point of view.
The English scaffolding is also used for organisational rather than
learning issues.
French in these cases is reduced to repetition and copying rather
than a means of expression or even exchange of information, even
though Jill makes efforts to create a pedagogic dialogue in French:

P: Excuse me Mrs .......
T: Excusez-moi
P: Excusez-moi
Mrs ........, is it J-A-P-E or J-U-P-E?
T: J-U

My after lesson notes listed a number of items that I could criticise:

1. Too much pupil noise - especially for first years.
2. Too much English.
3. Direct translation of language problems.
4. Repetition of teacher conversation with no pupil input.
   etc.

Obviously, I did not make all of these points to Jill, or in this form. What I had observed here was entirely consistent with Jill’s earlier comments on language and language learning. Thus, in her initial questionnaire, she had explained that the good language learner ‘had a good ear for rhythms ... and an ability to see structure and pattern in words’. This statement implies the notion of the learner being the quiet listener. She had earlier berated pupils who ‘talked over their teacher all the time ...I would be a lot stricter ... I know that I can explain my subject to other people if they are prepared to sit and listen, but it’s hard against a barrage of noise’. Yet, in many ways this is exactly what Jill did: allowed a lot of talking, over which she worked: ‘They get bored, I rather like to get them on with the work and hope they enjoy the activity’.

In her pre-course questionnaire, Jill described the good language teacher as one who could ‘make repetition interesting’. She had also found the lesson planning units most useful in the course in the autumn term, along with the formula: repetition, practice, production pattern. She was then applying this theoretical model. However, her
diary notes also show that she is essentially adopting the structural approach she claimed to be necessary in earlier comments. She finds that one year seven class had not grasped the idea of verb and subject pronoun. She decides to take remedial action:

The blank look on several faces when I tried to explain made me realise that they did not know what a verb was - I built the following lesson around showing what a verb was and pattern drilling the verbs they were learning. I made a cardboard dice with tu, il, je, etc. on it and we played team games - making the verb match the personal pronoun. They enjoyed it very much. I tried throughout several lessons to repeat the sentence they gave me with the correct pronoun and verb but it was evident that they did not even notice and that the explanation was not only quicker but absolutely essential.

This statement clearly continues a dialogue that puts her model of language learning in the right and the assumed 'inductive' method in the wrong. Yet, it also contradicts what she had previous claimed to be impossible:

(Games) are all very well in theory but get a class of twelve year old and it would fall apart as it is too complicated to set up; for example, the one we used the other day which involved dice. I know from my own children that using dice is asking for trouble - it's going to be thrown out of the window, etc.

However, there is little confidence in the teachability with some classes. When I asked her about the 'on m'a offert' structure' she claims that there is no way they would get it, so it is not worth teaching. The irony was that she did teach it. She claimed that this was because it had to be covered in Tricolore and that some of them might get it. This seems to shows compliance with external demands, almost as a way of explaining her own lack of success.
Our conversation after the lesson indicates the difficulty I experienced as a trainer in getting Jill to engage with the problematic aspects of her lesson. She opens with a statement that the kids get bored. This would obviously be a different statement from the pupils finding her lesson boring; responsibility is then shifted from her to the pupils. She claims to be 'happy with the way things are going', in other words, there is no pressing reason to change, or indeed to hear my comments. Her diary notes give an account of my first visit, which ends in her being 'torn off a strip', and, as a consequence, her being in tears. She clearly realises that the diary is a public statement and that I am to read it. In this case, it is a dialogue with the absent me. I am presented as prescriptive, and demanding pedagogic behaviour that runs counter to her own experience:

He tore me off a strip for putting words on the board for them to learn - too old fashioned apparently - these kids need the support of the written word as they have poor memories. It makes them feel they've got somewhere, otherwise the lesson becomes a blur of incomprehensible sound.

I become an external constraint. Thus later she finds 'there is a certain tension between the way the children are used to being taught and the way I am expected (by Mike)'. Poor grades from her pupils are also explained away in terms of materials being too complicated and covering too much too soon.

Approximately half way through her teaching practice Jill is still finding that 'her' approach works best: 'explaining the grammar and giving vocabulary to learn can get you through the book faster than painstaking setting up of dialogues and organising role plays'. Yet, there is clearly some guilt involved here. She teaches the perfect tense, but then organises lessons based on finding your way around town. This is abandoned, however, because the unit tests have to be done and she does not want to get too far behind. Such comments give the picture of a curious contradiction of choices and justifications. It could be summed up as she knows how she wants to teach, but cannot
do it. The factors prohibiting her are tutor demands, the pupils' usual learning habits, the demands of the school, the teaching materials. All of these are cited in place of an examination of the reasons for her own inability to operationalise the method we have discussed at the university. Yet she still feels she is being communicative. A high point in week 7 is when a pupil asks to go to the toilet in French; apparently, a result of her 'perseverance' with the target language.

The next lesson I observed of Jill's began with an almost textbook approach; for example, presentation, practice, production, and 3-stage questioning. Essentially, it was based around the presentation of food and drink through flashcards and then a listening back-up exercise. The lesson began in a rather ramshackle way, and there were clear signs that Jill could not impose a presence.

**Lesson Structure (45 mins., Year 8 French)**
- Oral Presentation - Flashcards
- Listening - Tape

The main teaching activity was composed of a 3-stage questioning input, thus:

- T: Ecoutez bien
  Voici une glace
  Claire, c'est une glace, oui ou non?
  P: Oui
  repeated # 3 pupils

- T: C'est une glace aux fraises
  C'est une glace aux fraises ou au citron
  P: C'est une glace aux fraises
  repeated # 3 pupils

- T: Voici un café
  Qu'est-ce que c'est?
  P: Un café
  repeated # 2 pupils

- T: C'est un café, oui ou non
Such a sequence can be viewed as trying to comply with a definite activity approach given at the university. However, in its application here there are problems. Firstly, there are some important differences between au, aux, de la and un, which are not brought out in the sequence. There is high maintenance of target language in the first section of the lesson, but it is not clear that pupils are doing other than rote repetition of phrases in conjunction with the pictures. The questions are 'closed', which is a major reason for using the technique as it offers a high degree of control over what is elicited. Pupils do this sequence, and Jill thus keeps them passive. There is no attempt to get the pupils to initiate questions or to personalise in any way. This passivity is reinforced by the follow-up listening, which has the pupils writing on sheets but not engaging with Jill. This could also be for disciplinary reasons. Certainly, her preoccupation in this direction is indicated from her diary notes: 'Difficult group. I constructed a very controlled lesson to keep them busy'.

A mixture of French and English also appears to perform different functions: to provide organisational support to the lesson; to maintain a semblance of target language use. French is preceded by English: 'For your homework I have a crossword for you. Un mot croisé pour les devoirs et donnez-moi vos cahiers', and English is sometimes used to elicit translations:

T: Who can tell me the phrase for 'I would like'?  
P: Je voudrais  
T: Yes, Je voudrais

It is difficult to see Jill understanding the pupils' view of language. She understands both French and English, but the pupils do
not. The language used in French and English also performs various purposes. Jill can operate these as she knows both languages; for the pupils this is not the case.

After the lesson, there was a clear difference between my interpretation of it and Jill's. My negative comments in my journal suggest private thoughts rather than those articulated to Jill. She notes my critical remarks on lack of originality and verve in the lesson, but I had been positive enough for her not to 'lose heart and to keep trying'.

Her comments on flashcards are noticeable. During the previous meeting she said that the pupils got bored with the use of flashcards. She now contradicts this:

The pupils laugh at them a bit, but I think they appreciate me making the effort.

I noted that she seems to get some personal gain from making them; she certainly feels that it helps her 'to think about how to use them'. Yet, I also comment that they are incredibly small and difficult to see from the back of the class. This may further suggest that Jill is very 'self-centred' about her thoughts, and relatively blind to pupil experience.

Her personal comments demonstrate that she feels trapped between what she would like to do, what she feels she might be able to do and what she can in fact do. Thus, after my suggesting that she refer to practical activity sheets given at the university for a source of ideas, she speaks of the problem of putting them into practice:

Yes. that is true. But sometimes my brain gets fuddled. It's difficult to take them on board and make a lesson of them. I don't know, it's difficult to use them.

She cannot imagine the activities in practice, they therefore, seem fragmentary. They need to be unified by an understanding of how they
interconnect, and how the guiding principles should be consistent. But it is difficult for Jill to do this at this stage: firstly, because she does not yet have a theory of teaching that has worked for her in practice; secondly, she feels caught in the various contradictions of her position and what is required of her. This ties in with the fact that she does not seem to be able to imagine pupils' experience or their separate views of language.

I, as tutor, am put in a difficult situation when she asks me what she should do. In both her first and second lesson she confronts me in this way: tell me what to do and I will do it. These questions are attempts to shift the responsibility of lessons onto me, and I am required to offer an exemplar or lesson solution, but the question is not so much what I would do, but what she could do.

At this stage, Jill's approach to lessons does not seem to have changed much. However, there is some self perception and the suggestion of the possibility of improvement. When asked, she gives her 'score' as nought for imagination in the previous lesson, and comments that the English lessons she is teaching are 'O.K'. She is not 'happy' then as she was after the first lesson, and can see areas for improvement, but she does not yet seem to be able to see how she might move forward in language teaching. Modern languages are to be difficult, but all the problems seem to lie elsewhere than with her.

Jill notes the problems of the different influences on her. This itself may not be the problem, so much as the fact that she needs to keep pointing them out. After half-term Jill is asked to give an INSET session on the communicative approach to her teaching practice school colleagues. The contradiction she feels in this school is summed up: 'the teachers here are negative and sceptical, however, they do get good results'.

Before my final visit Jill observes another teacher's lesson and offers a critique:
The lesson was boring: followed an exercise in Tricolore - meeting friends off a train, instructions, what is happening tomorrow, etc. She taught them 'demain, j'aurai les maths', when I am positive that most young people would use the present tense. A case of accuracy versus colloquial street cred. Then in pairs they had to make up their own dialogues. At one point she said 'I don’t want to hear anyone say 'you say this and I’ll say such and such'. French only please, but not once did she use any French herself to set the scene or the atmosphere of the class, or to give them a model of any kind.

Yet, this was precisely the level of criticism that Jill was not able to apply to herself. As yet, she seemed unable to take responsibility for her own teaching.

The third and final lesson observed by me involved a presentation of 'Il/elle va', 'Ils/Elles vont' and 'loin de/ près de'.

Lesson Structure (45 mins. Year 7 French)
Oral Presentation - Map
Hand Puppets
Writing/Drawing - Map/Board
Reading out loud - Teacher from book
Oral Questioning - T/P

In this lesson Jill spoke a great deal and used a lot of French. The first section of the lesson has Jill taking on different conversational parts, in conjunction with a poster displayed on the board and hand puppets in order to present a dialogue:

T: Elle quitte la maison
Elle tourne à droite
Elle va à gauche
Elle rencontre son ami Nicholas
Bonjour, où vas-tu?
Je vais à la piscine
C'est loin?
Oui, c'est loin
Il y a un café?
Oui, allons au café

Clearly, there is nothing in this to suggest that the pupils do understand what is being said; especially a sophisticated use of intonation which was employed to convey the interrogative.

From this sequence, Jill moved to questioning without using activities to involve the pupils in the content of what has been said. At first there is success with two students but this breaks down, which leaves Jill having to use different devices to elicit the sought after responses:

T: Où vont Nicholas et Françoise?
P: Ils vont à la banque (#2)
T: Marie, où va Françoise
P: Françoise va à la banque
T: Oui, Françoise va à la banque
Où va Françoise?
P: Françoise va......
T: À la banque. Françoise va à la banque
Où vont Françoise et Nicholas?
P:........
T: Ils vont
P:......
T: au café
P: au café
T: Ils vont au café

Jill then refers to 'c'est loin' de and 'prés de', but cannot elicit a response from the pupils on this language point:

T: La piscine, c'est loin de la maison ou c'est tout près?
P:........
T: La banque est tout près de la maison mais la piscine est loin
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Pupils do take organisational initiatives - for example, 'do we write it down?' - which occasionally is treated as a learning possibility by Jill:

P: Miss
T: Excusez-moi, madame
P: ...
T: Excusez-moi madame
I'm sure that you can manage it. Go on try.
P: Excusez-moi, I haven't got a pen

This sequence again demonstrates the mixture of language for different purposes, and an insistence on target language use that is feigning natural discourse.

This initial sequence in the lesson leads on to Jill reading a simplified version of 'Le Petit Chapereau Rouge', and following up with attempts at questioning.

In follow-up discussion, Jill again asks me what she should have done. I felt that there was a lot of material here, and it could have been broken up, possibly making three lesson. This avoids me giving specific detail, and attempts to explain the principles of integrating and extending language work with pupils. However, Jill, in her diary notes interprets it rather differently:

Mike felt I had tried too much. I know that the Head of Department would say 'how are you going to cover the syllabus in that case.

