# Who teaches the teachers? Identity, discourse and policy in teacher education

Maureen Robinson, Wendy McMillan

## Abstract

In this article we argue that understanding the identities that teacher educators construct for themselves is central to effecting innovation within a changing policy environment. The article begins with a theoretical perspective on the nexus of change and identity. It then discusses the central features of identity amongst a group of teacher college educators who have been incorporated into a higher education institution in South Africa. The discussion focuses in particular on their new roles as researchers. We argue that the promotion of research needs to be based on what teacher educators *already* perceive to be their particular strengths and roles. The paper ends with some examples of strategies for research promotion in this particular setting.

*Keywords:* Teacher education; Professional identity; Teacher research; Education change

## 1. Introduction

A post-apartheid political and social system has meant that there have been fundamental changes in the needs and demands of education in South Africa in the last 10 years. Teacher educators, in addition to keeping up to date with developments in their discipline, also have to keep abreast of a range of new curricular and policy imperatives in the country. This has placed enormous pressure on teacher educators who are currently preparing new teachers for schools that are very different from the schools they themselves experienced as young people.

One of these differences is the fact that the Constitution of the country now accords equal rights to all children, regardless of race, gender, ability or socio-economic status. This differs fundamentally from the apartheid era where race firmly defined the life chances of children, including which school they attended. Teachers now have to be prepared to teach in schools where children come from different racial backgrounds, something which often goes hand in hand with different language or socio-economic backgrounds. However, while national policy has set the frame for working in integrated schools, research into how teachers are working with these new realities is in its infancy. As the proceedings of a colloquium of school integration put it:

> The production of a new curriculum, which places citizenship and rights at its centre, as well as a National Action Plan to Combat Racism, raises a series of new questions about integration policies and practices in schools: on what kind of terrain in schools and teacher education institutions does the revised curriculum as well as the National Action Plan build; what are the national patterns in terms of integration; what is the meaning of integration for teachers, learners, managers and materials developers; how do schools and teachers challenge race and racism ... what can be learnt from other countries .. and can this information assist policy makers? (Nkomo, Chisholm & McKinney, 2004, p. 7).

Research into how teacher education programmes are preparing teachers for these realities is also just beginning. However—and this is the central point of connection with the argument of this paper—teacher educators are by and large drawing on their own resources as they prepare new teachers in this situation. Interestingly though, the competences and skills expected of South African teacher educators, while specific in certain respects, are probably no different from the types of professional competences being expected of teacher educators around the world. Reflections on the experiences of teacher education in a range of countries (UNESCO/OREALC, 2002) indicate that the increasing complexity of the world of teaching and learning is demanding that teachers are able to act as professionals, interpreting and analyzing educational events, acting in a variety of situations, reflecting on their own performance, and acting collaboratively with others (Mauri Majos, 2001; Villegas-Reimers, 2002). Such competences for teachers demand a similar orientation for teacher educators so that, as will be argued later in the article, research, reflection and enquiry need to become essential aspects of the lives of teacher educators.

The work of teacher educators in South Africa today is further complicated by institutional amalgamations that have brought a number of institutions together into new configurations. One of the consequences of this policy of institutional amalgamations is that former teacher education colleges have been incorporated into higher education institutions, where there has by convention been an emphasis on research. With this has come an expectation that lecturers from former colleges of education should engage in research, in a way that was not part of their traditional workload. The pressure to be involved in research was given further impetus when, a few months after this study was conducted, national legislation mandated the establishment of a new type of institution, the University of Technology. The research site was to be merged with a neighboring institution, to form such a university.

This article sets out to examine, in this context, the understandings that a group of primary school teacher educators constructed of their work as teachers of pre-service teachers. Working within a framework of participatory action research, the article reports on a qualitative study of the way in which the academic staff in the Faculty of Education at the Cape Technikon, an institution based in Cape Town, South Africa, conceptualized their own work.

The article begins by locating these teacher educators within the specific context of the incorporation of colleges of education into the national policy framework for higher education. It then outlines the motivation for an investigation of the curriculum design of the General Education and Training (GET) band (Reception Year to Grade Nine) teacher education programme at the Cape Technikon. We also outline the methodology that framed the research on which this article is based.

