

Wigs, disguises and child's play: solidarity recovered in education.

Abstract

It is generally acknowledged that much contemporary education takes place within a dominant audit culture, in which accountability becomes a powerful driver of educational practices. In this culture both pupils and teachers risk being configured as a means to an assessment and target-driven end: pupils are schooled within a particular paradigm of education. The article discusses some ethical issues raised by such schooling, particularly the tensions arising for teachers, and by implication, teacher educators who prepare and support teachers for work in situations where vocational aims and beliefs may be in conflict with instrumentalist aims. The article offers De Certeau's concept of '*la perruque*' to suggest an opening to playful engagement for human ends in education, as a way of contending with and managing the tensions generated. I use the concept to recover a concept of solidarity for teacher educators and teachers to enable ethical teaching in difficult times.

Keywords: accountability; ethical issues; teacher educators; vocation; solidarity

Introduction

It is widely acknowledged that an audit culture with a strong bias towards the pursuit of targets and outputs currently exists in many education systems world-wide, where the aims of education are predominately defined in relation to economic ends. (Ball, 2001; Apple 2004 and 2005). A policy driven auditing of schools is underpinned with an economic justification, related to gaining skills, qualifications and employment in a global economy. This is a powerful director of school action and of teachers' compliance with practices entailed. However, the pursuit of this aim often impedes the enactment of other principles espoused in these same systems. In England for example, the statutory national curriculum takes a principled stand on the value of inclusion and

states that ‘teachers should aim to give every pupil the opportunity to experience success in learning and to achieve as high a standard as possible’ (DfE 2011). The drive to achieve high ranking in a league table of published tests and examinations may militate against the principle of inclusion and in the process create tensions for many teachers, as this drive tends to require following practices for lesson planning and teaching which are frequently highly prescribed and technical in nature (Korthagen 1999, Crocco and Costigan 2007)ⁱ. Contradictory aims can create confusing situations for teachers as the following example may clarify. In an English guidance document about ‘personalisation’ of the curriculum, the concept of personalisation appears to suggest an individualising of teaching, an opening up to pupils’ individually and relationally. Guidance to the policy however indicates that the principle of inclusion of all pupils in ‘accessing the curriculum’ and the requirement to deliver specific targets are contradictory aims since the principle of ‘personalisation of learning’ to individual pupils is conceived within an audit paradigm/ We learn that ‘the key to manageability ...(*in personalisation*) is the layering of targets in order to provide a clear route from the numerical target to the curricular target for the group or individual pupil’ (DCFS 2008, 16). The ethical implications here are that the pupils are conceived primarily as a means to an end of higher test results: they are not an end in themselves (Fielding 2008). If individual flourishing were the primary underlying aim of the personalisation strategy, teachers would be able to devote time to attend to them in their individual particularities and the means to do so would not be so technically prescribed. Dialogical practice and the primacy of relationships in teaching are by definition, not a feature of *techne*. It is clear that this particular policy, to ‘personalise’ teaching, which at first seems based on a humanistic aim, one designed for the flourishing of the pupils, is instead conceived within an audit paradigm. Delivering this policy is a technical matter.

A conscientious teacher working in a school that requires lessons ‘delivered’ with highly specified ‘outcomes’, who is also trying to cater for *all* her students, may be in a difficult situation when required to evaluate a lesson taught within an auditing paradigm, framing questions about effectiveness in terms of whether specifically defined learning outcomes were achieved, and whether by all. If she believes that more time is needed with some pupils, she may also be conscious of the time-frame regulating the way in which the outcomes are programmed into the curriculum. There is a sense in which teachers in this context are driven forward to the next lesson and its ‘outcomes’, which weighs against going where the moment leads and attending to those spontaneous and teachable moments that can arise in a less regulated classroom, or returning to some ‘unfinished’ thing, when the exercise of judgement suggests more time would be fruitful because prescriptive schemes of work with detailed, specified outcomes for lessons give limited opportunity to seize the moment and to follow up pupils’ engaged curiosity, if these discussions and questions meander away from these specified objectives and outcomes. Teacher judgement is often overridden by having to ‘move on’ in order to manage the demand to achieve specific targets. The lack of time to engage with pupils’ concerns and questions, as they arise in the normal ‘flow’ can be a source of tension for teachers who understand and know that some pupils may be ‘left behind’ in the rush to move on. The tensions experienced by teachers in situations dominated by an auditing paradigm cannot be easily removed, since they have their source in beliefs and values.