This statement seems to elaborate previous lesson points made by Jill that the coverage of the syllabus is the main deciding factor in determining activities, not whether the pupils are learning or not. This tendency connects with her trend to see others and other situations governing what happens in lesson; i.e. Jill is not responsible. It also reinforces her view that direct telling is easier and quicker than indirect methods:
There are many things that can be explained quickly which children don't always see the meaning if you demonstrate.

It is finally clear at this stage that Jill has not been able to satisfy any of the criteria she feels that are being imposed on her. She wants to be communicative, but there are constraining forces; she wants to deal with structure but has another method prescribed to her; she wants to be lively and get the pupils working and learning but has not been able to do that. Her Head of Department makes the point that they are rather traditional in the school, but sees that a teacher has to be 'lively' to use more target language. Jill is not. Indeed, my comments refer to her general lethargy and inability to engage. There is the question of whether Jill can engage with pupils in either language. She also continues to shift the blame away from herself in her own sense of limited success. 'Cue card activities do not work'; a repetition of her original feeling about flashcards. I, as tutor, attempt to explain that it is not a question of them working or not working, but making them work. Jill has the self awareness to say: 'I am better at doing than making things happen'. Faced with this situation, it is unsurprising that Jill is looking for an external remedy; especially as for most of the term she sees external factors as constraining her.

Completing of course

There are various concluding comments that can be made about Jill. She seems to have separated out theory and practice that finds her not only relishing the former compared to the latter, but using it in functionally different ways. Theory is a way of externalising. It is functionally analogous to her seeing external constraints as the cause of her problems. There is little evidence that she reflects on her experience in a personal way. Thus, she seems to have 'bracketed out' her previous experience as a mother, EFL teacher and assistant. In the first term, Jill set up a pattern that she seemed to maintain for the rest of the year. She is clearly nervous about facing up to the practicalities of teaching. Her early microteaching scares her and tutor visits make her nervous. This sense of threat perhaps more
than anything makes it very difficult for her to act on the inadequacies she feels about her own practice; there is then a need to remove the blame by appointing someone or something else as the cause of the problem. By the end of her teaching practice some of Jill’s views have changed. Thus, games are now seen as useful, rather than impossible as previously. Interestingly, she now sees that lower ability pupils need more support and thus less oral work, contrary to her early intention to use a more oral based approach with the lower ability groups. One might conclude that the communicative approach works best with high ability pupils. Essentially, however, her view of language teaching remains the same: many aspects of communicative methodologies are excellent, but grammar explanations are needed: ‘They would have got it quicker with an explanation’ becomes almost a mantra to her. These points are also reiterated in the third term: one must tell pupils how language works; lower ability need more support. She again claims that the style of teaching is heavily affected by the personality of the individual teacher, but does not really apply that to herself. She felt that she had done her best, had tried to do what she was told:

I kept getting a sense of failing all round..... I felt I was doing what was expected of me from here because in some sense you are forced into doing something that the kids expect... they have been used to doing things in a certain way... mainly sticking to the book.

She placed her expectations in the theory. What I said, as tutor, was the theory, and therefore I was prescriber and proscriber; and thus villain.

The final sequence of conversation in her end of year interview probably sums up Jill’s position. Her comments arose from a discussion of classes not gelling and some pupils never accepting their own responsibility in matters:
There was one kid in one class who really used to annoy me. I used to have to make a real effort to be nice to her. It didn’t matter what you did.. it (was) boring....In the end, I said: 'if you find everything boring, then it’s probably because you’re a boring person....if you don’t put anything in, you get nothing out....criticising means that you are putting the blame on other people and disassociating yourself from it. I suppose that’s what she was doing. It was difficult and that was how she dealt with it.

The response that Jill described could equally apply to her own reaction to the demands of teaching. Despite these difficulties and sense of limited success, Jill went on to obtain a first post in a school local to her neighbourhood.
4.4.4 Marie

Introduction - Beginning of course

In many ways, Marie started the course with a profile that was one of the perfect student: an early applicant; native speaker; doing research for a French MA; and previous experience as an assistant in a secondary school. In her case study, there are many comments and evidence that she was committed, hardworking, positive and reflective. There are some indications that she is working with a quite sophisticated notion of language and language learning, which is partly formed by her academic experience and partly from her own experience of language learning. Both of these are also infused by the cultural differences to be found between France and England. Before the course starts she demonstrates a complex understanding of language:

Due to the limited number of signs which are combined with one another (man) can create an infinite number of words. The latter, associated in a sentence, produce unlimited messages. Messages are interpreting reality. There are as many languages as there are realities. Languages have many functions in society: it enables communication and expresses needs, passions, wills and ideas.

This level of insight can become a handicap to practical action. Accordingly, my own comments on Marie in the autumn term are that she seems rather ‘inert’, suggesting a thoughtful, if somewhat inward looking student. This is also the characteristic of her autumn term diary, where she is highly observant, and what she writes contains numerous reflections and notes to herself: ‘Be careful in the classroom, Marie - don’t talk to the same ones’. Marie works on a model of language teaching that she is prepared to modify on the basis of past and present experience. She notes that the grammar approach did not really work for her, but is not uncritical of the communicative approach, finding that it does not always push the pupils enough, and can be teacher centred rather than pupil centred.
She also provides a checklist for herself for planning lessons in language awareness classes that she gives as part of a group of students who go into a local primary school in the autumn term. However, experience seems to unsettle this confidence and commitment to the model. The first cracks appear when she is placed in a school that is applying a rather traditional approach: 'M. Grenfell played a trick. I cannot see any connection with what we are doing now'. Her own experience in the school leaves her unsure of what she should be doing and how it will be received. It seems that her own reflections on the principles of language teaching get squeezed out by her practical experience. Language itself becomes 'very confused'. For her, good teaching entails active pupils; something she criticises her autumn term school for not achieving, and which is prevented by the way schools are organised. She also says that she feels very 'passive', which seems to be a 'bad attitude' for a teacher. This binary base to teaching as passive is bad and active is good seems also to connect with her own experience of learning rather than to an intellectual commitment about how to teach. How pupils should be taught is based on how she was not taught. However, this commitment does not seem to relate directly to how to go about actually teaching in terms of methodology, but only to how pupils should experience lessons. She extends this approach to the way that the culture of a language is also important in the teaching process. It is, therefore, necessary to involve learners in France and how real people speak.

Besides these conflicts in experience and understandings, the picture of Marie as a rather distant, over reflective student is emphasised by her own analysis of her experiences of being on the course and in England. She claims that there was 'no communication' in the group during the term because each student had their own perspective. She also sums up her position in life:

> Yes, I like to put some distance between me and what happens to me. I don’t know if it is a good thing, but I don’t like much involving myself. I like to be in control. I don’t think it is good sometimes...it’s not what you need to feel committed completely.
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Marie connects this attitude with the style of her academic training in France, and, indeed, the French national character. Teachers are functionaries who come to school, deliver lessons and go away again with little other involvement. The French are also individualistic and reactive. This last point may well be the core of Marie’s character. There seems a contradiction in that she claims that the English are pragmatic, they like to apply what they know immediately. The French, she argues, stop and think. It seems that this is characterised by a very individualistic reflection; an inward gaze prior to a response. The final, characteristic French reaction, as described by Marie, gives the picture of unpredictability on the basis of idiosyncratic reactions rather than communal trends. She even goes as far as saying that in England people all look the same, whilst in France there is greater variety.

Teaching Practice

My notes on Marie during teaching practice indicate an extension of this trend of hyper-reflectivity, and methodological indecision. Her diary notes are awash with comments, reflections and reminders. She also uses many diagrammatic forms to image relationships, highlight and extrapolate practical consequences. Yet the impression given is one of continual crisis. Her very first comment is on the physical effects of teaching: ‘I feel too tired. I should stop working too much as I have noticed the damage of it’. In class too, she ‘uses’ herself too much.

This theme was present in our first meeting together, which occurred during a non-observational visit. Discipline was a strain for her, and she felt that there were so many things to think about. At this point, lesson planning is a real issue; not only in terms of the time it takes to do, but the actual implementation of the lessons: the beginnings of lessons are difficult, and, by week 2, she still does not feel that she has started a lesson in an orderly fashion. She feels that she spends too much time on lesson planning and they are too theoretical: ‘I concentrate too much on the communicative approach and forget the essentials’. There is then a conflict between
planning and implementing a perfect language lesson according to theory and the 'essentials', those aspects of classroom management that are needed to realise a good plan in practice. Marie is still operating according to the lesson plan activities as if they were a formula:

I plan too many things and rush to get through them all. In fact, I would rather make it up - do what I have to do. But it's exhausting - the kids are amused, but keep thinking up activities, games that they will enjoy, is exhausting.

Such a view is held to the end of the course where she criticises the programme for imposing an approach on her, when, as she says, she has her 'own ideas too'. The content of the course was seen as 'scatty', that is lots of ideas without a unifying principle. Of course, the unifying principle should be the lesson planning as representative of a communicative approach to language teaching, but these three elements do not progress in a linear form. During the first visit, Marie claims to be re-reading the course notes, which 'now make sense ', suggesting that they only work in practice. Marie must be getting something from the lesson planning design and the activities which now seem to be producing some positive experiences with classes.

The particularity of Marie was, of course, that she was a native French speaker. This means that she experiences French differently from those students who have learnt it as a second language. Earlier on in the course she had some positive experience with using her French; she was able to 'control and support' the pupils:

I felt that everyone was participating, everyone was moving at the same time.

She connects this directly to the fact that she was using French, which 'was always there'. Using another language, Spanish in her case, made her self-conscious and thus inhibited.
The fact that she used French natively, and she worked with a communicative approach, clashed somewhat with what she found in her early days of the teaching practice term. Firstly, she had to use the published course book 'Tricolore', which she found overly grammatical. Secondly, the unit tests that this course book demanded limited what she could do in a communicative mode. All this led to an experience of teaching that included several conflicting factors. She uses a lot of French, 'because the pupils appreciate it'. However, the standard is low, so she has to give instructions in English. Her English itself causes problems, which undermines her confidence. So much oral work also puts pressure on time to include other skill areas; but at this stage Marie sees that there is a need for compromise.

After these initial concerns, things seem to go quite well for Marie. She notes that she likes to make her own materials as this helps her to develop her own style. Marie still spends a lot of time on planning, but the barrier problem seems to diminish, and she is even 'able to change things on the spot'. She finds that she gets a 'good response from the pupils when the lessons are practical', and with some classes she can even express her personality which pupils enjoy. At this point the picture is one of a student beginning to have some success in the way she feels she wants to teach. In particular, there is a clear attempt to form a relationship with pupils through her language. This is born out from the details of the first lesson of hers to be observed. The lesson was based around pupils having a simple telephone conversation.

**Lesson Structure (1hr. 10 mins. Year 9 French)**

- **Oral Presentation -OHP**
- **Pair Work 1**
- **P/T Oral Work - Cue Cards**
  - OHP
  - Textbook
- **Pair Work 2**
- **Writing - Copying from board**
- **P/T Oral Work - Cue Cards**
Listening
Homework
Song

The lesson started with Marie using a lot of French to organise pupils:

T: Un peu de silence  
Sortez vos livres  
Asseyez-vous  
Vite  
Je fais l'appel

Although this final register was answered by the pupils in English, the opening activity required a lot of French from pupils in giving telephone numbers.

This introductory sequence was followed by Marie setting up an activity where pupils got the telephone numbers of their partners:

T: O.K. maintenant vous cherchez le numéro de téléphone de votre partenaire.  
O.K. now I want you to find the telephone number of your partner.

This sequence indicates a translation technique, from French to English, to organise pupils, and tell them what they are to do:

T: O.K. I want you to practice in pairs. One asks 'Quelle est ton numéro de téléphone?', the other one answers.

This leads on to another exercise in which pupils are given cards with information on which they have to exchange with a partner. Again, Marie attempts to present the language and what pupils are to do in French before pupil response leads to an English translation being given:
This conversation shows Marie using language for different purposes; organisational, demonstration, clarification. In 'vous dites, c'est moi' there is an example of a combination of language for instructional and demonstration purposes. The actual conversation appears quite successful, and it is only when Marie reverts to English to ask the pupil if he understands, and he claims not to, that it 'breaks down'. There is a clear attempt by Marie to create dialogue; in this case, understanding is being monitored as she tries to get pupils to use language through a condensed model of presentation, practice and production. Some twenty minutes into the lesson, Marie uses this work on numbers to practise asking the telephone numbers of key places in town. She also uses some published materials to practise this while she hands out the next oral input from her. This latter is based on a written presentation on the board, to be used with matched cue cards for pupil pair work. Marie presents this with English translations to check understanding:

T: Je voudrais le 34, 21, 67, 19
P: Oui
T: Je voudrais parler à Odile
P: C'est de la part de qui?
This dialogue is clearly a successful conversation, repeated with other pupils. It is not fully generative or personalised, as pupil have visual support, but it is not totally reading written prompts. One interesting aspect of the conversation is the way Marie is using her own name, as if this was a real conversation, with her seeking to speak with a specific individual. This is a good example of the way Marie is trying to be herself in the classroom, albeit compromised with English translations, pupil demands, structural teaching materials, etc. Marie continues with a listening exercise, then some songs to end the lesson.