The second section of the article argues that understanding the identities that teacher educators construct for themselves is central to effecting innovation within a changing policy environment. It therefore discusses a theoretical perspective on the nexus of change and identity. The third section draws on empirical evidence from the study and highlights the discursive threads central to the identities of these teacher educators at the Cape Technikon.

The final section brings together the theoretical and empirical sections of the study. It argues that any process of change in teacher education needs to be cognizant of the motivations and attitudes of teacher educators themselves. The restructuring of the work of teacher educators

will have little lasting impact if it is not interwoven with teacher educators' existing strands of identity, so that the new and the old blend in a re-conceptualized view of what is 'normal' in teacher education.

Debates on the relationship between teaching and research are not only relevant to institutions, professions or nations undergoing a transformation of identity and mission, as was the case in this study. Studies in the UK, for example, have tracked how undergraduate and postgraduate students view the respective benefits of their lecturers' involvement in research and teaching (Lindsay, Breen, & Jenkins, 2002). The authors of this study argue that explicit strategies are needed to strengthen the potential linkages and synergy between teaching and research. Based on their New Zealand experience, Robertson and Bond (2001, p. 5) make the point that "the conception of a modern university rests, in part, on the claims of a close, even symbiotic relationship between research and teaching." In their view, it is important to move beyond a teaching versus research debate, and to explore the nature of the *relationship* between these two fundamental aspects of academics' work. Their own findings indicate a variation in academics' perception of this relationship, "ranging from a negative relationship, to a view of teaching and research as an integrated, mutually supportive activity ... from a view that comprises a relatively simple dichotomy to one that is an integral, relational composite" (Robertson & Bond, 2001, p. 14).

Our study aims to further this debate in two ways. Firstly, it locates the general discussion on the relationship between research and teaching in the context of a group of individual academics experiencing a sudden shift in institutional location, with new and potentially disruptive expectations of their professional identity. Secondly, it focuses in particular on teacher college educators, where dominant norms of caring and nurturing frequently frame how the teaching-research debate is constructed.

## 2. Incorporating colleges of education into higher education

In this first section we locate the teacher educators within the specific context of incorporation of colleges of education into the national policy framework for higher education. In February 2001 the Cape Town College of Education in the urban suburb of Mowbray in Cape Town and the Boland College of Education in the rural town of Wellington were incorporated into the Cape Technikon. This incorporation created a new Faculty of Education at the Cape Technikon, with over one thousand students and 37 permanent academic staff members. The Faculty was divided between two campuses, situated 70 km from one another.

Colleges of education in South Africa have traditionally been designed according to a model based on extensive contact time with small classes of students. At the time of the incorporation the average class size was 24 on the Mowbray campus and 59 on the Wellington campus, although here the students were frequently taught in smaller sub-groupings. In 2003, student timetables in the 4-year B.Ed. degree indicated an average of 32 periods of 45 min each in a week, and many lecturers were involved for 20-23 periods of weekly contact time with students. This model was consistent across three years, with students' fourth year programme diminishing to about 20 periods or less a week.

This extensive contact model of teacher education was in tension with that held by the first, and newly appointed Dean of the new Faculty, herself a former university academic. Drawing on the discourse and practice of higher education, she argued that active and meaningful engagement with policies, national frameworks, advances in knowledge and debates around social development would not be possible unless dedicated time was set aside for research and professional interaction in the Faculty.

The prominence that the Dean gave to research as part of the teacher educator's 'work' was consistent with the Cape Technikon's own emerging vision of itself as an institute of higher learning where research and teaching were both valued. Informed by recent national policy prioritizing research in higher education (Department of Education, 2001), the institution offered significant support for the promotion of research, although in lecturers' views this had yet to be matched by a reduction in expected teaching workload (notes from staff seminar, 1 March 2002).

The study upon which this article draws was conceived in the context of the perspectives outlined above. It was framed by the Dean's assumption of research, reflection and enquiry as a 'natural' part of teacher educators' work, and her frustration that very full teaching timetables allowed lecturers little time outside the immediate classroom situation.

The research was conducted within the framework of participatory action research. Action research aims to contribute both to knowledge and to the improvement of action through reflection on this knowledge. It is a research paradigm best suited to formative evaluation projects that seek to understand programs with the expressed intention of informing and improving their implementation (Cousins & Earl, 1995, p. 8).