Teachers' beliefs and values

Teaching is essentially a relational practice (Dunne 2003, Noddings 2003) and there is strong evidence that most teachers see teaching predominantly as a vocation (Huebner 1987, Rogers and Webb 1991, Hansen 1994 and 1995, Schwarz 1998, Estola et al. 2003) and demonstrate what Aloni has called 'the fundamental commitments of educators' (Aloni, 2008). Individual teacher narratives evidence 'teacher's vocation as a moral voice and its manifestation in the form of caring' (Estola et al. 2003, 239). Examples abound in the individual pieces which are commonly set at the beginning of many courses of pre-service training, in which beginning teachers set out their views and their values as they embark on their preparation to teach. These pieces refer predominantly to the establishment of relationships and to the qualities and dispositions they remember in their 'best' teachers, and wish to cultivate themselves and they also frequently make points about social justice, in the sense of 'wanting to make a difference'. They do not write in an effectiveness discourse. Some career-change teachers talk about returning to education to escape the values of their previous careers, which they have experienced as lacking in orientation towards to social ends. (Heilbronn 2011). Significantly, pupils hold similar views and talk predominantly about good teachers as those who listen to them and 'help' them, and not in technical terms of terms of achievement of targets and results (ESRC 1997, Wiedmaier 2007 et al., Wang and Holcombe 2010).

Given the above, we might question why teachers in much of their practice appear to collude with a performativity culture that constrains that practice into largely technically rational activity. Current orthodoxy about targets and the curriculum is, however, difficult to combat as it seems to be based on the premise that gaining the

defined skills, in the manner prescribed will lead to qualifications and ultimately employment. To deny that economic autonomy through the acquisition of work skills should be an aim of education seems counter to teachers' basic beliefs and common sense. It then becomes difficult to question curricula design, which would lead to questioning the examination syllabii that generate the qualifications, since the curriculum throughout is assessment-led and to question these syllabii would lead to a radical re-thinking of the secondary curriculum and possibly school organisation. (The arguments about the test-led curricular have been substantially articulated, for example Davis, 1999 and 2008 and Stobart 2007). Teachers rarely step outside their own curriculum paradigm and this seems reasonable: to ask fundamental questions of one's daily work could lead to a loss of faith in that work, in the sense of removing the ladder one is standing on. It is then rarely questioned that the predominant aim of education, which eclipses all other aims, is pupils' employability and not education as an initiation into as 'worthwhile activities' and morally defensible forms of enquiry and experience (Peters, 1965). Teachers rarely question the premise on which the employability-skills-acquisition model of education is based because it is difficult to think clearly through its 'double-bindedness'. Bateson (1972) introduced the notion of a 'double-bind' as the traumatic experience of receiving contradictory messages which demand two different responses or actions that cannot both be completed. People experiencing such contradictory messages experience emotional and often psychological tensions that make their normal functioning difficult or impossible. Teachers who hold strong vocational values and find these compromised by what 'schooling' may demand of them, are at risk of this kind of emotional and psychological difficulty since they are liable to suffer from experiencing situations which strain and even contradict their

beliefs and values (Hartley 1994). Teachers who are comfortable with their school culture may be less inclined to difficulties of this kind.

