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Performativity “and the damage done”: an account of how a surveillance culture and “regress of mistrust” initially impacted on participation in an action research study within a further education college.
Overview

• Introduction and contextual information about my research
• Unpack concepts of performativity, organizational field, habitus and capital and discuss them in relation to my research
• Concluding remarks
Aim of the research

• To work **collaboratively with a team of teacher educators from a further education college** to explore the use of modelling in their practice.

The four research questions

• How do teacher educators from the further education sector use modelling with their student teachers?
• What factors affect the use of modelling by teacher educators from further education colleges?
• What are In-Service student teachers’ perceptions of modelling as a teaching method and how does it help them learn how to teach?
• What happens when teacher educators work collaboratively to improve the pedagogy of teacher education?
What is modelling?

• “the practice of intentionally displaying certain teaching behaviour with the aim of promoting student teachers’ professional learning (cf. Gallimore & Tharp, 1992).”

(Lunenberg et al. 2007, p.589).

• Lunenberg et al. (2007,p.597) “a powerful instrument” that can shape and influence changes in student teachers’ practice...little or no recognition of modelling as a teaching method in teacher education”.

Inspiring tomorrow’s professionals
Loughran and Berry (2005, p.194) on modelling

• “However, even though it may be desirable, it is complex and difficult to do and is particularly difficult to develop alone.”

Korthagen (2001 in Loughran, 2006, p.1)

• “[B]eing a teacher educator is often difficult…in most places, there is no culture in which it is common for teacher education staff to collaboratively work on the question of how to improve the pedagogy of teacher education.”
My research methodology

• **Second-person approach** (Chandler and Torbert, 2003, p.142)

• **Research “with” rather than “on” people…”** (p.143)

• Working collaboratively with a group of teacher educators based at one further education college

• Using **stimulated recall interview** (with teacher), **semi-structured interview** (with teacher) and **focus group** (with teachers’ students)

• Through “craftsmanship” (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009, p.260) of my research to have a “**professional conversation**” (p.2) with each participant about their use of modelling
Reflectively and reflexively ‘unpacking’ research

My research
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Reflectively and reflexively ‘unpacking’ research

- Bourdieu’s theoretical triad of organizational field, capital and habitus (Emirbayer and Johnson, 2008)
- “regress of mistrust” (Ball, 2003, p.226)
- “surveillance” (Foucault in Lawy and Tedder, 2012, p.306)
- “vulnerability” (Lunenberg et al., 2007, p.590)
The theory of ecologies of practices

"practices can sustain or suffocate other practices" (Kemmis et al., 2014, p.50)
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