Action research starts 'where people are at'—with their concerns, looking at what practitioners consider to be the problems in their own practice. It seeks to generate change from inside rather than imposing change from the outside. Drawing on an action research paradigm, the investigation was therefore focused on how Faculty staff might make maximum use of their time, effort, and skills. Within the limits of practical constraints, every attempt was made to involve lecturers as active research partners in aspects of the research. Data was collected through individual semi-structured interviews with a random selection of a third of the academic staff.

The primary purpose of the research was to contribute to curriculum development by feeding into the evaluation and planning process in the Faculty. It was envisaged that the study would signal strategies for streamlining courses and timetables in ways that would release staff from their dominant occupation of teaching in order to engage in the equally significant work of enquiry.

While the investigation was motivated by the desire to make *time* available for staff to engage in research, the Dean did not immediately realize the significance of this intervention. Since research was what she had done as a university employed teacher educator, she assumed that it was a 'natural' part of the work of academics. She did not realize how, in setting out to *restructure* how time was used in the Faculty, she was, in fact, making a particular statement about the nature of teacher educator identity. As she herself put it: "I did not see myself as a change agent, trying to do something different. I just thought that what I was doing was normal." It was only the analysis of the data that revealed that the promotion of research, reflection and enquiry in the Faculty was more than a 'technical' exercise of re-shuffling slots on a timetable.

The rest of the article details how, through this analysis of the data, the study became re-framed as *re-conceptualizing*, rather than *restructuring* (Grim-mett, 1995) the work in the Faculty and how this re-conceptualization revolved around an understanding of teacher educator identity.

## 3. Identity and change

In the second section of this paper, an argument that understanding identities that teacher educators construct for themselves is central to effecting innovation within a changing policy environment is presented. A theoretical perspective is offered on the nexus of change and identity. Internationally there has been a lack of attention to research on teacher educators (Lanier & Little, 1986; Loughran, 1997). It is thus hardly surprising that the nexus of identity and change has not been explored in the context of teacher educators. It is therefore to recent studies of teacher identity that we turned in order to frame our theoretical understanding.

Welmond (2002), in a study of teachers in Benin, presents the interface between teacher identity and changing policy as a turbulent landscape. He argues (2002, pp. 37-43) that educators bring their own preferences and ambitions to the process of change and that the juxtaposition between different visions of who educators are and what roles they are expected to play has serious implications for the effective implementation of change. He presents teacher identity as dynamic and contested, shaped by and constructed within potentially contradictory interests and ideologies, competing conceptions of rights and responsibilities of teachers, and differing ways of understanding success or effectiveness. He suggests that these understandings are clustered into "cultural schemata"—culturally specific, historically grounded competing perspectives of teacher identity that are more or less coherent and more or less shared for particular communities of teachers. Welmond (2002, p. 60) warns that if policy makers are interested in promoting a new definition of teacher effectiveness, they will inevitably compete with those historically grounded and widely accepted notions of teachers' rights and responsibilities. He suggests that a more promising response would be consciously to link desired changes to themes already present on the teacher identity landscape.

Theorizing from a case study of Namibian educators, O'Sullivan (2002) also links effective change management and policy implementation with understanding teacher identity. She presents teachers' subjectivity as significant to effective change implementation. Change, she argues, inevitably involves loss, anxiety, and struggle because it strikes at the core of learned skills, philosophies, beliefs and conceptions of education, thereby creating doubts about teachers' sense of competence and self-concept. Drawing on Bishop (1986), she argues that teachers are more likely to engage with change if it is perceived to pose little threat to their identity and if the proposed reform is viewed as relevant, desirable, and as having advantage over existing practice. Drawing on Parlett and Hamilton (1972), O'Sullivan (2002, p. 224) therefore motivates for the importance of "accessing teachers' perspectives, values, motivations, attitudes and views" prior to implementation of change. This, she indicates, is necessary because change in the classroom involves more than extending repertoires by acquiring new skills. It means changing attitudes, beliefs, and personal theories.

Both these authors argue that identity plays a significant role in educational change. If this is indeed the case, one could surmise that reducing contact time with students would do little to promote research in the Faculty, unless teacher educators themselves identified with and valued the new roles being expected of them.

In the next section of the article we present empirical evidence from the study and outline the components of teacher educator identity that emerged from the interviews.