The ethic of care leads teachers to feel responsible for pupil success in education, and the gaining of the goods of education. One of these goods is undoubtedly the achievement of economic autonomy through employment. When teachers feel unable to question the premise of employability behind curricula design it becomes difficult to further question what the aims of education might be. To do so would lead to a loss of certainty in the benefits of the work that teachers do and lead to confusion. This is more than a professional matter – it is an existential matter. Performing the function of curriculum delivery agents within a regime of rituals, such as inspections and audits (Ball 2001), limits an existential openness to the possibility of uncertainty and of fallibility. Dewey's historical perspective in *'The Quest for Certainty'* (1960) and Schön's development of Dewey in his account of 'technical rationality' (1983) are particularly pertinent here as a pointer to mechanisms that have led to a 'managerial narrowing of educational endeavour to the sphere of the secure and the predictable' (Papastephanou 2006). A key question for teacher educators who are responsible for courses and professional development, is how to enable teachers to positively question their situations without losing efficacy, without losing their confidence in their ability to act, since confusion can be paralysing. The primary situation to challenge is that of being configured as a technician of curriculum delivery, over and above a teacher in relationship with her pupils. Prescriptive pedagogy, tightly controlled curriculum goals, inflexibility in lesson planning, these are all symptoms of 'the obsession with effectiveness (that) leads to an ideal of minimising or effacing risk' and this 'further grounds measures for limiting educational goals to those that can be achieved fully

(Papastephanou 2006, 51). Yet without an opening to risk teachers are not open to ethical possibility inherent in dialogical encounters, in relationships.

In the next section of the article I focus on the implications of the discussion for teacher educators.

Solidarity as a teacher educator

It is a premise of this article that educators have an ethical responsibility to those they teach which encompasses not misleading them and in the case of teacher educators not misrepresenting or ignoring the tensions and difficulties of the practice, in order to prepare them ‘to understand the moral and ethical complexities of their role and thus enable them to reflect ethical actions and decisions in their professional practice’ (Campbell 1997, 255). Importantly too, teachers' practice ‘inevitably has a strong influence on the moral lessons students directly and indirectly acquire in the classroom’ (ibid). This responsibility entails an injunction on teachers, as Kitchner points out, to ‘affirm their ethical values throughout the curriculum’, since it is the case that ‘implicit attitudes and explicit behaviour of faculty communicate as much as course content about being ethical’ (Kitchner 1992, 190).

To affirm these ethical values in relationship with others is to demonstrate solidarity with others. To argue this claim I first examine the concept of solidarity as applied to the teacher educators in this context, taking the meaning of solidarity with its obvious connection with ‘solidity’ meaning ‘solid, not flimsy’, which resonates with the need for situational competence, a quality that is necessary for teachers in the lived circumstances of the practice. But ‘solidarity’ has a more widely used connotation as meaning ‘solid with another’: the term carries a socially embedded meaning. Being

‘double bound’ by the exigencies of technical rationality and vocational ideals sets up a conflict in many practitioners. To resist the demands of technical rationality requires strategic competence. If people are to survive and thrive in repressive situations they need to cope with these situations without losing agency. Since these situations are social situations, solidarity with others is fundamental to coping and resistance since it is highly unlikely that the socially atomised individual could develop successful modes of engagement with their situation. Teachers are socially and culturally bound, and not isolated agents. Resistance to difficult and oppressive situations needs the engagement with others who are ‘solid’ with the resisters, which means solid in an existential sense and solid with the values resisted and the values upheld. In the case of teacher educators and student teachers this means supporting the development of certain capacities and capabilities. Being solid with student teachers is being significantly engaged with them in a social practice, with implications for a wider nexus of professional knowledge and collective responsiveness. Camus (1962) has characterised a choice to be made between two existential positions, one can be ‘solidaire ou solitaire’, either solid with another or alone. The resonances with the vocabulary around ‘solidarity’ accord with the English common usage of the word ‘solid’ as an adjective, which is first recorded in English in the fifteenth century, originating from the Old French ‘solide’ meaning ‘firm, dense, compact,’ which came into French from the Latin, ‘solidus’ meaning ‘firm, whole, entire’. ‘Solitary’, meaning ‘on one’s own’ has resonances with the word ‘isolated’, from the Latin ‘insulatus’, meaning ‘made into an island’ (OED, 2046-7), a meaning that Donne finessed in his meditation in 1624. ‘No man is an Iland, intire of it selfe; every man is a peece of the Continent, a part of the maine’ (Donne 1975).