Despite the noticeable use of English in the transcription, my after lesson notes indicate an impression of a high use of French with the pupils coping with it. What is clear is that Marie had succeeded in engaging with the pupils, using French and English, and getting them to engage with each other. To this extent, the classroom was communicative. Moreover, there were incidents of genuine dialogue between pupils, albeit along rudimentary lines.

What is Marie’s state at this part of the course? This was a good lesson, but there are problems. She still felt tired by the effort involved; the previous day her mind went a blank and she got confused. A conversation with the normal class teacher was revealing in terms of the influences on Marie. The class had been top ability, and the teacher wanted Marie to stay closely in contact with what was being done in lessons; in fact Marie was told what to do on a weekly basis. She felt that Marie did too much oral work, which had been ‘corrected’. She felt that this particular lesson had been very orally based, as Marie felt that this is what I wanted, indicating a wish to please rather than a genuine commitment to the approach. She also noted that Marie was spending too much time on lesson planning: sometimes an ‘ordinary lesson’ had to be given. Marie had again been
Marie’s diary notes indicate the ongoing dialogue she maintains; not so much with language teaching per se but with herself as teacher. She notes the affective nature of pupil experiences in lessons: ‘words reflecting experience - experience being a child: Emotions, feelings, play, security....they like things that are close to them’ and the relational aspect of her work with them: (communication) good point - how to relate to pupils and create relationships with them’. Curiously, she writes that she has no reaction to certain pupil behaviour and notes that she has ‘not conformed’. This suggests the image of Marie as a bit of an outsider within the school, which also connects with her attempts to form a personalised relationship with the pupils rather than develop a teacher persona. Of course, a communicative approach points in this direction, and her native French competency allows her to be herself; probably in the same way she acted as an assistant. There are, however, teacher attributes expected from schools, and, indeed the pupils that Marie does not yet seem to have developed or even recognised. Still, by mid way through her teaching practice she seems more integrated into the school: ‘I am starting having a rough idea on how I should behave’.

My final lesson observation took place approximately three quarters of the way through her teaching practice.

**Lesson Structure** (1hr. 10 mins. French Year 10)
Oral Presentation - Board
Pair Work - Board
Writing - Copying Vocabulary
Listening - Tape/ Board
Reading - Text book
Homework
Game

The lesson was based on airport information giving flight numbers, times, destinations, etc. which were displayed on the board as the pupils entered the classroom. After settling the class down Marie
practised various times using a clock; this included the twenty-four hour times. She then indicated the diagram on the board:

T: Regardez le tableau
   Je vais prendre le vol à 15.40
   C’est quel vol?
P: AF110
T: Où vais-je?
P: 15.45
T: Où vais-je? (pointing)
P: Nice

Time is a significant factor in understanding this lesson. The school in which she was placed operated lessons of one hour and ten minutes each. The initial exercise of practising the times and questioning them based on flight information lasted ten minutes. Marie then transferred the same activity to the pupils:

T: Maintenant, vous allez travailler en paires
   Tu demandes - je veux aller à Amsterdam
   quel est le vol
   et tu dis - c’est le vol AF110
   tu comprends? Alors, allez-y

There was no translation in this case, so the structural transference from teacher led to pupil-centred activity appears successful. However, Marie quickly stopped the activity and asked four pupil pairs to perform their dialogue. The whole activity had lasted two minutes. This is clearly a misjudgment of timing and activity. There were none of the conversational patterns she had tried to incorporate in the previous lesson. The dialogue had been reduced to a basic and answer sequence with no genuine exchange of information; neither was Marie involved in the discourse. In fact, it seemed to amount to little more than a practice exercise. It did not seem to connect with the follow-up exercise in any productive sense. The next activity lasted 20 mins. It consisted of Marie checking a list of relevant airport vocabulary and a listening tape. The vocabulary was dealt
with by straight translation into English:

T: Ouvrez les cahiers (mimes)
(This was Tricolore 4A)
T: La porte, qu'est-ce que c'est en Anglais?
P: Gate
T: Le vol?
P: Flight number

etc.

The listening tape consisted of eight announcements, each with a flight number, gate, time of departure and information on lateness or possible cancellation. Of course, to give this information takes a relatively small amount of language. In order to grasp such detail as 'flight number AC850' Marie had to replay the taped sequence as many as four times. Marie tested the comprehension by pupils of each phrase by asking for an English translation and repeating the French:

T: What's that?
P: Cancelled
T: And what's that in French?
P: Annulé

By the end of this sequence, most pupils were bored and chatting.

Some forty minutes into the lesson, Marie moves onto another activity, this time based on reading from the text book as a way of calculating the destinations of a given group of travellers. Her approach is again translation.

T: Maintenant, on va lire. Après chaque phrase. After each phrase you will tell me the words you do not understand and I'll prepare something to write on them
John, tu lis A
P: Il est midi
T: O.K., you understand: it's midday

etc.
Pupils were left on their own to read for twenty minutes. The follow-up was in French:

T: Où va Miss Carter?
P: Los Angeles
T: Elle va à Los Angeles

However, the class is very restless at the end of the lesson and the activity is abandoned after four examples with no further comments, and the lesson brought to a close with homework and a game to finish.

The final example of French between the teacher and pupil is a good example of the way that pupils in this situation operate with a minimum amount of structure to convey sense, whilst with the teacher it is the opposite, with efforts being made to expose pupils to as much French as possible. Another reason for this extra usage of French from the teacher is as a compensatory effect; that the pupil response is adequate but does not demonstrate the structural competence desired by the teacher. A 'correct' answer is therefore 'corrected' by additional language, as if to demonstrate to pupils what they should have said, rather than accept the adequacy and relevance of the pupils' response. Although this phenomenon makes sense in pedagogic terms, it does not form a naturalistic view of language use, and similarly breaks the discourse conventions. Moreover, in strictly pedagogic terms, it operates with an inductive model of learning, leaving pupils to grasp the meaning of the structure, or not, as an implicit function to what the teacher is stating.

It is also clear that a pedagogic discourse has to be created and maintained by the teacher. In order to do this in French, a variety of repair devices are employed to keep the pupils in relation with the teacher. This relationship seems to become the primary concern of the teacher, to the extent that principles of language teaching are abandoned or heavily modified in order to conform to real pedagogic relationship of the lesson. So, for example, in the above example,
there is a noticeable shift between the first and second lessons observed. Both make use of translation, but in the second it is used not only for organisational purposes but to systematically check the meaning of all vocabulary. Armed with this clarification, pupils attempt listening and reading activities in terms of giving solutions to linguistic problems. In the first lesson Marie was using language to discourse with the pupils, and to make pupils discourse with each other. In this second lesson, language is continually seen as the problem that can be solved by Marie giving the meaning. The structures of the activities are different. In the first lesson there is an attempt to relate through discourse in French, in the second the basic activity is pedagogic in design, and can be solved only through the understanding of the language. Understanding is brought about with Marie supplying 'the' answer. Such satisfies Marie's pedagogic need; this makes her a teacher.

Clearly, my comments show that I found this a disappointing lesson at the time. Marie seems to have deteriorated. There are several factors at play in this. Her diary notes again suggest the contradictions of activity/passivity in her own view of herself as a teacher. On the one hand, she feels she must be more adventurous, yet on the other she sees that she is not able to do that through lack of personal strength:

As a teacher, I must realise I need to create more space for myself and switch off from work. Some of my lessons did not go very well because I was physically not fit (lack of sleep, etc.).

These comments correspond to the points made by her after the final lesson:

I thought and thought yesterday and could not think of anything to do.....I'm just too tired. A few weeks ago I was exhausted making materials, and now I can't do it any longer. In fact I spent so much time making materials that I was forgetting how
to use them. Now, I am trying to make a little material go a long way. Otherwise I don’t know what I’ll do in September.

This last point is significant, as it shows how significant realisations can come about from very negative experiences; in this case the perception of her own physical limitations. A pragmatic turn in this case can be extremely positive in modifying behaviour. It can be viewed as a compromise, but it is also a move away from a theoretical construct or ideal, and the coming into being of a closer relationship with the experience of teaching at hand; which is not to say that theory is abandoned, but it does become less explicit in determining practice and a personal evaluation of it.

The same could be said of her lesson planning, which, whilst continuing to be problematic for her, leads to modification of practice:

I want to say something about my lesson plans: they’re getting shorter and shorter. I just can’t do it anymore. It’s too restrictive - when you always have to move on, you can’t wait for the pupils because your lesson plan says you must be doing something else. It doesn’t allow you to react to something the pupils have said. So now I have a basic outline and work on that.

Her views on communicative language teaching also produce different responses. She criticises the department for being very ‘teacher-centred’, and feels that ‘teachers should love giving independence to children’. Yet, she seems to feel that the communicative approach is somewhat an imposition:

Yes, indeed, we don’t do what we want - whether we like it or not, we have to use the communicative approach - besides, it has proven to be the best method, so why criticise it.

This very statement seems to have contradictions. A communicative approach has been ‘proven’ to be the best, which is not true, yet it
seems to be imposed and contrary to individual inclinations. Above all teaching practice had a negative effect on the model of language learning that Marie wished to put into operation, whether grounded in the version included in the training programme or her personal inclinations:

I know what you would say. I knew you wouldn’t like it. The book is so dull and boring. I just couldn’t think of anyway to make something of it. And anyway, they have to learn the rules for the grammar test. It’s all traditional here. I’m sinking like everyone else. I’m the only one trying to approach the lessons in this way and to use as much French as possible. All the others just talk away in English, so I’m becoming like one of them. I’m sinking.

But this statement is very dependent on her state at a that particular time. Later, when she is reflecting in her end-of-teaching-practice-questionnaire, she claims to be more confident and have a sense of achievement. She also questions the various approaches to teaching languages. She defines communicative language teaching as ‘initiating enthusiasm’, but realises that enthusiasm itself can be difficult to harness, for example, in using games with pupils. Lessons can also become too ‘entertainment like’. She wonders: ‘I do understand that language should be just a tool or a means and not an end in itself, but do they remember the words or just the need and function they wanted to express’. Yet at the same time, grammar explanations had been ‘inefficient’ and a ‘failure’ for her.

This dilemma was mirrored by Marie’s experience of the demands put on her from various sources; most particularly the school and the university:

To be in between; to implement all these ideas, I thought it was what I had been trained for, so I had to do it. But there was pressure from the department to do something else. But you are marked on the course, so you have to please all parts. If
you come, I think I had better do something communicative. If
the deputy head comes, I think I have to be careful there is
not too much mess in the class. So there were a lot of
parameters.

There is then a tension in her practice, both in being observed and
her own thinking on language teaching. In the first term she reported
anxiety with microteaching and working with the primary school pupils
with language awareness materials. She was clearly nervous about
being observed and often did not feel at ease in the classroom. When
moving away from her native language she was much more self-
conscious, and her own reflections on teaching both in and outside of
the classroom seem to be problematic for her. She seemed to be self-
critical and over-reflective at first. Later, she claimed not to have
the authority to be critical. At another time, she puts failure down
to her incompetence as a teacher, not the approach. Finally, she is
aware of the contrasts involved in language teaching, and no single
emphasis is the answer, and:

I feel that the communicative approach is not yet the right
approach, although it is the right way because the children are
responding....(At the moment) it’s too repetitive...parrot
like. It doesn’t give independence. It teaches a certain way of
communicating; shopping, etc. Everyone is all nice, the
shopkeeper, etc., but when you are in France, the shopkeepers
aren’t like that.

Completing the Course

Marie’s view on language teaching seem to go through stages in the
year. To begin with, she has a very definite model of language and
language teaching. At first, she accepts the communicative approach,
but each encounter in the classroom disrupts both her personal model
and the one she has been presented with, an interpretation of which
she attempts to operationalise. This contrasts with her own practice.
To begin with she is concerned with lesson planning, as a means to
applying the approach; then she is able to produce some lessons where
she can be herself and interact with pupils. Finally, she moves to
standard and routine practice based on published material partly as a
result of the physical effort involved in directly engaging with
pupils, and partly her own contradictory readings of what is expected
from her by different groups of individuals.

Distance - to language, to experience, to theory - again
characterises her relationship with these aspects of her teaching.
Marie has a functional view of language in L1 acquisition:

I get the impression that they (children) use language as a
tool. They are in it. In fact they are the language in some
ways; but now when you learn through the language, you distance
yourself from the language.