## 4. "We are there to be teachers"

The first common construct that emerged from the interviews was that of the teacher educator as *teacher*. One member of staff expressed it unequivocally: "We are there to be teachers."

Another declared: "I'm at my happiest in front of a classroom ... I think this is what I was meant for." Many of the teacher educators presented their identity as 'teacher' overtly, making it clear that they identified with the roles and responsibilities of a primary school teacher. Many celebrated their continued contact with schools as a professional strength. Others presented recent classroom experience as giving them added professional credibility.

Often this identity of teacher was associated with hands-on classroom expertise—either as a teacher in a particular phase or in the primary school specifically: "I am, myself, a qualified primary school teacher". Some teacher educators implied that they understood that effective teaching and learning was only possible *because* of their own practical experience in classrooms: "They respect my knowledge because I have been in the Foundation Phase [Reception Year to Grade 3]." The privileging of hands-on expertise frequently resulted in an implicit assumption that those who were not experienced in a particular phase were less able teacher educators.

Existing research indicates that there are a number of common discursive positionings to the identity location of 'teacher'. Appropriating from Woods' (1981) categorization of teachers and drawing on empirical research by Nias (1988), one particular identity emerges as pertinent—that of vocational commitment to teaching. This includes caring for learners and encouraging and supporting growth and learning. In the discussion that follows, these strands will be examined in detail.

## 5. "We care about the students"—teaching as caring

At the heart of a vocational commitment model of teaching lies the assumption that to teach is to care (Bullough & Gitlin, 1995). One teacher educator spelt this out explicitly in the context of primary school education: "The primary school teacher works with a younger child. He is literally dad and mum to that child ... That's why it's important for me, that he has that feeling, the teacher. It is not just a question of passing on facts."

Drawing on the belief that a good educator is nurturing, many teacher educators highlighted a pastoral relationship with their students: "We care about the students". This attitude was lived out by individual lecturers in a number of different ways. One teacher educator drew on a common construct of the 'teacher' as a surrogate parent to explain her role: "I never see myself as mother of my subject only, and I kind of take an interest in what is happening in the phase". Another believed that his responsibility extended beyond teaching: "I feel one should include values, uplifting norms, ethics, morals, empathy ... You can teach it by practising it and by observing when it is manifest". This perspective of pastoral care was often linked with a sense of responsibility not only for the academic well being of students, but also for their socio-emotional health.

## 6. "Students learn best when they are actively involved"—constructing effective teaching and learning

It was clear that these educators constructed their role and responsibility as simultaneously pastoral and pedagogical. Central to the pastoral strand of teacher identity is the assumption that this facilitates effective teaching and learning (Bullough, 1997). This assumption not only shaped how teacher educators explained teaching and learning—it also explained *why* they nurtured their students. Bottery (1992, pp. 12-14) argues that different discourses of the ultimate purposes of education produce different approaches to teaching. Teacher educators highlighted strands of both a "cultural transmission" discourse and a "child-centred" discourse. Drawing on the discursive parameters of a cultural transmission model they argued

that students learnt through observing demonstrations. As one lecturer put it: "By observing good teaching demonstrated to them ... they see how it works in practice. So actually you have to, whenever you teach or lecture, apply those principles that you teach, through the theory that they need to know. By seeing and doing themselves."

Drawing on the discourse of child-centredness, teacher educators argued that students learnt when involved—that they learnt through doing. Unanimously lecturers drew on and wove together strands from these discourses. Individual accounts varied according to personal experience, subject areas, and philosophical affiliation. However it was clear that the majority of teacher educators assumed that students learnt through practising skills, knowledge and values modeled to them: "I do, and then I get them to do what I believe should be done in the classroom."

This is not to argue that lecturers expected students blindly to follow formulaic 'recipes' in their learning. Reflection was noted to be an important aid to learning: "They must design and develop. And that is difficult for students because they are used to getting, so now they have to think for themselves. I keep saying to them, but the model is here. I am modeling everything I expect you to do, now transfer that in different areas. They find that difficult."

Although clearly privileging practice, many lecturers also emphasized that practice is shaped by theory and that this played an important part in teacher education: "[We need to] actually let them practise, to practise the theory."