I wish to reclaim the French root for the word, which accords with modern French usage, notably ‘solidarité’ as ‘mutual responsibility,’ which was a 1675 coinage

of the "Encyclopédie" (published in France between 1751 and 1772), deriving from 'solidaire' meaning 'interdependent, complete, entire' as derived from 'solide'. I try here to detach the word from its current significance and to reclaim the freshness of the word when first coined by the project of the Encyclopédie. To note that the current significance and meaning of the word in education lies largely in Freire's powerful use in 'Pedagogy of the Oppressed' (1970), where the concept forms part of a liberation project in the particular class and ethnic circumstances in which Freire was teaching and writing. Hence it carries inevitable political meanings not necessarily entailed in the 1765 definition. It has been claimed that the political aspect of Freire's book negate its function as a text about education (Stern 2009). More profoundly Freire's concept has been challenged by Levinas on ontological grounds: solidarity is an impossibility, the Other is not 'knowable' in the sense taken by Freire. As Margonis (2007) reminds us, for Levinas

the relationship with the other is not an idyllic and harmonious relationship of communion, or a sympathy through which we put ourselves in the other's place; we recognize the other as resembling us, but exterior to us; the relationship with the other is a relationship with a Mystery. More basic than any posited unity stands the radical difference of the other (1987, 75-76).

In this account of solidarity as 'solid with' I make no ontological claim that might be open to Levinas' criticism and do not imply that 'being solid with' must lead inevitably to a radical pedagogy.

For teacher educators 'being solid with' entails two strong ethical demands. The first is the responsibility to prepare teachers to manage the process and practices of schools and schooling in an environment where much of a technical nature needs to be

learnt. The second is to demonstrate 'solidarity' as 'being solid with' these teachers, which means not glossing over, burying, avoiding, nor yet confronting for the sake of contestation, the dilemmas generated by holding vocational values in audit driven culture. This second injunction entails living with contradiction and inducting student teachers into the practice of living in the space of contradictory demands, seeing such 'double-bindedness' for what it is, being able to articulate dilemmas and understand the sometimes painful existential position of living with them. Ethical teacher educators should help those they teach to develop ways of living with contradictions, so that they do not become paralysing. Part of the role of teacher educators may also involve assessment, leading to accreditation, as gate keepers to teaching. Where this accreditation is based primarily and narrowly on standards and competences it may seem as if this role does oblige compliance with practices that border on the unethical. The reasons for this lie in the widely discussed objections to standards assessment for teachers (Thompson 1992, Carr 1993, Lum 1999 and 2003). Ethical teacher educators need to enable student teachers to develop strategic competence and capability, the ability to work within the confines of the curriculum and the culture and also keep their own agency, which includes the ability to exercise their professional judgement and their critical faculties.

Developing strategic competence and capability can be helped by engaging in practices that promote solidarity, as 'being solid with', and do no harm to others, such as pupils. Strategic competence and capability are demonstrated in the exercise of practical judgement (Heilbronn 2008). In *The Practice of Everyday Life*, de Certeau introduces a useful concept that can explicate some of the aspects of solidarity that I am advocating here. De Certeau develops the French idiomatic expression *la perruque*, used to refer to activities or tasks undertaken for personal reasons, under the pretence of

legitimate, paid work. #*La perruque*’ literally means *wig* and according to de Certeau its origins lie in an ancient tradition of 'duping the master'. '*La perruque* may be as simple a matter as a secretary's writing a love letter on “company time” or as complex as a cabinetmaker's "borrowing" a lathe to make a piece of furniture for his living room (de Certeau 1984, 25). The significant factor about engaging in *la perruque* for my current argument is not the material diversion of employer's resources to the employee's own ends, but the carving out in the working day of personal time. Is time borrowing unethical? Is it unethical to write a personal letter in the boss's time, or shop online using office-supported equipment? Engaging in *la perruque* differs from pilfering in that nothing of material value is stolen. It differs from absenteeism in that the worker is officially present at work. 'The worker who indulges in *la perruque* actually diverts time (not goods, since he uses only scraps' (ibid.). This personal time becomes a space for an action related to human ends and not the ends of the factory, the workshop, the production line, and I am suggesting in this case, the classroom. And once this personal time-space exists it poses the possibility of action outside these other-manufactured exigencies.