This seems to be spoken very much as a native speaker; one who has
experienced language and the experience of using the intimacy of
personal language in pedagogic settings. It is as if the other
students already have this distance from language because they have
learnt French as a second language. However, Marie 'is' her language.
Her lessons are an extension of herself in a very real sense. Lessons
that bring language into question in a problematic way will then also
bring her own identity into question. Such an experience is likely to
be threatening. There is a connection here between language and
experience. Children experience in this direct way, adults cannot.
This phenomenon connects with the language of pedagogic activity in
the classroom:

It was difficult to synchronise the activities and to be
myself; to be in the right place at the right time...I try to
distance myself more...(but)....it depends on what sort of
distance I am. If I stand at the board and stare like this, it
is horrible. But the teacher in the primary school could just
make her presence felt.

This latter teacher had provided Marie with a model of how to 'be'
with classes that connected with pupils in a way that was
interactional, but allowed pupils not to be subjugated in a negative way. The method of language teaching provided on the course had imposed itself negatively in this possible ideal relationship. Indeed, the structure of the relationship was akin to training itself:

I thought you had the teacher, the book and the pupil. And with us, there was you, the communicative approach and us.

In both cases, language and the communicative approach, there existed a problematic medium for the interconnectedness of those involved. By constantly objectifying and reflecting on theory and practice Marie found herself caught in various dilemmas, most noticeably expressed in her quandaries over the approach to language teaching she wanted, and felt obliged to use:

I think that it is important that I can internalise, analyze myself. If you are given a method: this is the way you have to do it and I'm here and I can't see the relation with me to that, so I have to build up one if it is necessary.

Despite sympathies with communicative language teaching Marie was finally very critical of it, and indeed the training process that had presented her with it:

We could have straight away gone on trying to find a good method ourselves all together. For example, we have good linguists, people have got good qualification. We could have tried to teach each other... Try another language unknown to us; maybe then we would have understood the way we had learned.

Yet even here, there are contradictions, as Marie also notes how the very activities and ideas that were 'scatty' and had 'constrained' her, became useful when she was faced with practice. The problem was, however, that she felt that she needed to discuss them, but: 'since I was in school I couldn't'.
Finally, Marie felt that she had destroyed the communicative approach:

I enjoyed destroying it. But this is a good way into new methods.

This statement suggests that some parts of the communicative approach, an idealised form, had been destroyed by her, in theory. There is no evidence from her practice that her own new method had yet come into being. There are many clear indications of what did not work for her and which personal and environmental factors restricted her, but there are also incidents of her having successful experience, which, in the light of previous knowledge and experience, and a number of instrumental features given to her as a result of training, could form the basis for the emergence of the new method she hints at.

Marie went on to obtain a first post locally.
4.4.5 Jackie

Introduction - Beginning of course

The key to understanding Jackie is constant enthusiasm; 'positive' and 'committed'. She came from a teaching family:

'I'm doing what I've always wanted to do. I love teaching ...
I've never enjoyed myself so much.'

It is her attitude and personality that carry her through teacher training; she is rarely critical of anything and seems to look for the positive aspects of every situation. She is extremely verbose and comments vociferously in her autumn term diary on all her experiences during the course. Very early on in the autumn term she opens a dialogue on language teaching. As if mirroring her own attitude to learning, she notes that pupil enthusiasm is the most important factor in determining success in language teaching. She does not so much list features of the communicative approach, as highlight principles behind it and make personal comments and asides. Her diary has a very personal sound to it with reminders to herself. What would her approach be? She constantly calls on the need to be flexible, so that if a class is used to a traditional approach, then she feels that the communicative approach is something towards which one should work. Yet, this flexibility does not seem to extend to others. She is critical of classes she observes for the over use of English in them, and she wants to insist, in her enthusiasm for the communicative approach, that it is applicable to all years. She talks about 'hiding grammar'.

Her comments about teaching are mainly favourable; she plans her lessons well, and has good feedback from the school in which she is placed. Her basic outlook on starting her main teaching practice is probably summed up by her end of term remark that she wants her lessons to be as communicative as the pupils can handle. Her reservations about it centre on how pupils can be made to think creatively and the need for support with the lower ability groups.
Her personality seems to be a positive asset but it also causes frictions. On different occasions she makes negative comments about her fellow students and their attitude. She is, however, self aware enough to note that not everyone can be as enthusiastic as she is and it may get on 'people's nerves'. Still, she feels that it is her 'personality, character and charisma' that are going to be most useful to her as a teacher, rather than her 'academic prowess'. The latter aspect of her fellow students had frightened her at the start of the course. This is a student then with lots of personality and enthusiasm for language teaching, with a commitment to the practical aspects of her training. There are few theoretical disagreements with the content of the course, and she calls for flexibility in approach, as well as the primacy of individual characteristics, be they of the pupils or the teacher.

**Teaching Practice**

Jackie was very happy to be in the school in which she was placed. The first visit by me during teaching practice did not include a lesson observation, as this was not convenient. I noted that she had settled in well. Her lesson plans showed an application of the approach recommended at the university. Thus, presentation, practice and production models, the designation of final dialogues, and a quasi-structural approach to language learning. Clearly, she was needing to be flexible, especially with lower ability classes, for whom she felt she required more strategies. She spoke of needing to plan lessons to match where the pupils were, and to build up to the communicative approach before half term. At the moment the pupils did not understand it when she spoke French. Therefore, she clearly had a strategy for implementing her intended approach in its full form. She was aware of the demands of her position. She spoke of the fact that she had not at first been performing the teacher role that pupils expected. An example of this was the need to discipline and punish pupils, which she now had done with the effect that the pupil was behaving. She had also praised another pupil who commented herself that she needed encouraging. This notion possibly came from advice within the school, and certainly her department were very supportive.
of her. Her enthusiasm continued to brim over, and I noted I was somewhat overwhelmed personally by the very verbosity of what she was saying; that there were hardly moments for my own comments and she seemed self-contained - 'a hermeneutic cycle of her own'. These remarks suggest a student with strong 'classification'; in other words, impervious to outside influences. Theoretically, students are generally strongly 'classified' (for protection), and weakly framed as they do not have very much control over what goes on: the school, pupils, departments and me in my role as tutor all seem to have more influence than them. This picture is not so clear cut in Jackie's case, as she seems to be experiencing, responding and modifying in the school context; there is however the question of appearances created by her comments and reality. It could be that Jackie was giving this impression of flexibility whilst remaining quite rigid in her outlook and in the schemes she wished to apply. Myself, as tutor, seemed almost to be excluded, to have no position in this in the range of her experience; either because I am outside of it, she did not need this support, or because I was a threat. The fact that none of the incidents of criticism of her are commented upon gives the impression that Jackie saw her task in individual terms. She overcame criticism and problems by either brushing them aside or taking individually initiated action. For example, she is disappointed when she has to have recourse to the Head of Department over a disciplinary matter. She seems to see the main responsibility for what happens in lessons to be very much her own. Help is needed for moral support, but essentially she is in charge.

During these early days Jackie continued to engage with a dialogue with herself concerning both language teaching and herself as a teacher. She is more descriptive than analytic, and many of her comments concern classroom management; thus, 'I consciously tried to be quicker today', and 'must learn names as quickly as possible'. As ever, she is very positive. Her first note is 'brilliant day', and she later writes that she cannot stop talking about her classes. There are also minor criticisms; for example, 'planned too much - need to focus on smaller element of the topic'. These comments show a very extensive insight into the various aspects of teaching, both
methodological and organisational.

The second visit from me, and actually the first lesson observed, took place two weeks after the first visit. Jackie was taking a Year 11 group, with whom she claimed to be revising the imperfect tense.

**Lesson Structure** (50 mins. Year 11 French)

**Oral Presentation** - OHP
- Flashcards

**Writing** - OHP
- Exercise Books

**Homework**

The lesson showed a clear commitment to using the target language for classroom discourse, both in learning and organisational mode. Thus:

T: On va commencer

Est-ce que vous avez la feuille de papier qu'on vous a donné, hier? comme ça........

Qu’est-ce que c’est une photo.........

..........Je mange du chocolat......... etc.

The opening sequence of work demonstrates a number of classroom discourse techniques, and issues involved in a presentation, practice, production model of teaching:

T: Qu’est-ce que c’est mignon?
P: Cute
T: Oui, Je joue avec le chat.
Dans le photo, j’ai trois ans...Quelle âge ai-je?
P: You’re three
T: (Writes on Board)
A trois ans, je mangeais du chocolat
Qu’est-ce que ça veut dire?
P: When I was three I ate chocolate
T: Yes, when I was three, I ate chocolate
I used to eat
T: (Repeats with 'limonade')
P: I drank
T: Or I used to drink
T: (Repeats with flowers)
P: I liked
T: I used to like
( -> Description: I had blond hair, etc. in French)
P: I was
T: I used to be

etc

There are at least two levels of discourse going on in the above extract. Firstly, a learning one where Jackie is presenting information about herself to the pupils in French. This is very teacher centred, semantic-syntactically, with the pupils being put in a position of passive recipient. There is therefore a need for Jackie to involve them in the subject content, but, because of the structure of the language example used, she is forced to revert to translation into English, both to engage the pupils and check the pedagogic level of what she is working with. This second pedagogic level also includes the implicit teaching point: the imperfect tense. However, the example demonstrates the problematic issue of at least three English applications for the one form in French; thus, 'Je buvais' in French could be translated in English as 'I drank', 'I used to drink' or 'I was drinking'. Jackie is indicating the 'used to' form by correcting the pupils in each case, but it is unclear from their translations to what extent they understand the distinction between the perfect and imperfect tense. It also seems that Jackie has a specific pedagogic intent in correcting them that it is not at all clear the pupils are perceiving. They certainly do not follow the pattern she is trying to construct.

The lesson continues with transformation exercises to be rewritten using the imperfect form, again based on who Jackie was and what she did, compared to the present day. The pedagogic intent is again
conveyed by frequent translations into English and the presentation and form of the exercise. Jackie does engage in language that attempts to convey the organisational intent of what the pupils have to do with the inner dialogue of the example:

T: Et maintenant, il pense, ah..quand j'avais 20 ans..Il faut écrire

There is a ‘double dialogue’ here: one between the person who is reputedly thinking to himself; and a second narrative one that allows Jackie to contextualise the speaker. The statement from Jackie attempts to relocate the tense - Et maintenant - the person speaking - il - and the temporal direction of this personal reflection - quand j’avais 20 ans. All this is combined with an organisational instruction - il faut écrire. Yet, at this point in the lesson, there is no indication that pupils can deal with this level of sophistication.

Twenty minutes into the lesson and, after another contrastive example based on Jackie, there is an example of a genuine dialogue involving pupil and teacher, although significantly it does not involve the focus of the teaching point of this lesson:

T: Maintenant, je joue au squash. Comme toi, oui?
Tu joues au squash?
P: Oui
T: Où ça?
P: A Appelmore
T: Ah bon, tu joues au squash à Appelmore
Mais à trois ans, je jouais avec mon frère.

The follow-up to this sequence is for pupils to write as the teacher based on an OHP gap filling exercise using the imperfect tense. There are asides where Jackie attempts to insist on French dialogue:

P: Do you have a piece of paper?
T: Est-ce que vous pouvez dire ça en français?
P: Est-ce que vous avez une pièce de papier?
T: Hmm. OK Here you are.

There are also further example of 'double dialogue'; for example,


The lesson concludes with a French, followed by an English explanation of homework: drawn pictures and imperfect descriptions of habits, etc.

This lesson shows an early attempt to create a communicative context. Many of the difficulties encountered in this attempt are inherent in the model methodology; in this case, the isolation and practice of structure. That being said, there are different features to note. Firstly, the language structure and example are very teacher centred, and there is minimum effort to engage directly with the pupils in the target language. Secondly, there are at least two levels to the dialogue; the ideal one that Jackie has planned, and the actual one that Jackie needs to create in situ in order to sustain a flowing pedagogic situation. This latter is one that will contain enough features such as support structures and organisational techniques for them to comply with what Jackie is demanding. To this extent the lesson does do this. Thirdly, Jackie is attempting to teach/revise a particular language point and combine this with an image of the communicative classroom that sets a high premium on target language use. Finally, there are two functions of the lesson structure and language: pedagogic and managerial, and the latter impinges on the former.

Our post lesson discussion covered a number of communicative language teaching principles on which Jackie was eager to comment in the light of experience:
Target language - at first they didn’t know ‘il faut’ or ‘on doit’, so I taught it to them. So, I had them up touching arms, etc. It’s the thing about target language; you’ve got to introduce it slowly.