Within this perspective the student/lecturer relationship was implicitly presented as an apprenticeship with the teacher educator as 'master teacher'. Central to an apprenticeship model is frequent contact of lengthy duration. Drawing on such a model led many teacher educators to value contact time with their students: "I have been given more time this year. I have been given more contact time with them. So I lecture them and then I have time now to do some microteaching within the class ... to actually let them practise ... the theory basically."

Teacher educators were frequently critical of models of teacher education that promoted large group lectures as a form of cost-effective education, arguing that they mitigated against effective teaching and learning: "Up to fifty or sixty maybe you can still handle and still demonstrate good practice, but it will have an influence on ... the chances that the students have to demonstrate that in class … So that application, and demonstrating that they can apply the techniques that you've taught before they go out to schools, that will be limited."

Potential contradictions were, however, evident when individual lecturers drew on competing discourses of what constitutes effective teaching and learning. This was particularly evident for one lecturer. On the one hand she drew on a discourse that promoted reflection as a tool for effective learning both for herself and for students: "I think they learn through reflection ... You've got to actually make meaning yourself out of all this random information that's flying at you."

On the other hand, the way in which she simultaneously drew on a discourse that framed contact time as responsible engagement with learners made it difficult for her to 'give up' or 'hand over' any of the roles for which she felt accountable. Consequently she expressed a fear of using tutors: "I actually would like to use a tutorial system ... And that is something senior students could do if you could trust their knowledge and this is where the big dilemma always

is ... I don't know whether it is just arrogance on my part or whether it is genuine concern, but to actually hand that over to somebody else."

It was evident that drawing simultaneously on the discourses of "teaching as vocational commitment" and "learning as reflection" led other lecturers similarly into potentially contradictory understandings. On the one hand, these lecturers expressed concern about the consequence of high contact time with students—that students had little time for reflection on their development as teachers. As one lecturer explained: "And that is a major problem if we want to also encourage them to do research. To do assignments properly, they need time for that." On the other, they expressed anxiety about teaching through non-contact time activities, suggesting that students were not adequately skilled for independent learning.

A sense of responsibility and a belief in the value of contact time led other lecturers to express suspicion about colleagues who did not use all their timetabled classes for face-to-face teaching. Questioning the work ethic of peers, one lecturer argued:

> Lecturers would indicate that they've got so many periods a week and it looks terrific. And when you look for them, you find that ... there is very little contact time in it ... It is not wasted time provided that you are being honest and you are committed to the proper process. It is really time for them to go back and reflect and find out and put together and make connections and then come back. ... In the hands of a lecturer who is not professional it becomes dangerous. But in the hands of the committed tertiary institution lecturer, knowing what he or she is doing, it is a very valuable tool.

Implicit for these lecturers were a number of assumptions framed by their identity as 'teacher'— that a 'good' teacher is available to his or her learners beyond classroom contact time, that a 'good' teacher is in the classroom with his or her students, and that by inference, a teacher educator who is not on campus is not behaving responsibly and is probably engaging in activities that are not directly related to his or her role as 'teacher'.

## 7. The value of a college education

Welmond (2002) argues that we need to look at the cultural and historical sources of particular perspectives of educator identity. To understand how teacher college educators came to construct their identity as 'teacher', it is important to investigate the difference in teacher preparation normally associated with colleges and universities.

Historically teachers' colleges have been associated with the preparation of a practically skilled teacher who was competent in the classroom, on the sports-field, and with cultural extra-murals. Often referred to as teacher training (Gore, 1995) (as opposed to teacher education, where there is a greater emphasis on the development of reflexive and critical competencies in students), this preparation privileges skills and competencies that have direct and practical application in classrooms and schools.

Universities, in contrast, focus more on an academic preparation—usually with a generalist academic undergraduate degree and one postgraduate year of teacher preparation. Arguing that cognitive skills prepare teachers for flexible placement, universities argue for an academic and intellectual preparation over a purely practical one (see Kruss, 2002, p. 39). Obviously these dichotomies are crude, and teacher education models at colleges are often not so very different from those at universities. However, what is significant for the argument

presented in this article, is the way in which the teacher educators presented the 'university/college' positions *as though* they were dichotomous.