La perruque is more related to the realm of play, with its connotations of creativity and leisure, than to the domain of morality. One engages in *la perruque* 'for work that is free, creative, and precisely not directed toward profit' (ibid.). De Certeau rightly asserts that successful exercise of the practice relies on the worker's wit and ingenuity, and as such represents autonomous acting and experiencing, within the confines of what might otherwise be monotonous work - work undertaken merely for the wage it represents and not for any intrinsic value to the worker. He is at pains to point out that nothing material is stolen and there is no implication that engagement in *la perruque* entails incompetence or inefficiency. De Certeau's discussion is situated

within the specific context of contemporary consumer society. In this context *la perruque* should be valued as a strategy to support survival and flourishing in any institution designed for ends not related to human flourishing. The worker who engages in *la perruque* exercises desirable qualities in a situation of constraint, and at times, servitude.

In the very place where the machine he must serve reigns supreme, he cunningly takes pleasure in finding a way to create gratuitous products whose sole purpose is to signify his own capabilities through his work (ibid.,3).

Consumer products in a market economy rely on the profit motive and the good of individual consumers and producers. De Certeau situates his interpretation of *la perruque* within the discourse of communal shared values. For de Certeau the worker engaging in *la perruque* asserts a different ethic to the dominant ethic of the market and does so only

with the complicity of other workers (who thus defeat the competition the factory tries to instil among them), he succeeds in ‘putting one over’ on the established order on its home ground(ibid., 25-6).

The worker confirms his solidarity with other workers or his family ‘through *spending* his time in this way’ (ibid., 25).

Wiggery (a translation I will use for ‘*la perruque*’) is aligned to playfulness rather than unethical behaviour. Wit and ingenuity in being a good wiggery player are qualities that support resilience, as the persistence of a genre of ‘gallows humour’ suggests. These human qualities are related to playfulness: they enable us to stand back from an otherwise engulfing situation, to see it with some sense of perspective, and in the exercise of our own playfulness we are put us back in charge of our actions. When

we act playfully we create our own meanings in a situation. Good wiggery players manage to keep their own creative sense of playfulness, as opposed to absorbing the dominant orthodoxy, and this in turn keeps the possibility for rational reflection alive. Playfulness enables and announces that alternative viewpoints exist, even if these alternative viewpoints are not fully rationalised. The possibility of resistance is announced through witty responses in restrictive situations. The concept of wiggery carries more than mere wit and ingenuity as it also implies not coming headlong against authority, acting at all times in a non-confrontational manner. The concept is applicable in all the relationships under discussion here, teacher educator with student teacher and student teacher with pupil, as is further developed in the next section.

Solidarity with pupils and play

Student teachers and teacher educators frequently notice ‘wiggery’ in the classroom when they observe pupils in lessons. In this section I shift focus from the relationship between the teacher educator and her student teacher, to those that teachers develop with their pupils and I wish to suggest that charity towards ‘off task’ behaviour might be a step towards reconciling conflicting demands of those teachers’ own practice. Why should teachers in general, which includes student teachers in particular, turn a blind eye to ‘off task’ behaviour in the classroom? Does encouraging playfulness and ‘wiggery’ undermine teacher authority? Does ignoring ‘off task behaviour’ act against the pupils’ best interest? Can an ethical teacher educator invite student teachers to turn a blind eye to such behaviour? To answer some of these questions I want to think about the transition, I might even say the translation of the infant child into the school child. In England this takes place at the age of five, or in the school year in which she becomes five but generally ranges from 5-7 in most education systems. A number of

reasons and stories about going to school might be offered to her. From the perspective of the state, the child is enrolled in a social institution in which she will begin her education as a future citizen of that state, so the entry into school is in some sense a call up for compulsory school service. In an English school context she will begin her work on the first Key Stage of the National Curriculum very soon after entry. At the end of the Key Stage her educational achievements are audited and counted with the schools' targets and achievements, in the published league tables of schools' results, according to the market model discussed earlier in the paper. In this climate both junior and infant pupils routinely undergo the kind of educational experience that was once common to 16-18 year olds, when school examinations took place predominantly and only at this age. 'Cramming' for examinations, was a feature of the education of this age group and the institutions engaging it were often called 'sausage machines'. This kind of learning experience equates to de Certeau's account of being a factory worker, 'on the boss's time', which we could contrast with a pedagogy based on inquiry and exploration advocated by educationalists such as Rousseau, Dewey, Bruner, Piaget, Vygotsky, Froebel, Montessori, who, while differing in theoretical detail, all based their pedagogy on the primacy of experience in the child's development of knowledge and understanding.