Attitude pervades all, and I again comment on her confidence and eagerness to please. She is still aware of what she must do; thus she says she has come a long way and now plans in detail, as she will not have time next year. Certainly, her materials are beautifully produced; but I make negative comments about the way the material passes from ‘I’ teacher to ‘he/she’ teacher without the pupils getting a chance to refer to themselves. Besides the reasons given above, there is evidence from her diary that one of the reasons for this is the need for structure to control the classes. To begin with Jackie presents an extremely positive image of her teaching, which she says she loves. However, slowly the reality of the classes begin to question this view. Thus, a year 9 French class (9F7) become her problem group; another year 9 group, who she had reported as ‘loving being stretched’ cause her problems; and in the class of the above lesson two pupils had previously sworn at her. At this stage, she uses at least two strategies to respond to these: firstly, she finds external causes, such as ‘fridayitis’; secondly, she increasingly uses classroom activity as a means to gaining control - thus, ‘a calming wordsearch’ to start. Jackie seems to be very ‘self-centred’ in these lessons; both in terms of her sealed, almost over enthusiastic attitude, with which she is almost outwardly impervious, and the actual lesson plan and structure, which does not really engage with pupils’ own lives. When a class punctures this enthusiasm and confidence, and she has to ask for outside help, she is ‘shattered’. Yet, Jackie moves to cope with this feeling. So, by the end of week 3, and continually confronted by her difficult year 9 class, she decides to join their after school drama class in order ‘to facilitate getting to know them rather than be in permanent conflict’. This tactic seems to have an immediate effect on her, both in terms of the group in particular, who she reports as being ‘much better’, and her general outlook. In week 5 she is commenting about ‘another good lesson controlled by ‘moi’ ‘ and a ‘brilliant idea’
concerning lesson design. After these events, she does continue to have sporadic problems and crises, but these continue to be explained very much in terms of lesson planning; in other words, problems with the design, sequence and conception of activities rather than her fundamental relationship with classes:

(she falls) into the trap of introducing a menu without preparing what each item was before (and with year 11) their lack of vocabulary means that 50 mins. is spent introducing vocabulary and cramming a few sentences in at the end.

It is half-term and Jackie is exhausted. There is, however, some evidence to suggest that the price for her high enthusiasm and positive attitude, something that she evidently sees as being central to her potential success, is a certain detachment from areas of criticism. She has clearly moved to ‘deal’ with pupil problems, although it is unclear to what extent she is entering into a pedagogic relationship with them and to what extent she is merely crowding out misbehaviour with an overbearing personality and insistence on busyness. For the rest of her training Jackie refers to her department as being helpful and supportive, but there are no details of advice given to her. In her penultimate week she is observed three times but there is no comment on what was said. Just before half-term, one teacher observes her and says~

say...

that her activities were confusing, but Jackie does not elaborate on these comments. They seem to be brushed aside. My visits go recorded, although nothing is said about feedback or comments. Again, the impression is that Jackie is closed to outside influence: she identifies and deals with her own problems; threats to her personal self image of what she has to do and how she has to do it are kept at a distance. Where things do break through she deals with them in order to return her to where she wants to be, and the state in which she wants to be. Poor lessons are often explained in terms of various constraining factors: ‘horrible negative lesson cramming them with pattern practice’, ‘group still low on vocabulary, ‘writing lessons to quiet them down - not very communicative ’, ‘trying to cover the book ties me down so much’. A week after half-term finds her again
having discipline problems and exhausted, and she has to take some
time off. The impression is one of sheer physical and mental
exhaustion in keeping up the level of energy and positiveness she has
set herself: and, after resting, there is again an act of will in not
only making 'brilliant' lessons but insisting on them being
brilliant. Yet, there is nothing in my observations or those from the
school to suggest that her actual lessons were that good. Everyone
accepted that as a teacher she had a great deal to offer in terms of
energy, personality and commitment. That her lessons were good on
occasion, is clear, but there is little evidence from the recorded
data that she was yet able to operationalise her thoughts about the
sort of lesson she had in mind. Indeed, it is as if her ideals ran
ahead of her practice.

My third visit to her took place one week after half term and
involved a year 8 French class.

Lesson Structure (45 mins. Year 8 French)
Oral Presentation - Flashcards
Writing - OHP
- Exercise Books
Oral Presentation - OHP
Listening - Tape
Visual Presentation/ Writing - OHP
Speaking - T/P
Game

At one point in my notes I comment that it is the wrong lesson at the
wrong time - a period five of five. Essentially, the lesson is built
around the presentation and practice of locations around the town.
This is done through flashcards, copying of vocabulary and a
listening exercise. As before, there is a mixture of French and
English, the latter being used for organisational and disciplinary
reasons:

T: Eh bien. Quiet.
(Noisy beginning. Ps coming from Maths.):
I've marked your books and I want to say two things - some of
you I want to see because you haven’t done all of your work - I want to see all of your books on Friday, so that they are up to date

(2 pupils give out books)

Quelle est la date aujourd’hui?
P: Mercredi
T: (Writes Mercredi on board
Et la date ? le.....?
P: vingt-sept
T: Oui, le vingt-sept février
Ouvrez vos livres et écrivez la date

There is a real sense that Jackie is having trouble controlling this class. Having got them writing, she gives them the title of the topic of the day: 'Bienvenue à Boulogne'. She is using this to indicate that the pupils must do what she says, but it is only partially successful:

T: Après la date, écrivez...... Can you stop talking about your marks and write what I’ve told you.......Eh bien, commence...Some of these words you know, and some of them you don’t....(with flashcards) Le château, le parc.... I’m not continuing with this much noise. This lesson goes on until lunchtime - we can continue then if you like.

What follows is a fairly standard presentation of vocabulary using flashcards and 3-stage questioning, although there are frequent interjections concerning disciplinary matters:

T: C’est le parc ou l’auberge de jeunesse. Look, if you don’t shut up, you can go to see Miss Cole. C’est l’auberge de jeunesse ou le parc
P: C’est le parc

etc.
From this activity, pupils go on to write out the vocabulary, along with the English next to it. While they do this, Jackie moves around the class to answer questions in English. One incident is dealt with firmly:

T: Get up...I'm fed up with speaking to you. Get outside...You'll need a book and a chair

Jackie then orally presents family members and locations:

T: Où est mon père?
Il est dans le parc...
(writes: où est mon père?...Il est dans la maison)
P: Have we got to write this down, Miss?
T: Not yet
Qu'est-ce que cela veut dire en Anglais?....(elicits translation + other examples)
Il est où?
P: Dans le marché
(P): Have we got to write this down?
T: No, I'm going to play the tape now and I want you to make a note of which relative and where they are.

The pupils then do this activity with Jackie playing the tape of five examples, with extra explanations in English between each playing. Interestingly, when Jackie goes through the activity with the answers she starts by giving the English of the person and the location; for example, 'No. 1, Brother and market'. This is despite her claim in the end of autumn term interview that she had not heard one listening comprehension that did not involve translation and her intention not to do this. In fact, it is a pupil who points out the illogically of this:

P: If we haven't got it right, how are we to know the correct French?
This results in Jackie writing the French whilst providing an English translation. The lesson ends; firstly, with the pupils making a sentence that involve them, or at least the 'je' form, whilst Jackie takes in the marks; secondly, she attempts a language chain game, with the pupils repeating the previous statements and adding location vocabulary to each. The bell goes, however, and the lesson is brought to an end.

Clearly, this lesson represents an attempt to apply a standard model as given at the university. This attempt might be for different reasons; for example, Jackie wants to please her tutor or she finds it a particularly useful approach. It is also a model that has perhaps been specifically designed to maximise teacher control, anticipating disciplinary issues. There are evident disciplinary problems in the lesson, although interestingly, this group is not referred to in her diary notes as causing her particular difficulties. Yet, in her discussion with me after the lesson, she does cite discipline as being her biggest problem: 'I don't seem to be able to get enough control of them'. She recognises that a lot of her language work is structured so as to keep control; and she feels she has to write things down because pupils expect it; presumably for their own support and sense of security. What is noticeable, however, is that even though Jackie is evidently having problems with discipline, unable to create the lessons she would like and conforming to pupil demands, she is in fact engaging and responding to pupils. Moreover, she is having some experience at least of the type of lesson she is aiming at:

T: One group I had, I just flung myself in it and I was the waitress. And they were going 'Kellnerin' and ordering meals, etc. I had them just....I'm not sure how to express it...(Holding cupped hands) I held them, just, just like that. It was marvellous....I'm with them just there. Like it's being totally there with them. And that's a joy.
There is clearly a sense of oneness in these incidents, where Jackie feels the pupils and she herself are working together.

Most of her teaching practice diary notes then continue with a sense of bravado to the end of term; thus, a writing activity works 'perfectly'. Later, she seems to lay her doubts about her academic ability to rest in terms of teaching, as she feels she has never enjoyed her language so much: 'like at college it was o.k., but now I’m totally into it'. Her enthusiasm is reflected in the way she integrates socially into the school staffroom, where she involves herself in everything that is going on around her.

The experience of teaching practice seemed to refine rather than substantially alter her views on language teaching. In the end of TP questionnaire, the communicative approach was expressed as the goal of teaching, but it needed to be tailored for each class at a particular time of the week; and brighter pupils expected grammar explanations out of context. In other words, she was compromising her beliefs in line with the pupils. Target language use was also something towards which you moved gradually. She also felt that for the lower ability groups, the further from grammar the better.

Completing the Course

By the end of year, she was saying that she felt that she had passed her driving test but did not yet have a car (unlike Jill who did not admit to really having her hands on the steering wheel). She again reiterated how 'mindblasted' the first term had been, and how the summer term had gone off the boil somewhat. The image she had of herself was less as a good linguist than as the teacher who made lessons enjoyable for those pupils who were not the best linguists. Teaching was therefore seen as a matter of relationships for Jackie; of keeping pupils interest and making sure they were not disobedient. Jackie also expressed the whole process of training as relational, and, in particular, the part I played in it:
One of the turning points or great things was a couple of weeks ago on the Monday. A rediscussion of the communicative approach. Although I did not partake in that debate, that was a great point for me because I could see that the point of you introducing the approach as and when you did - and it made sense of the whole year. Although different people in the group - it was coming across as a conflict situation. They were questioning your interpretation of the approach but it all came together for me: of course you have to have an approach that is presented to you and for some people it is going to fit the way they work, and for others it’s not, so they’ll modify it. But we need the original approach.

Jackie saw my method in asking the students to take the approach on board in a basic, preliminary form and then problematise it:

You’ve set yourself up - you’ve allowed things to be questioned...you’ve moved on again. You’re allowing people to question the communicative approach... you’ve even hinted that it’s in question in your own mind as well.

Jackie had also begun to do this. However, she was not questioning the theoretical underpinning she understood to be the communicative approach, neither was she trying to justify an alternative approach. She was, however, drawing conclusions from her experience:

In Teaching Practice I spent so much time doing all the work. When I was planning a lesson to 11 o’clock at night, I would be thinking: then I’ll do this and then I’ll do that. At the special school I planned a couple of lessons with the emphasis on the kids doing the work...And it hit me then that it was far easier, and far more beneficial if they do all the work rather than me.... (On teaching practice) I thought I was being child-centred about a lot of the activities...I thought it was being communicative but it wasn’t that refined...I was still the contact in the role play.. and rather than going for the full production I would be going around interacting with the groups
rather than leaving them to do their own thing.

In actual fact, this amounted to designing 'lessons to allow for extra things to come in rather than the final dialogue that you presented in the lesson plans'. This came about through 'building on lessons you've done before, re-introducing things, so that they still feel they are able to bring things in from previous lessons, previous final dialogue sessions, and also giving them scope to bring in things they've done away from the classroom'. This last point had been given to Jackie by a language adviser. The totality of the views expressed here are good examples of two things. Firstly, is the way a notion for Jackie is now grasped with a dynamic sense of reality and applicability, whilst before it had only been recognised theoretically. I had previously, on two occasions at least, made the point to her that her lessons could be more personalised. Yet she had not grasped this as an urgent issue at the time. In the second lesson I observed, Jackie referred to an example of her already doing personalised work in response to my criticism, although this seemed to be a rare occurrence. Secondly, the issue of personalisation had come into Jackie's mind with a sense of urgency and practical intent as a result of this idea being fed and created from different sources; thus, me, her lesson teaching experience, her lesson planning experience, another language adviser, experience gained in a different school, and reflections on the common features of all these. Of course, there is still the question of the extent to which Jackie was able to go on and operationalise these realisations in practice but at least in her mind there is the intent and an awareness of newer models of language teaching and how lessons could be organised.

Finally, there is no real indication that Jackie has solved the CLT 'problem' for herself. At best it is expressed at a series of half-contradictory intentions and statements. For example, she earlier criticises an extensive use of English in the classroom but then goes on to do the same thing herself. Nevertheless, she does keep sight of the idea that what pupils do is more important than simply cramming language in; although, here again, her realisation of this up to this
point is less impressive than her putting it into practice. Similarly, she holds on to the idea that planning is part of the solution; in other words, the methodological choices that are made. Finally, however, there remains the impression that what is lacking in both language theory and practice is compensated for by Jackie by sheer strength of personality.