What was significant was how lecturers drew on their own experience as students to argue for an appropriate model for teacher education. Those who were college trained themselves tended to argue for the value of a practical college-type teacher preparation. Some lecturers indicated that the strengths of the 'college' model lay in frequent contact with schools and prolonged opportunities to practise teaching skills and strategies. Many with a university qualification emphasized the value of the skills and deportments that they associated with a university model: "We have students who always say, but we can't use this in the schools. And I tell them, I know you can't, but I am also working at you, I'm not just working at what you can do in school. You open a window and you say, you must fly through the window. You know, like we were taught at university."

The 'college' versus 'university' model were often presented as in competition: "And then I think that people must make the paradigm shift that we are no longer a college." This belief led one university-qualified lecturer to argue that: "But here, I think, the students are still being spoon-fed which comes from a college mentality which I find in lecturers."

Some educators argued that a university model was inappropriate for college/technikon students. Others wove perceptions about university and college models together, implicitly arguing that the newly constructed 4-year degree was able to provide the best of both worlds—an academically challenging university component married to a practical college component.

Pride in their work as teacher educators was a common theme. Often implicitly drawing on the 'college' discourse of a practically skilled all-rounder who is effective in classroom, sports-field and cultural extra-murals, this was usually expressed in terms of an excellent 'product' well equipped to face the multiple challenges demanded at schools: "A headmaster phones me ... they don't want to know about academic ability. They want to know "Is she neat? Does she smoke? ... Is she the sort of girl (sic) that children will look up to?" This role model thing ... But not only that "... is she good in English and in Afrikaans, can she coach netball, can she coach the choir?''... And they look for people like that and we produce people like that."

Potts (1997) has provided a detailed account of the experiences and perspectives of academic staff in the Australian College of Advanced Education in the period 1965-1989, a period where the higher education sector in Australia experienced strong growth, followed by drastic restructuring and curtailment of growth. It is interesting to note in his description of these academics' "occupational socialization" a parallel concern with the college/ university dichotomy, with concern being expressed that the College was sometimes making an effort to upgrade the total academic profile of the institution "at the expense of downgrading the emphasis on such previously valued attributes as work experience" (Potts, 1997, p. 34).

## 8. "I just don't have the time"—time and overload

Staff rationalization and the consequent increase in the number of students in a class and number of contact sessions per lecturer were generally experienced as stressful. One lecturer described her perception like this: "I have spent the last three years in crisis ... in the last two, three years I have had neither the chance nor the energy to worry about the big picture, because I could barely hold my nose above my own little picture."

Significantly, even under added workload pressure, teacher educators continued to draw on the discursive parameters of being a 'teacher'. In drawing on a discourse that a teacher's work is preparation, classroom contact and marking, most teacher educators assumed that these parameters were not negotiable. The three-fold nature of teachers' work was usually woven together with assumptions about how students learn best, thus privileging a model of contact time. As lecturers took on more classes, as class sizes expanded, and as continuous assessment made increasing demands on marking time, these teacher educators solved the demands by working harder. In doing so many drew on the construct of the 'ideal' teacher— conscientious, hardworking, and self-sacrificing. This perspective was often associated with pursuit of personal excellence. They argued that they were unable or unwilling to lighten their workload. As one educator explained: "It is easier to do it myself, in fact ... I love the work. Don't get me wrong. That's the problem. I don't want to give it to anybody else. I want to do it, I really want to do it."

This description of work echoed strongly with the ethic of care which Smyth, Dow, Hattam, Reid, and Shacklock (2000) have indicated dominated the work of teachers in their study in Australia: "professionalism is equated with care and ... the commitment to respond to the needs of pupils and colleagues through the development of relations of care is ... central to judgments about good teaching" (Smyth et al., 2000, p. 140). Smyth et al. argue, however, that this ethic of care can also serve to undermine teachers. Teachers with a strong commitment to their students react to cost-cutting measures and consequent intensification of their work environment by simply working harder, not wishing to undermine their own ideology of professionalism.

## 9. Conclusion
The conclusion brings together the theoretical and empirical sections of the study. It argues that any process of change in teacher education needs to be cognizant of the motivations and attitudes of teacher educators themselves. In foregrounding the centrality of identity to change, the views and comments highlighted by this group of lecturers in one institution offer theoretical tools for understanding the introduction of new forms of practice in a teacher education institution.