It is not disputed that play is of foundational importance to the psychological, emotional and cognitive development of children (Isenberg and Quisenberry 1988, Fromberg 1998 and 2002, McCune and Zanes 2001, Jenkinson 2001). Indeed, at one time in England the primacy of play to children's development was recognised as a foundational aspect of curriculum design in the primary school. Following the 1967 Plowden Report, play and experiential learning became central to the primary curriculum in England, a curriculum that was changed after the 1988 Education Reform

Act established a statutory National Curriculum and testing regime from ages 5-16 (DFE 1988). Plowden had stated specifically that we should not assume that only what is measurable is valuable (1967). In the current context, when student teachers are able to be charitable to pupils' playfulness in class they are at the same time acknowledging children's right and need to play, and in so doing enabling those children to create a space for play, in a non-confrontational manner. From the children's perspective, they have to survive in school without getting into head-on clashes with authority. Children who are unable to dissimulate and disguise non-compliance often get into difficulties that may lead to exclusion from school and other adverse circumstances. These can lead to a career of disadvantage and confrontation. Children who are good natural 'wiggery players' have some survival and developmental advantages in the school system. With an ability to sometimes 'do their own thing', they may develop a number of dispositions that are important to leading a good life, such as tactfulness and diplomacy, attentiveness, situational alertness, creativity, independence, solidarity. Children have to respond with tact to teachers if they are to avoid confrontation. They need to notice what is going on around them, otherwise they may be caught out. They need to be aware of their class mates and know how to draw on friendships: their wiggery needs to fit in with interests beyond their own, otherwise it would soon be revealed. Therefore teachers who understand and appreciate the benefits of wiggery would stand in solidarity with their pupils in their pupils' daily encounter with schooling.

Solid with and solid against?

How does this discussion about children and wiggery relate to the central argument of the paper, that teacher educators need to stand in solidarity with their student teachers and those on courses of professional development? I suggest that

noticing and understanding playful wiggery in their pupils can remind teachers of the space and time that can be created for activity related to human ends; can help foster a humane approach to their pupils, and a situational alertness and competence which they and their pupils require to cope with the tensions and contradictions of school life, helping to keep open a pedagogic space of thoughtfulness, a space for what Van Manen has called 'tactful teaching' (1991). Unless teachers are able to understand and resist the technicist demands of their working situations, they risk, in their turn, acting unethically, by treating the children as means to an end, that of better test results and higher targets, rather than people in their own right, 'an end in themselves' with entitlements to exist in their own liminal space.

De Certeau thinks of *la perruque* as the tactics of the weak. In the current school situation student teachers and teachers in general have very little chance to exercise their own judgement on curricular matters and even on relational matters in many casesⁱⁱ. In celebrating *la perruque* de Certeau expresses how the practice might benefit us within an institution led by managerial, rather than humanistic aims. He tells us that:

we can divert the time owed to the institution; we can make textual objects that signify an art and solidarities; we can play the game of free exchange, even if it is penalized by bosses and colleagues when they are not willing to 'turn a blind eye' on it; we can create networks of connivances and sleights of hand; we can exchange gifts; and in these ways we can subvert the law that, in the scientific factory, put work at the service of the machine, and, by a similar logic, progressively destroys the requirement of creation and the 'obligation to give' (de Certeau 1984, 149).