Jackie went on to be offered a post in the same school in which she did her teaching practice.
4.4.6 Carol

Introduction - Beginning of course

The particular feature that stands out in considering Carol is her background upon entering the course. She applied just before the course began. At interview she explained that having become a successful consultant trainer with an international firm in the West End of London, she wanted to abandon this career in order to become a teacher. At this time, she had all the trappings of success: expensive car, designer clothes, executive lifestyle, etc. Despite personal doubts on my part, not least about her rusty language skills, she was accepted onto the course.

Early on she showed her willingness to adapt and become part of the group, being a highly sociable and personable student. She also changed her appearance in order to reflect her change in status. Clearly, she enjoyed her new environment; being part of a group rather than responsible for it. She showed exemplary effort; giving detailed and extensive notes in her diary about every aspect of the course. There was then a meticulousness and exhaustive thoroughness in her autumn term that went way beyond the requirements of the task. In her pre-course questionnaire, Carol stated that she had gained professionally and personally from learning languages; which she used to argue was the value of them. Her early views of the necessary attributes for being successful were attitudinal; early success was important, as were open-mindedness, positive perceptions, a willingness to apply oneself and 'profit' from mistakes. This focus on the learner attitude rather than a particular methodological approach extended into her thoughts about the autumn term:

The generation of a positive attitude toward language learning at the earliest opportunity could prove immediately more valuable than the early assimilation of a few key phrases.

Towards the end of her autumn term teaching experience she is overriding the contradictions she feels between experience and ideal,
her theory and practice, in terms of motivation:

There is a real danger in demanding too little of pupils – to do so is to remove from them the potential for sense of achievement, which they would have attained (Herzberg’s theory of motivation).

She is here reflecting on her previous knowledge and experience in training to provide a theoretical explanation for a disquiet she feels about the language teaching she has focused on this term. The reasons for limitation of success can be put down to affective, attitudinal, motivational factors. This opinion comes out in early sessions where she stresses motivation as a key factor in language learning and enquires into its content: ‘does the principle of self/peer esteem act as a positive or negative factor within the classroom?’ By the end of the autumn term she is expressing this in explicit theoretical terms:

\[(\text{performance} = \text{skills} + \text{knowledge})...\text{You can teach people skills and knowledge, but all that is multiplied by attitude. If you don’t get the attitude, it doesn’t matter what you teach them in terms of the skills and knowledge...you must get to the stage where all three are at the right level to get the job done.}\]

Carol seems to be adopting a quasi-deductive view of knowledge; that she can extrapolate objective principles from reflecting on practice and articulate them in such a way that they can be reapplied.

On her first unaccompanied teaching in the autumn term, she clearly has to adopt an ironic tone:

Having tackled the ‘why do we have to learn French/’ queries and established myself in a ‘non-pushover’ role, we settle down to the riveting subject of ‘ma chambre.’

The ironic stance, slightly tongue-in-cheek, is a way of distancing
herself from the experience; the imagined ideal and the reality. Humour is a good way of making light of a disturbing context. This attitude combines with what she describes as her ‘scepticism’ in microteaching about how much pupils would learn from a given sequence.

She had described how she would be able to personalise language a little more, but, nearer to the event, she notes:

I felt that they would benefit from clarification of a few basic grammatical points, which were severely inhibiting their ability to communicate.

On another occasion she prepares a lesson ‘strictly by the book’. It entails the presentation and practice of the partitive, but she feels ‘guilty’ that grammar, ‘or structure, as it is now euphemistically called’ is forbidden, so she has to compromise with colour codes and the listing of masculine and feminine words. She concludes:

It is surely more difficult to grasp usage of the partitive if one has not learnt the general rule which can be applied to a multitude of situations.

There are contradictions in her experience and thus intentions, but she is willing to adapt and already feels there is something she can do. At the end of the autumn term she highlights the way she had been able to personalise some of the work with pupils by using cosmetics and information about homes, etc. and claims that it is impossible to teach the perfect tense with pupils of low ability. Communicative language teaching is full of contradictions for her. She seems to claim that the low ability pupils cannot cope with grammar, so a more orally based approach is needed. But if pupils are going to write at some stage, they are going to need the ‘basics’. Yet she ‘still finds it difficult to imagine how people can learn a language if they never learn the difference between accusative and dative’ and claims ‘to find it difficult to distinguish between a notion and a function’. It is as if she is willing to try a new approach, but, when faced with
limited success in her own terms, she reverts to the 'basics'.

We might say, therefore, that Carol has a mixed model of language teaching; she has selected some of the positive, experiential elements of communicative language teaching which connect with her notions of attitudinal factors as determinant of success. She also has a model based on her own past experience that she can only partially abandon in theory. In practice, she does not seemed to have had much positive experience of an alternative view of language learning aside from some motivational enhancement by personalising work with pupils with special needs.

With reference to the culture shock of coming from retail training to schools, there is nothing in what Carol says that suggests that the move is regretted:

I was prepared for facilities to be worse than they really are. It's bad when you're using an OHP and you have one hand clamped to it because the thing is falling down. That's not terribly good but it hasn't been so different than in industry. You see training in organisations is always the department that operates with the lowest funds and is cut first.

And on her change of lifestyle:

You have a nice house, but you're never there...you sleep all weekend to recover...you feel you are on the sidelines watching this life.....quality of life is an important consideration, even though teachers are underpaid and do not have ideal conditions at work..the quality of life is better.

Teaching Practice

Carol was happy to go and teach in the school in which she had been placed. There is an initial 'honeymoon period', followed by the first hints of problems; year 8 are 'gregarious' and a 'delight to teach' (sarcastic); year 10 'resemble a bunch of beauty advisers on a bad day'; and 'year 9 shows signs of being a challenge'. The ironic tone
again seems to hint at the disturbing aspect of initial contact with these classes. I previously commented on Carol’s insistence that attitudinal factors are the most important key to successful language learning. In this respect, her worst fears are confirmed, as in her second week she reports:

pupils’ negative attitudes - are they trying it on or do they really see it as no use to them.

Such attitudes clearly also give rise to various disciplinary problems for Carol, which require a tougher approach than the one she adopted previously:

(teaching) demands stricter group control: a gentle reprimand leaves a group of trainees feeling ashamed. It has no impact on the year 9.

All this makes plain to her that the gap between teaching and training is wider than she had first imagined. By week 2, therefore, experience has had a profound effect on her view of herself and teaching. She had previously seen attitudinal factors as being the key to successful teaching and learning, but here she finds herself in situations that negate this factor: what then is the likelihood of success? Moreover, there had been a previous tendency to think that teaching could be mastered as she was already master of training. An underlying support to this premise had been removed. Her dialogue on actual language teaching remained. Now the communicative approach is seen as an aid to discipline and attitude, as ‘it has taken the emphasis away from the more taxing aspects of language’. Approach to language teaching shifts away from real learning, pupil involvement and the teacher taking the responsibility for how the classroom is organised to a tactic to contain pupils’ disaffection. She does not, however, initially submit to this move but states quite explicitly that even though pupils enjoy ‘competitive, participative activities, the major challenge lies in ensuring that they learn something from these activities, do not just see them as an easy option’. She continues to debate the relative merits of a communicative versus
grammar approach and seems to begin to sense an alternative to the communication through structural grammar model that she reworked so often in the autumn term:

if they are not aware of the correct grammatical form, they won't appreciate the difference between their response and my corrected repetition; if they cannot appreciate the difference, they are unlikely to learn the correct form. Perhaps more 'discovery based' learning is necessary with a great deal of pattern practice.

In week 3 Carol catches a cold. I visit, but there is no comment on this. Faced with negative attitudes, she decides to embark on a project with her Year 9 class, the first lesson of which is observed by me.

**Lesson Structure (60 mins. Year 9 French)**

- Oral Presentation - Brochures
- Reading - Worksheets
- Oral Work - P/T
  - P/P
- Set-up of Project - Sheets
  - Brochures

The introduction to this lesson used translation for making organisational language explicit:

T: Nous avons étudié les hôtels, les régions, les spécialités. Pendant cette leçon vous êtes les propriétaires et vous allez faire un dépliant avec les détails de l'hôtel.

O.K. you've studied hotels and the specialities of the region. Today you are going to make a brochure with the details of the hotel.

P: ........

T: D'abord, nous sommes au syndicat d'initiative

O.K. What we are going to do is have numerous brochures, etc. of France and you're going to prepare something on your region.
I hope we'll make a poster but to do that you're going to have to ask at the syndicat.

Carol went on to give the pupils a model dialogue based on a conversation in a tourist office; the exercise is for pupils to read for five minutes and to note down vocabulary not understood. This sequence was followed up with Carol checking and translating vocabulary:

T: Vous avez fini?
Moi, je suis Steve
Vous êtes les employés
Vous commencez s.v.p.
P: Bonjour Monsieur
T: Bonjour Monsieur
Vous avez une auberge de jeunesse?
Qu'est-ce que c'est en Anglais?
P: .......
Youth Hostel

This conversation mixes imagined context with classroom pedagogic practice and organisational moves, much as the others students did. There is the request if pupils have finished, the switch to imagined role, which, in this case entails a change of gender, then the practice of a situationally based conversation which collapses into a move for vocabulary clarification. The sequence was repeated with two other town sites, and then Carol reverted to English to organise pupils into pairs for the purposes of the project. She then went through a number of regions in France explaining their relative characteristics: foods, monuments, leisure activities. Carol had a number of information packs but the pupils would not get the 'info 'til' they asked her. There was further support material in the form of photocopies from Tricolore. For the second half an hour of the lesson pupils worked in pairs on the materials. Finally, the bell went and pupils packed up and left with no further comment to the class as a whole from Carol, although she had spent a good deal of the lesson troubleshooting.
The main feature of this lesson was the fact that little direct teaching took place. Instead, the lesson was decentralised: the pupils mostly worked on their own from materials prepared by Carol. There is no doubt that a great deal of time and effort went into preparing the information packs, and Carol and the Head of Department subsequently commented about both the quality of the materials Carol produced, and indeed the time it took her to prepare them; reputedly six hours each night. But in this case the impression is that the materials and project are a way of diverting attention away from a direct relationship with Carol as a teacher. Even the inputs that are included in this lesson seem to be confined to giving pupils as briefly as possible all they need to get by on their own. This approach could well be a way of avoiding confrontation; both in terms of language and lesson planning and discipline. She had problems with this group, had threatened detentions, but was still steeling herself 'to do the deed'. The use of target language in the lesson seems to be a gesture rather than a definite decision in what language was to be used, why, and for what purpose. Clearly, there was little productive language use on the part of pupils. Carol claimed that this would come later, although she notes herself that she is 'dubious about the fact that they are all using English to communicate with each other'. Asking her about the lesson proved quite difficult and it was clear that Carol felt defensive. Questions and comments by me were therefore seen as having to be defended. In such a position it is difficult to discuss openly in a way that will allow a sharing of knowledge and experience. The projects seem to be successful; the pupils appear interested, and, she writes that moving on to the topic of travel and accommodation proved easier after the projects had been presented some four week later. However, the impression that her motive in doing the project is to avoid demanding too much effort and application from pupils is underlined somewhat when she herself comments:

( the) downside seems to lie with the 'pre-communicative' aspects. I am making a rod for my own back when classes expect every lesson to be enjoyable. The presentation and practice activities do involve the class in the odd bit of concentration
and hard work which is less well received.

With this class, success seems to be expressed in terms of keeping them positive, even to the point of sacrificing pedagogic objectives. With other groups she is able to continue her reflection on alternative approaches to language teaching. Here again, a communicative approach is seen as inductive, with all its resultant problems. In pattern practice: 'they identify key structures in the context of one situation and don't transfer them to another context; 'je voudrais' becomes an opening used in a restaurant or shop rather than a means of expressing what they would like to do/play/see/visit', and she feels that this approach takes longer than the old-fashioned 'learn-by-heart' method. Such a statement can only be made from conclusions drawn on immediate experience. The problems seen with a pattern practice approach to communicative language teaching are based on immediately perceived results of its application. It is not surprising therefore to see Carol expressing her own success in the apparent acquisition of grammar structures; notably the identification of 'ich' and 'wir' endings by her year 8 group, which she judges a 'significant achievement'.

Faced by difficult groups, however, her tendency is to avoid potential problems by reverting to gimmicks and a rather over-personal attitude to pupils, as a way of compensating in her relationship with them for their negative and destructive attitudes. By week 5 she is using video with classes, which they enjoy. This move seems to be another strategy to entertain the pupils rather than confront the question of the difficulty she has in designing any sort of lesson, either grammatical or communicative, that will engage the pupils in a pedagogic relationship.

In week 5 my second visit takes place.