The analysis indicated here suggests that freeing up spaces in a timetable for research, reflection and enquiry, although important, is not likely to be a *sufficient condition* for the promotion of such enquiry. While the investigation reported here was motivated by the Dean's desire to increase time for lecturers to engage in reflection and enquiry, the lecturers working within a 'college' discursive parameter seemed rather to be seeking time to *teach*—to plan, to give classes, and to mark. Many of the strategies with potential to free up time for staff to research—for example, combining classes, non-contact time with students, and fewer evaluative assignments—were in fact in conflict with the understandings that many staff members held about what constituted good practice as a teacher educator.

Despite this, we would argue that it would be a mistake to juxtapose the perspectives of 'teaching' and 'enquiry' as falling within two dichotomous paradigms. Rather, there is merit in examining the advantages to teaching and learning of integrating a discourse of "teaching as vocational commitment" and one of "learning through reflection".

The strengths of the vocational commitment model are numerous. Firstly, skills, knowledge, and values are acquired that are directly related to the market place.

Secondly, the pastoralism implicit in this model supports individual learners and models appropriate teacher behavior (Bullough, 1997, p. 16). There is evidence that students from disadvantaged groups benefit from a pastoral model of tertiary education (McMillan, 2004). A more political point of view even argues that teacher education which focuses on personal development may provide greater emancipatory opportunities to disadvantaged students than do lectures on socially relevant topics (Robinson, 1999). Significantly, an internal document at the Cape Technikon went so far as to argue that a lower student-teacher ratio in first and second year would allow for better psychological, emotional and intellectual support for students, make them feel more secure and confident, and give a better chance of assessing specific needs of disadvantaged students and providing early intervention (Cape Technikon, 2002, p. 23). Ironically, this is exactly the approach which is implemented by lecturers in the Faculty of Education and which is seriously under threat due to extensive rationalization of staff from former colleges of education.

How then might enquiry be woven into existing teacher educators' identities? This article has argued that by accessing people's perspectives, values, motivations, attitudes and views prior to implementing change, change agents are able to 'tap into' existing strands of identity, thereby facilitating a weaving together of old and new roles and responsibilities. A re-conceptualization of teacher educator identity is, however, most likely to succeed where the values contained in the 'new' identity build directly on those of the 'old' identity. This transition is more likely to be successful where the situational adjustment that the academic is required to make does not conflict with his or her own "personal and occupational view of self" (Potts, 1997, p. 108).

We have argued that a research orientation is important in teacher education, and that time needs to be created for this to occur. But given more flexibility in the timetable, the question remains as to how lecturers themselves would choose to use the time provided. The evidence of this study indicates that, despite national and institutional pressures to be involved in research, many lecturers would prefer to use the time to protect their pedagogical and pastoral role. A similar conclusion was drawn by Leslie (2002), whose wide-ranging study of academic staff in the USA found that faculty staff often indicate a preference for the intrinsic satisfaction of teaching, even in a context where the extrinsic rewards and incentives are greater for those involved in research.

We would argue, however, that this preference for maintaining the teacher-educator-as-teacher' identity does not necessarily contradict a 'teacher-educator-as-enquirer' identity. Rather, it points to the importance of building research, reflection and enquiry on what teacher educators *already* perceive to be their own particular strengths, namely maintaining a close and supportive relationship with students, ensuring a hands-on approach to teaching and learning, and linking directly with schools. Teacher educators thereby become active players in "the advancement of pedagogical content knowledge [which] represents a form of the scholarship of discovery that overlaps with, and should be viewed as part of, the scholarship of teaching" (Paulsen, 2001, p. 21).

Drawing on the participatory action research paradigm, and in line with our commitment to research informing and improving practice, this article ends with a brief description of some of the initiatives undertaken to link research development with the interests and identities of the teacher educators in this study. Foremost to the development of a discourse on the relationship between research and teaching has been the introduction of staff seminars, where lecturers present their own research and are encouraged to debate strategic issues impacting

on their practice. Examples of such debates include considerations of what constitutes good teaching, how independent learning can be facilitated and how teacher education prepares future teachers for diversity in the classroom. Another significant point of engagement has been the debate on the use of time, and what constitutes a lecturer's 'workload'. Both these strategies have opened a space for staff to start initiating research, presenting at conferences and publishing in academic journals.