So this resistance is not passive, and not confrontational. It is the resistance embedded in relationships. 'It relies for its success, or at least for its continuation and avoidance of destruction, on the connivance of others in some form' (ibid.). It relies on

other people tacitly agreeing not to ‘inform’ that ‘shirking’ is taking place, that someone may be avoiding their duty, or their obligations to an authority. It relies on ‘camaraderie’, or ‘comradeship’. ‘Comrade’ has a political connotation for English speakers and here again it is useful to de-couple the sense of the word from its twentieth century associations and reclaim an early recorded use as ‘one who shares the same room’, in a similar move to that around ‘solid with’ and ‘solitary’. The French word ‘camarade’ as used in the sixteenth century is still used today to mean ‘friend’. ‘Camaraderie’ is friendship of a certain kind as there is also the French word ‘amitié’ which is more related to a personal friendship, having its origin in the word for ‘love’. ‘Camaraderie’ refers to the kind of relationship of a shared social space, a ‘camera’, in Latin, ‘a room’, a classroom for example.

Morally responsible teacher educators are solid with their student teachers in all circumstances as is a pastoral responsibility of any teacher. In the current, specific context outlined at the beginning of the paper and referred to as an audit culture, ‘being solid with’ means both preparing student teachers with the applied technical knowledge and ‘sharing their burdens’, the tensions and contradictions of teacher existence

References

- Aloni, M. 2008. The fundamental commitments of educators, *Ethics and Education*, 3, no. 2: 149-159
- Apple, M. W. 2004. Schooling, Markets, and an Audit Culture. *Educational Policy* September 2004, 18, no.4: 614-621,
- Apple, M. W. 2005. Education, markets, and an audit culture. *Critical Quarterly*, 47, no. 2: 11–29
- Ball, S. 2001. Performativities and fabrications in the education economy: Towards the performative society, in *The performing school: Managing teaching and*

- learning in a performance culture* ed. D. Gleeson and C. Husbands. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Bateson, G. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, E. 1997. Connecting the ethics of teaching and moral education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48, no. 4: 255–263.
- Camus, A. 1962, *Exile and the Kingdom*, London: Penguin Books.
- Carr, D. 1993. Questions of Competence. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 41, no. 3: 253-271.
- Crocco, M., and Costigan, A. 2007. The Narrowing of Curriculum and Pedagogy in the Age of Accountability: Urban Educators Speak Out, *Urban Education*, November 2007. 42, no. 6: 512-535
- Davis, A. 1999. *Educational Assessment: A Critique of Current Policy*. Impact No 1. London: Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain.
- Davis, A. 2008. *Educational Assessment: A Critique of Current Policy* . Impact No 16. London: Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain.
- DCSF. 2008. Personalised Learning a Practical Guide. Nottingham: Department of Children, Schools and Families.
- de Certeau, M. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life, Vol. 1*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: California, University of California Press.
- Dewey, J. 1960. *The Quest for Certainty*. USA: Capricorn Editions.
- DfE. 1988. *Education Reform Act*. London: HMSO.
- DfE. 2011. Including all learners: the three principles in the inclusion statement: general article. Department for Education.
<http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/curriculum/b00199686/inclusion/challenges> (Accessed 30 April 2012).
- DfE. 2012. Systematic synthetic phonics and the Year 1 phonics screening check. Department for Education.
<http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/toolsandinitiatives/emailstoschools/a00205297/phonics-07-11-11> (Accessed 30 April 2012).
- Donne, J. 1975. Devotions upon Emergent Occasions, Ed. Anthony Raspa. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
<http://litmed.med.nyu.edu/Annotation?action=view&annid=1128>