Lesson Structure (50 mins. Year 8 German)
Pair Work - Worksheets
Listening - Tape
  - Worksheets
This second observed lesson began with Carol handing out sheets to pupils as they entered the room with which they were to speak to each other and find out prepared names, jobs and where they live. A second sheet dealt with bus lines and their destinations. The organisational aspects of the lesson were achieved through a mixture of German and French:

T: Put your names, die Namen, on the sheets
Wir machen eine Tabellen

This initial input from Carol happened against a background of a very laid back introduction. There was no formal coming together. Rather, Carol preferred to smile and chat to pupils as they entered the classroom. She was very 'smiley', almost charming them, and friendly.

Carol provided the necessary questions on an OHP and explained in German, then English, how they had to fill in information obtained from their conversation. By the time pupils commenced the activity, there had been no dialogue between her and the pupils as a class in German or English. The next activity, some 20 minutes into the lesson involved Carol eliciting the information obtained by the pupils and awarding points for it. The German was kept to organisational matters, and always translated. There seemed to be no teacher input; rather Carol was organising pupils to work on their own. She then acted to award points, check success and move onto the next activity. In this case the follow-up used the second sheet she had given pupils. This time, from a taped dialogue, pupils had to give bus destinations. A sequence of mixed German and English was used to set the activity up, which again left the pupils engaging in work that did not require further input from Carol.
T: Ruhe, Bitte
Schlag in ihrem Hefte. Seite 120, 120
P: One hundred and twenty. (translates
T: Letze Seite
Nächste Woche wurden wir Kapital H beginnen
Heute, wir werden 7 dialogen aufhören. Wir müssen in die
Tabelle die Antworten schreiben
Zum Beispiel, Nummer 1 in der dialogue ist: Welche Bus fährt an
Chanfield
(repeats)
Sie schreiben A. You write A
OK, what you have to do is listen and work out from the
dialogue where the bus is going. Give it whatever letter it
corresponds to in the book.
(The tape is then played)

A similar format to the first exercise of giving the answers and
taking in the marks followed. Between these two activities, the
following conversation occurred:

Ps: Can we have a bug competition?
T: O.K. we'll get onto the next and then I'll get the bugs
Ps: Great
T: Ich werde die Bugs suchen. I'll get the bugs after the next
exercise.

It transpired that Carol had been handing out 'bugs', small
promotional furry creatures that she had previously obtained from her
job, to pupils as rewards for good work. It is difficult to justify
this, as it is likely to cause resentment from those pupils not
getting good scores, hence not getting a bug, and therefore becoming
even more demotivated. Presumably, Carol gave a bug to every pupil
irrespective of their score in the listening exercise. Clearly, they
enjoyed this and it did give a positive character to the lesson;
something which Carol had gone to great lengths to secure from the
moment the pupils walked into the room. She had succeeded in gaining
the pupils' approval. Her Head of Department was similarly
complimentary of her. In fact, she was exemplary in several areas: work with pupils, commitment, lesson preparation, materials, attendance at meetings, attitude to advice and criticism and organisation. Many of these features clearly relate to her own belief in attitude and motivation as a driving force and key to success; and Carol seemed not only to adopt such an approach openly herself but conspired to produce it in others, even to the point of ‘seducing’ classes into liking her lessons. Her materials were of an extremely professional standard, reflecting the level of quality she sought to establish and maintain in her previous job. It is as if this will solve the problem of language teaching for her. However, none of this can disguise the rather poor conception and execution of the lesson. Firstly, the various parts of the lesson do not seem to connect, and there is no clear direction to it. Secondly, her use of German, which is sporadic, is limited to parallel gestures in organisational matters. Thirdly, at no point does Carol engage in dialogue, either in English or German, which requires pupils to respond to points arising from the lesson materials. In fact, the activities themselves seem designed to keep pupils occupied, and are limited to question/answer sequences that they either work on themselves or solve from predesigned printed materials. In both cases, the pupils are passive with respect to Carol. Whilst pupils work in pairs, she avoids the issue of knowing exactly what they are doing, or indeed interacting with them. The teacher led activities in the lesson take place under test conditions with Carol directing from the tape recorder rather than involving herself in a two-way interaction over the pedagogic content. Carol then becomes checker and organiser. This suggests a student that as yet is failing to engage in a working relationship with pupils; either pedagogically or disciplinary. She substitutes well prepared activities and bribes for the development of a critical understanding of what she is designing in lessons and for what purpose. The good relationship that she has managed to create with pupils is one that is not based on pedagogic principles but personal, attitudinal ones. Presumably this relates to Carol’s belief in the necessity of good attitudes as a prerequisite to effective learning, which seems to make the actual lesson content incidental.
By half way through her teaching practice she is pleased at the way things are going, although the question of discipline dominates as Carol states that she is disappointed at how authoritarian and autocratic she had to become. She feels that the above lesson was successful ‘as it did represent a relatively successful attempt to build vocabulary and concepts with which the class was familiar in the singular form and use them in the plural - i.e. ich, wir, er, sie - the class responded with gusto’. Given that this interpretation does not fit in with my view of the lesson, either then or now, it is clear that Carol is still thinking in terms of success as the teaching and production of structure, albeit it in a more orally based form:

Certainly, some children are better served being taught situations they can use rather than to write a grammatically accurate business letter. Also, the fact that they feel more confident to do so. What I did suited me for A-level but I was woefully inadequate in buying a train ticket. However, do the pupils understand why I address them as ‘ihr’ in one context and ‘euch’ in another?

There seems a dilemma here about the motivational advantages she sees as inherent in the communicative approach and the structural teaching needed for real language learning. Because she cannot see the communicative approach in structural terms, she cannot see it as having anything other than motivational advantages. Ultimate successful teaching still depends on the structural mastery she has achieved with pupils:

It is difficult to know what to do for the best ...in order to make sure that those pupils who are nearly there understand the language structure, whilst trying not to inhibit those with a lesser grasp of the fundamentals.

Here, there is an inability to see the ‘fundamentals’ as not being fundamental for the pupil. However, she does have glimpses of how she might have improved her own language teaching:
(There is) a chasm between 'phrase book French' and knowledge of the structures and vocabulary which they require in order to hold conversation. In hindsight, we should have spent more time discussing their experience of each subject.

This statement is tantamount to seeing what was lacking from her lesson; communicative dialogue and a personal involvement from pupils on the level of the subject covered.

By week 9 of her teaching practice, she is adopting a 'carousel' approach after observing another member of staff doing so. Material preparation is time consuming, but this is Carol's forte. She is able to analyze the advantages of the carousel approach:

- variety of activities maintains interest and impetus to exercises.
- individuals work at their own pace and control their own input rather than being obliged to work at the average pace of the other members of the class, etc..

It is clearly also an approach that harmonises with Carol's previously observed tendency to avoid taking a lead in what occurs in the classroom, as her effort goes into the materials preparation rather than the actual teaching input in the lesson. This approach leaves Carol with a maximum amount of time to attend to the relational, attitudinal aspects of the lesson, and avoid overly demanding input from her which may risk having a negative effect on the pupils' esteem for her. Each time there is a disciplinary incident, Carol notes it with regret; a trend that she sees as regression rather than progression' compared with the good grace she recalls from her own schooling. A disciplinary attitude seems to be anathema to her.

At this stage another of her lessons was observed.
Lesson Structure (50 mins. Year 10 French)
Writing Test - Book
Oral Presentation - OHP
Carousel Activities - Tape
  - Speaking
  - Reading

After the class arrives, she settles them and sets off with a mixture of French and English:

T: Bonjour la classe
Shhh!
Aujourd'hui - nous avons un invité
Can you make sure you are in test conditions. We have a visitor to see how good you are.

The test comprised of a SEG modular task requiring the writing of a letter to a tourist office requesting information concerning the opening times and cost of entry to a local castle, along with transport details, etc. Pupils then settled down to do the task for some twenty minutes. The test papers were then collected in.

The next section of the lesson had Carol working from the OHP:

T: Hier, nous avons visité le musée
Qui a visité un musée hier. Levez les mains. Quel musée?
P: Musée de Louvre
T: Et qu'est-ce qu'on peut voir?
P: Le Mona Lisa
T: Oui le Mona Lisa
Et Gary
P: Le Louvre
T: Le Louvre aussi
Mary, can I have your attention? O.K. with the boss you visited Le Musée des Beaux Arts
What is that?
P: The fine art museum
T: O.K. yes I suggest you write these down. These are the places your boss wants you to visit. Le musée du château etc.

The lesson continued with Carol listing places to visit and eliciting translations from the pupils in English. At the start of this conversation there is a genuine dialogue between Carol and a pupil, albeit with the pupil giving a limited response to where he has been (imaginary) and what he saw there. However, this exercise quickly transforms into a listing of place names along with requested translations. For most of these, it is apparent that cognates are the major guide for pupils (e.g. la poste), with the exercise being one of 'guess-the-meaning'. Having worked with this exercise for some fifteen minutes, Carol moved on to the third section of the lesson:

T: Maintenant nous allons au cinéma
Mettez les feuilles dans vos livres
Yesterday we started a new section: divertissements.
What we are going to do for the rest of the lesson
We're going to divide up into groups
1) Group 1 - here's a tape
2) Group 2 - some talking
3) Group 3 - looking at a film review

A few minutes are taken to go through necessary vocabulary, after which, pupils work in groups until the bell.

This lesson has many aspects in common with the previous lessons observed. There are the same professionally produced materials; the same 'chummy' attitude to the pupils. The actual lesson structure seemed to comprise of three sections: the test; OHP work based on places to visit in town; and some group work based on material concerning the cinema. In all of these, it is possible to see a familiar avoidance of constructing a coherent lesson plan with an integrated structures and a balanced set of activities. None of the lesson sections seemed to be connected to one another. Carol claimed that the pupils were required to do the test, but this seems an
excuse, as she chose to administer it in a lesson in which she knew she was going to be observed. Once again after the lesson, she apologised for the lack of target language in the lesson. Clearly she was in defensive mood; similarly claiming that the lesson was not representative, the class were not that well behaved, and the test was an obligation.

There was a lack of attempts to involve the pupils in any type of developed dialogue in or on the language beyond offering direct translation; presumably as a way of ensuring maximal pupil independence in the task that followed; in other words, leaving Carol free from direct pedagogic involvement. The group work is a further opportunity to hand over the responsibility for what happens in the lesson to the pupils. The effort is in materials production rather than lesson planning. She claims that this is to do with previous experience:

Well that comes from my previous job where presentation was everything.

However, there is also the notion of the teacher-as-entertainer:

Well again I think it's the discipline thing - I always think I'm going to lose them if I don't try to gain their attention.

A key point is that in the three lessons observed at least, Carol has not tried to gain pupils' attention pedagogically. There have been substitutes in the form of gifts, her over-friendly attitude, attractive materials, and pupil centred exercises: but a measure of her confidence in sustaining a continual interaction with the pupils is indicated in the lack of time given over to direct interaction; and even here most of the discourse is limited to translation and management instructions to prepare the pupils to cope with the next exercise she puts them through. There seem to be two weaknesses that lead to this situation. Firstly, Carol is clearly not strong linguistically, as was apparent from her first interview. There is something of a covering up of this, and it does not get a mention in
her diary; in fact the issue of language and target language is scarcely mentioned even though there is a mismatch between what Carol seems to feel is represented in the communicative approach and the extent to which she can put it into practice. The evidence of these lessons again suggest lack of confidence, if not competence, in a level of fluency that she would be happy in maintaining in lessons. Secondly, is the question of discipline. Carol had constructed a strong self image and presentation of herself through her materials production. Her difficulty in maintaining that self image is evident in all her comments on disciplinary matters:

I feel disillusioned that children did not respond to my attempts to motivate them, but saw it as a weakness. Hence, I have become more authoritarian...I feel I have been unable to develop a strong rapport with the pupils.

Indeed, there is evidence that Carol tried to develop such a rapport, but this was outside of classroom activities rather than through them. One might even say that she sacrificed such activities in her attempts to accommodate pupil preferences. In order not to exacerbate negative attitudes, Carol avoided confrontation over disciplinary matters. As she sensed that such disciplinary matters arose through the difficulties of language teaching and learning, the latter were similarly designed with managerial rather than pedagogic strategies in mind. The link with modern language teaching is noticeable in her comment that it was in these lessons, rather than in English lessons, that she had most problems. This experience must further disrupt her confidence in the method of language teaching, communicative or grammatical, which she was trying to operationalise. The authoritarian figure that she now sees herself to be, negates every principle of management she had propounded for the last ten years.