We would argue, therefore, that research, reflection and enquiry can be seen as essential tools in the development of *even better* teacher educators, whom are able to interrogate their discipline, the policy frameworks within which they work and the complex social conditions of schooling. In short, those who have intimate knowledge of their students and the workplace will be able to contribute in a grounded and meaningful way to the process of knowledge production about education in general and teaching and learning in particular.

## Acknowledgement

## References

Bottery, M. (1992). *The ethics of educational management.* London: Cassell.

Bullough,, R. V., Jr. (1997). Practising theory and theorizing practice in teacher education. In J. Loughran, & T. Russell (Eds.), *Teaching about teaching. Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education.* London: Falmer Press.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., & Gitlin, A. (1995). *Becoming a student of teaching: Methodologies for exploring self and school context.* New York: Garland.

Cape Technikon (2002). Internal document (not for circulation).

Cousins, B., & Earl, L. (1995). The case for participatory evaluation: theory, research, practice. In B. Cousins, & L. Earl (Eds.), *Participatory evaluation in education; studies in evaluation use and organizational learning.* London: Falmer.

Department of Education. (2001). *National plan for higher education.* Pretoria.

Gore, J. (1995). *Emerging issues in teacher education.* Murdoch: Innovative Links Project.

Grimmett, P. P. (1995). Re-conceptualizing teacher education: Preparing teachers for revitalized schools. In M. F. Wideen, & P. P. Grimmet (Eds.), *Changing times in teacher education: Restructuring or re-conceptualization?.* London: Falmer Press.

Kruss, G. (2002). *Employment and employability: Expectations for higher education responsiveness.* Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Lanier, J. E., & Little, J. W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching.* New York: McMillan.

Leslie, D. W. (2002). Resolving the dispute: Teaching is academe's core value. *Journal of Higher Education,* 73(1), 49-73.

Lindsay, R., Breen, R., & Jenkins, A. (2002). Academic research and teaching quality: The views of undergraduate and postgraduate students. *Studies in Higher Education,* 27(3), 309-327.

Loughran, J. (1997). Teaching about teaching: Principles and practice. In J. Loughran, & T. Russell (Eds.), *Teaching about teaching. Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education.* London: Falmer Press.

Mauri Majos, T. (2001). Initial and continuing education in Spain in the context of 21st century education. In Regional Education Project of Latin America and the Caribbean. (Eds.). *Teacher training: Contribution to discussion. Some country experiences.* Santiago: UNESCO.

McMillan, W. (2004). "I could go work in a factory, but this is something I want to achieve"—narratives into social action. *Race Ethnicity and Education,* 7(2), 115-134.

Nias, J. (1988). What it means to "feel like a teacher": The subjective reality of primary school teaching. In J. Ozga (Ed.), *Schoolwork: Approaches to the labour process of teaching.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Nkomo, M., Chisholm, L., & McKinney, C. (2004). Through the eye of the school—in pursuit of social integration. In M. Nkomo, C. McKinney, & L. Chisholm (Eds.), *Reflections on school integration. Colloquium proceedings.* Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council.

O'Sullivan, M. (2002). Reform implementation and the realities within which teachers work: A Namibian case study. *Compare, 32*(2), 219-237.

Paulsen, M. B. (2001). The relation between research and the scholarship of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 86,* 19-29.

Potts, A. (1997). *College academics.* Charlestown, NSW: William Michael Press.

Robertson, J., & Bond, C. H. (2001). Experiences of the relation between teaching and research: What do academic value? *Higher Education Research and Development, 20*(1),5-19.

Robinson, M. (1999). Initial teacher education in a changing South Africa: Experiences, reflections and challenges. *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 23(3), 191-201.

Smyth, J., Dow, A., Hattam, R., Reid, A., & Shacklock, G. (2000). *Teachers' work in a globalizing economy.* London: Falmer.

Villegas-Reimers, E. (2002). Teacher education in the United States of America: Recent trends in its policies and practices. In Regional Education Project of Latin America and the Caribbean. (Eds.). *Teacher training: Contribution to discussion. Some country experiences.* Santiago: UNESCO.

Welmond, M. (2002). Globalization viewed from the periphery: The dynamics of teacher identity in the Republic of Benin. *Comparative Education Review,* 46(1), 37-65.

Woods, P. E. (1981). Strategies, commitments and identity: Making and breaking the teacher. In L. Barton, & S. Walker (Eds.), *Schools, teachers and teaching.* Lewes: Falmer.