- Dunne, J. 2003. Arguing for teaching as a practice: A reply to Alisdair MacIntyre. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. 37, no.2: 353-71
- ESRC. 1997. What pupils tell us about teachers and lessons. Economic and Social Research Council.
<http://www.sln.org.uk/1419/downloads/newsroom/what%20works%20for%20learners%202006%2010.pdf>. First published: Sept 1994
- Estola, E., Erikkilä, R., Syrjälä, L. 2003. A Moral Voice of Vocation in Teachers' Narratives. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*: 9, no. 3: 239-256.
- Fielding, M. 2008. Personalisation, Education and the Market. *Soundings*. 38, no. 1: 56-69
- Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Fromberg, D. P. 1998. Play issues in early childhood education. In *The early childhood curriculum: A review of current research* 2nd edition, ed. C. Seefeldt, 190-212. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- 2002. *Play and meaning in early childhood education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hansen, D. T. 1994. Teaching and the Sense of Vocation. *Educational Theory*, 44: 259–275.
- Hansen, D. T. 1995. *The Call to Teach*. New York: Teachers College Press .
- Hartley, D. 1994. Mixed Messages in Education Policy – Sign of the Times. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 42:3 230-244.
- Huebner, D. 1987. The vocation of teaching. In *Teacher renewal: professional issues, personal choices*, ed. F.S. Bolin and J. M. Falk, 17- 29. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Heilbronn, R. 2008. *Teacher Education and the Development of Practical Judgement*. London: Continuum.
- Heilbronn, R. 2011. Evaluation of student teachers' written texts on the good teacher. 2008-2011. London: Institute of Education, University of London. Unpublished coursework evaluation.
- Isenberg, J. and Quisenberry, N..1988. 'Play: Essential for All Children'. The Association for Childhood Education International.
<http://www.freepatentsonline.com/article/Childhood-Education/93348877.html> (accessed 17.05.12).
- Jenkinson, Sally. 2001. *The Genius of Play: Celebrating the Spirit of Childhood*. Melbourne: Hawthorn Press

- Kitchner, K. S. 1992. Psychologist as teacher and mentor: Affirming ethical values throughout the curriculum, *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 23, no. 3: 190-195.
- Levinas, E. 1987. *Time and the Other*, trans. Richard Cohen (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press).
- Lum, G. 1999. Where's the competence in competence-based education and training?. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 33, no. 3: 403–18.
- 2003. Towards a richer conception of vocational preparation. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 37, no. 1: 1–12.
- McCune, L., & Zanes, M. 2001. Learning, attention and play. In *Psychological perspectives on early childhood education*, ed. S. Golbeck, 92-106. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Margonis, F. 2007. A Relational Ethic of Solidarity? *Philosophy of Education 2007: 62-70*. ojs.ed.uiuc.edu/index.php/pes/article/viewPDFInterstitial/1437/184
- Papastephanou, M. 2006. Education, risk and ethics, *Ethics and Education*, 1, no.1: 47-63
- Peters, R.S. 1965. Education as initiation. In *Philosophical analysis and education*, ed. R. D. Archambault, 87–111. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Noddings, N. 2003. Is teaching a practice? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 37, No. 2: 241-52
- OED. 1983. *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, Volume 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Plowden, B. 1967. *The Plowden Report: Children and their primary schools*. London: Central Advisory Council for Education (England).
- Rogers, D. and J. Webb. 1991. The ethic of caring in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 42, no. 3: 173-81.
- Schön, D. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schwarz, G.E. 1998. Teaching as Vocation: Enabling Ethical Practice. *Educational Forum*, 63, no.1: 23-29.
- Stern, S. 2009. Pedagogy of the Oppressor, *City Journal*, Spring 2009, 19, no.2. http://city-journal.org/2009/19_2_freirian-pedagogy.html
- Stobart, G. 2007. *Testing Times; the uses and abuses of assessment*. London: Routledge.

- Thompson, M.1992. Do 27 competences make a teacher? *Education Review*, 6, no. 2: 4-8.
- Van Manen, M.1991. *The tact of teaching: the meaning of pedagogical thoughtfulness*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Wang, M.T. and Holcombe, R. 2010. Adolescents' Perceptions of School Environment, Engagement, and Academic Achievement in Middle School, *American Educational Research Journal*, 47, no. 3: 633-662.
- Wiedmaier, D., Moore, C., Onwuegbuzie, A., Witcher, A., Collins, J., Filer, C., 2007. Students' Perceptions of Characteristics of Effective College Teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44, no.1: 113-160.
- .
-

ⁱ Examples exist in various strategy documents in England, relating to numeracy and literacy, such as a current controversy around the teaching of reading to primary school children by the means of a specified pedagogy involving the use of synthetic phonics (DfE 2012) rather than 'real texts'.

ⁱⁱ An example is a nationally adopted policy on managing pupil behaviour in England, known as 'Behaviour for Learning', which gives particular advice of a mechanistic, behaviourists kind.