**Completing the Course**

In terms of Language learning and the course, Carol writes in her post-TP questionnaire that the model of lesson planning and the presentation, practice production model given to students had been
most helpful. Ironically, I had not seen her put either into practice in an explicit way. Such a methodological approach might be very conducive to Carol's meticulous approach to planning but this was not evident in the lessons observed; these were not formula lessons. By the end of teaching practice, she still expressed the dilemma of method in a way similar to her previous remarks. A communicative approach removed many of the inherent problems in language teaching and made lessons more entertaining and attractive; it therefore had benefits, particularly for pupils with low ability. There was the need for proper structural teaching with those who could manage it; mistakes need to be corrected as 'bad habits' are difficult to eradicate. Her dilemma was caught by the rather structural materials she was given to teach with, which meant that she was torn between doing things by the book, and achieving nil comprehension, or cheating and giving explanations in English. In this case, she felt: 'I am damned if I do and I am damned if I don't'. There seems to be a separate issue here. Carol clearly did avoid using overt grammar explanations, yet she was not able to replace this with an approach with greater emphasis on oral work in the classroom. When pupils were not given the necessary 'conceptual knowledge, that is grammar, it is tantamount to asking them to do a job without having the tools'. This left both pedagogic situations without an organising principle other than 'amuse the pupils' and try not to be too demanding. In this respect too, she had not altered her view that motivation and positive attitude were the key to learning; even again quoting her previous formula that performance was determined by knowledge and skills but that all of this was dependent on attitudes.

There is the question of her position in training. Although she felt happy with the department in which she worked, she notes that the most difficult aspect of teaching practice had been 'pupils' perceptions of her as a transient, temporary body for whom it was unnecessary to perform to a high standard'; although this had improved as the term went on. In school, it has been noted how she found herself in various dilemmas that she never really resolved. Clearly, one of these was her own view, based on her experience of how she learnt languages, and hence, how she should now teach. This
dilemma had become polarised as the choice between two approaches; one of which was seen as proscribing explicit grammar and aiming for motivational rather than language learning issues with pupils, the other being its structural opposite. I questioned her at the end of the course on her statement that she did not like the fact that pupils who could do more were prevented from doing it. The 'more' in this case being expressed in grammatical terms. Was this what a communicative approach was advocating?:

I think that is partly the difficulty. I got the impression at the beginning of the course that it was geared towards the lowest common denominator...taking away the grammar...so like language learning for drongos...But when you go back and look at it more, you see that it is more to do with covering the same work but organising it differently.

It is noticeable that this 'insight' is only now coming through for Carol, after a good deal of experience and reflection on it. It suggests a binary opposition that has been set up but not substantially rearticulated even though when pushed she can question it. This opposition seems to relate to her own background and the model she had from this:

Seeing most of us learnt in a different way, we got the impression that this approach was now used because people were not able to cope with the traditional ways...you were dealing with a group of people who learnt by the traditional method...even younger people seemed to have followed a very traditional pattern...to be told that communication is more than the 's' on the end of an adjective was heresy...we thought we've all done it and got on, and it was pointed out that we were slightly brighter than the rest, so we interpreted it in this way.

This is a curious series of statements. To begin with she seems to accept that the communicative approach is not simply a method for the less able; and she is able to see how commitment to one method comes
from success with it. Her final statement gives intelligence as the determining factor in this adherence to a method. The idea that the communicative approach going beyond simply the issue of intelligence is therefore only half-articulated. Yet, for her, the communicative approach involves grammatical induction through pattern practice, that pupils have 'got to be pretty bright' to perceive. There are contradictions of understanding and resultant methodological approach in this. She goes on to argue that it all depends on the learning style of the pupil.

These sorts of insights and their connections with and influence on practice are highly dependent on the context of their articulations. Thus, the points included in these contradictions all seem to be true in some circumstances. There is the image of the overwhelming primacy of experience for students. As Carol says, in matters of language learning models: 'the more theoretical aspects went by because we were fighting for survival'. In a final version of communicative language teaching she refers to it as the 'use it' approach. She quotes this to differentiate between old and new styles of language learning noting that the search for a communicative aim is a major difference with the latter. Indeed, she relates this to her own learning experience; her Italian is better because of the amount she has had to use it. But, she notes, this is dependent on when and where, and it may be misleading to extrapolate intensive language work towards high fluency into beginner and intermediate levels.

Training for her had been a positive experience; although she criticised the number, length and style of visits she had received from me, her tutor. All of these were somewhat lacking when compared to her 'normal' practice as a trainer. Still, she commented, 'I think you've coped very well with us. I would not have liked to have trained that group. There are very diverse opinions, backgrounds and philosophies'. She did, however, suggest an alternative teaching approach. Rather than give a basic framework: 'create a hypothetical situation...criticise it...wouldn't it be nice if we had this...sell the idea...and then produce it...so that now we've all criticised our
own way of learning languages, we can all appreciate how good the communicative approach is': a model Carol had obviously used in training.

It is as if every time Carol encounters a problem in teaching she reverts back to the 'basics': grammar, attitudinal enhancement, impression management. Finally, there are models and ways of proceeding that Carol has managed to bring forward from her previous learning experiences and her career as a trainer. At best these are a preoccupation with form and appearance. However, this is extended to the point where it is used as substitute for confronting the dilemmas of planning lessons that engage pupils in a working relationship with her and her vulnerabilities in terms of her linguistic competence and ability to manage and motivate pupils. It is as if teaching is perfectible in the way that her materials are. When this does not succeed, there is a crisis, or at least the holding on to form in the absence of content. She can see improvements in theory, but not in practice, as yet. Finally, she remains happy with her move and the change of career. There is, however, the impression, that she is happier in theory than in practice. Even her former employer referred to her as being 'too academic'. Attitude is dependent on the position within the structure of the context.

Carol was employed in her main teaching practice school.
4.5 Conclusions

Clearly, each of these case studies can be read on their own terms, as each represent an account of a particular student in training. Much of what I have said about them has been derived from their own words. Some of the research data was gained from my questions and my place in conversation with them. Much of it comes from them alone; their diary entries, their lesson plans, etc. The case studies can be read as ethnographic accounts of particular students in training, and it is possible to conclude what this meant for each.

Jill clearly relished being back in a university context and enjoyed the theoretical discussions. However, in practice she was unable to operationalise her method of language teaching. Caught between traditional approaches from her own past learning and the ambiguities of method she finds in the schools in which she is placed, she struggles to develop a coherence in practice. She mostly holds on to certain key beliefs and externalises contradictions by blaming constraining factors. She does develop her thinking in the course of training but this is still full of contradictions she only resolves through personal assertions.

Marie attempts to be herself in the classroom and make her own native language come alive. She too has strong views about language teaching and is sympathetic to modern approaches. However, she is extremely reflective and personalises the limitations she finds in practice. In particular, her own physical fatigue is an important element in the collapse of effort she puts into developing methodology. She feels she is becoming like 'all the rest'. Her reflectiveness is attributed by her to national characteristics and academic training.
Jackie is successful; although mainly through force of personality. She appears hermetically sealed in her enthusiasm and highly independent. This attitude leads to a productive engagement with problems as in the strategy she adopts for problem groups. Other problems, however, seem to be brushed aside, and there is often the suspicion that her actual methodology works through willpower rather than design.

Carol struggles to use what she sees as valuable past experiences in a different context where she is vulnerable because of her rusty language skills. She replaces pedagogic contact through methodology and/or the language by strategies to ensure pupil compliance to the atmosphere she is seeking to create. She too finds traditional methodologies more convincing than modern approaches, although she wants to use the latter.

Janet certainly has a grasp of modern approaches to language teaching, which she begins to develop with classes. However, she is always out of place, and this, along with her modest linguistic competence, undermines her commitment to modern language teaching. The search for social relations brought her into teaching, but she can only find these away from the modern language classroom. Teaching languages becomes unreal for her and she aims to find another more caring profession.

As these case studies are based on individual students, it is understandable that each highlight different facets of training. Even so, it would be possible to return to the concepts provided by teacher education research and read each case study off against these. For example, each of the students is reflecting to a greater or lesser extent on the components of training and thus can be viewed as reflective practitioners. They clearly are all having to adjust to particularities of training.
situations, and pedagogic content knowledge, in the form of linguistic competence, appears crucially important in the case of certain students at least (Carol, Janet, Marie).

Other general conclusions might be made. For example, different students seem to engage with the various forms of theory and practice in differential ways (Jill, Carol). The processes of this engagement clearly involve a number of ambiguities and contradictions which are only ever partially resolved.

Personalities are extremely important (Jackie, Marie), and the question of individual student security, both in and out of the classroom, and in physical health and self-regard, is important.

Students each attempt to develop a systematic approach to lessons (Janet, Carol). These approaches vary but attempt roughly to respond to various demands perceived as emanating from training; either from individuals or curricula. Lessons are often disrupted; they do not go the way that they were planned and outcomes do not always match intention. Methodologically, it is clear to me that my own evaluation of lessons need to be made on the basis of a series rather than a one off. For example, Janet’s initial approach seemed quite good. It was only once I realised that the same formula was being used each time that I questioned the extent to which a flexible teaching approach was being developed by her.

The research shows up the contradictions and problems in the type of approach to language teaching being advocated; for example, the way that target language use can create a multi-layered discourse with organisational, managerial and pedagogic being included in the same utterances. Similarly, the same way that authentic
materials and situations can lead to ambivalence of context and near absurd topic treatment; for example, in Janet's statement of being 'in the fridge' (p. 201), or Jill's half real/half imaginary use of birth dates (p. 210).

Moreover, it is clear that teaching language is only part of the demands of training for students. These case studies demonstrate the complexity and diversity of experience for students. What happens out of the classroom and away from modern language teaching often seems more important.

Different students have different demands put on them in different situations to which they respond in different ways. Developing teaching abilities therefore often appears fragmentary, highly personal and indeterminate. These responses themselves have different outcomes. Thus, Jackie's move to meet her problem year 9 group in extra-curricular activity such as drama has a significant impact on her relationship with them in modern language lessons. Janet's involvement with the 'vocats' entails a similar quality of relationship; but the experience for her underlines rather than dissipates her problematic relationship with modern language teaching.

These are preliminary comments, and I have avoided going into detailed discussion of the various remarks I have made on points arising from the case studies. This is partly strategic, as I do consider them in greater detail later in the thesis. However, I also believe that many of these points are incidents of the product of the processes of teacher training rather than the processes themselves. The processes are embedded in each case study, the products of which are different for each student, as they each react in differential ways; not only because of their own individuality but the
particular circumstances and contexts in which they find themselves. For example, the process of training to teach modern languages engages all students in confronting their own linguistic competencies. The resulting product is manifest on an individual basis. This engagement is therefore essential, if not always unproblematic. Time spent in a foreign country has structural significance for the process of modern language teacher training, but does not necessarily determine the outcome of that process in a linear fashion.

Case studies of the lived experiences of teachers are rare in themselves (cf. Louden 1991, Clandinin 1986 and Elbaz 1983 for examples of exceptions). This type of intensive, longitudinal case study for students in training is new in itself. Bennett and Turner-Bissett (1993) do offer small extracts from case studies in students learning to teach but these are not longitudinal or derived from the students' own voice. A group of contemporary students, training at the same time on a one year course is unknown as far as I can ascertain after an exhaustive search of the research literature. The modern language dimension gives the five studies a context that makes this ethnographic account completely new in the field of teacher education research. The meticulous gathering of empirical data, and its analysis through the construction of non-critical and critical case studies, can therefore be seen as resulting in a new contribution to knowledge in the area: of the study of a group of intensive, longitudinal case studies of the training experiences of student teachers of modern languages. The description and analysis are themselves unique.

However, I have only started to make more generalizable statements about the processes embedded in these studies. So far, I have ethnographic accounts of the students in training, from which I have derived conclusions about
each one. Next, I need to re-consider these conclusions, and the data on which they are based, in terms of the underlying theories of knowledge formation I developed earlier in this thesis. I need to do this in order to indicate the essential character of the processes involved in training of which these case studies are five product examples. To undertake this analysis, two principal points need to be kept in mind: firstly, the essential processes to which I refer should be objectifiable and constant; secondly, and somewhat to qualify this last point, the outcome or product of these processes should be understood as determinate but never fully pre-determined. In other words, we are talking about dispositions, probabilities and likelihoods rather than fully predictable consequences and courses of action. These points need to be kept to the forefront of the further analysis. The need to provide an objective, scientific account of the processes of training should not make the indeterminacy of human agency transparent. There is, after all, a dynamic relationship between the objectifiable, and thus understandable and generalizable, processes of training and the way that these are realised in and through particular contexts and individual subjectivities. These are the guiding principles of the analyses in level 2 and 3.
4.6 Summary

In this chapter I have presented details of my level 1 analysis. I have referred to the way the critical case studies were constructed and how the five students were selected. A synopsis of each student study was proved as well as the five full critical version on coloured paper. The non-critical version of one of these is placed in the Appendix. I have argued that these studies constitute a rich account of the five students in training and stressed the particular features they each include. I have made some concluding comments in line with certain key concepts raised earlier in the thesis and discussed some of the salient aspects of training that all students share to a greater of lesser extent.

The task is now to take these studies and offer another critical reading of them at a more general level. I do this with reference to the theory of practice and 3-level analytic framework presented in chapter 3. This move towards generalization and theory is a move towards a more specific examination of the processes embedded in the case studies set out in this chapter.