

**Blowin' about the tops: How a university teacher
experiences and negotiates the ethics of teaching**

Paul Heyward

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education, the University of Auckland, 2019.**

Abstract

Teaching is an inherently ethical activity. The act of teaching necessarily involves teachers making decisions about what is right for their students' intellectual, physical, spiritual and moral development. While the title "educational ethicist" is commonly associated with scholars of moral and educational philosophy, I suggest all those who teach need to understand themselves as educational ethicists. This thesis is an account of my "becoming" an educational ethicist as I experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching.

In Part 1 of the thesis I am becoming a scholarly and researching educational ethicist. I begin to explore the question of how teachers make ethical decisions and the place a code of ethics plays in this process. A review of the literature reveals that, while there is a body of research that explores ethical decision-making processes, there is a paucity of scholarship on the place of codes in the decision-making process. A small-scale study of the nature of ethical dilemmas experienced by student teachers on practicum provides insights into why certain types of ethical dilemmas emerged for the participants and how they managed these dilemmas. By the conclusion of Part 1, I am becoming an activist educational ethicist as I engage in recent national policy debates around professionalism and the ethics of teaching in New Zealand.

My frustration at not being able to gain an authentic sense of how teachers experience the ethics of teaching through empirical research with others resulted in a methodological turn in Part 2 of the thesis. I redefine what it means to become a researching educational ethicist by turning towards critical autoethnography to explore the ethical nature of teaching. In this process, I am becoming a theorising and reflective educational ethicist. I reframe my research question to: **how does a university teacher experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching?** In researching this question, I blend Laurel Richardson's "writing as a method of inquiry" with John Smyth's model of "critical reflection" to interrogate my ethical decision making as a university teacher. This decision making is re-created as lived narratives that are analysed through a theoretical framework of teacher identity construction, to reveal the complexity of interwoven issues of oppression and empowerment, agency and structure, and the ethics of teaching. My framework draws on teacher life-history research, sociocultural theory and Louis Althusser's concept of interpellation to provide critical insights into *how a university teacher experiences and negotiates the ethics of teaching*. I find that experiencing and negotiating those ethics is an act of continual identity construction and reconstruction within the dilemmatic world of the neoliberal university. This thesis shows, intimately, how I am continually becoming an educational ethicist and provides rich theoretical insights into the process of teacher identity construction.

Acknowledgements

Teaching is considered an ethical activity because it involves relationships with other human beings. In completing this thesis on how I experience the ethical nature of teaching I have relied on my relationships with some very important human beings.

My colleagues and friends. You have given me belief, support and aroha. Melinda Webber and Brian Marsh (my sane beer buddies in a crazy ole mixed up world), Maree Davies (my confidante and collaborator), Richard Hamilton and Fiona Ell (my time and space manipulators), Judy Robinson, Lyn McDonald and Lynda Garrett (my time and space providers), Robert Sturgess (my neighbour, friend and listening post), Mike Fitzpatrick (the host with the most), Louis Guy (my teaching mentor and ethical role model).

My family. For my boys, Billy, Tom and Archie who continued to love me when I disappeared for days on end into my writing dungeon. For my sister Donna and dad, Kevin, for always being there.

My supervisors. Peter O'Connor and Barbara Grant: You allowed the writer inside me to emerge and take flight. Saville Kushner: For providing an inkling of another way of exploring the ethical world of teaching. Esther Fitzpatrick: For being my autoethnographic mentor and emotional support through many ups and downs. I regard you all as fine colleagues and dear friends.

To my Mum and Dr Ruth Williams. For always being on my shoulder providing me with balance and perspective. Peace be with you.

Stephanie Sheldon. Thank you for being there each step of the way. You made this possible. Thank you for keeping the home fires burning, the humour, the walks, for reading my work again (and again), and the reference checking. You are my muse, my love, my life.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	xi
Chapter One The Introduction	1
I Am “Becoming” an Educational Ethicist	1
Why an interest in the ethics of teaching as a classroom teacher?	1
Why an interest in the ethics of teaching as a university teacher?.....	3
Why an interest in the ethics of teaching as an educational researcher?	6
Writer’s Block and a Methodological Turn	6
(What’s So Funny ‘Bout) Peace Love and Understanding? A Consideration of Andrew Sparkes’s Autoethnographic Account of an Academic Life in Neoliberal Times.....	10
How I imagine student Jim.	10
Who are the strong and the trusted?.....	11
Where is the harmony?	14
Overview of Thesis Parts and Chapters	15
Significance of Research.....	17
Part One	19
Chapter Two The Ethical Nature of Teaching Under Review.....	19
Introduction.....	19
Section 1: The Moral Nature of Teaching: Why Do Teachers Need to Be Ethical?.....	20
Section 2: Teacher Decision Making	22
How do teachers know they have an ethical dilemma?	23
How do teachers make ethically challenging decisions?.....	23
How should teachers take consequences into account when making ethically challenging decisions? A teleological utilitarian perspective.....	27
How should teachers take rules into account when making ethically challenging decisions? A deontological Kantian universalist perspective.....	28

How should teachers take virtues into account when making ethically challenging decisions? A neo-Aristotelian virtues perspective	30
Section 3: A Code of Ethics/Conduct: How Might a Code Help Ethical Decision Making?...	31
What is a code of ethics/conduct?.....	31
Why develop a code?	33
How are codes developed?.....	37
How have teachers used codes?.....	39
Chapter Three Between a Hard Place and a Hard Place: Comparing Ethical Dilemmas in Teaching.....	43
Introduction.....	43
Theoretical Background.....	43
Method.....	45
Participants and data collection.....	45
Data analysis.	45
Findings.....	47
Dilemmas that could be accommodated within the Shapira-Lishchinsky taxonomy (48 incidents).....	47
Personal pedagogical beliefs versus associate teacher/school pedagogical practice (30 incidents).....	48
Dealing with the challenging behaviour of children appropriately versus protecting a safe learning environment.	50
Demonstrating cultural and religious sensitivity versus providing equal time and value to all learners.	51
Fear of accusations of misconduct versus meeting the needs of children.	52
Discussion.....	52
Conclusion and Implications.....	59
Chapter Four Engaging in Debates on Professional Ethics in Teaching: A New Zealand Tale...61	
Introduction.....	61
Overview of Professional Ethics in Teaching in New Zealand (2013–2018).....	61

Why the Shift from a Code of Ethics to a Code of Professional Responsibility?	62
Submission on the Education Council New Zealand Draft Code of Professional Responsibility	63
Case study.	66
Direction given to teachers in using the <i>Code of Ethics</i> and the <i>Draft Code of Professional Responsibility and Standards for the Teaching Profession</i>	67
Recommendations.....	68
Conclusion.	69
An Unexpected Invitation	70
Opinion: Paul Heyward – Get Up, Stand Up.....	71
Taking It to the Top: Letter to the Right Honourable Chris Hipkins, Minister of Education ..	72
Part Two.....	77
Chapter Five The Love Affair: A Methodological Turn	77
Introduction.....	77
Section 1. An Introduction of Sorts: How I Met Autoethnography.....	77
A poetic interlude.....	81
Structural integrity.	82
An Inventory of My Intellectual Foundations	83
Master of Education research project (2004–2006).....	83
Doctor of Philosophy (2009–2011).	84
Doctor of Education confirmation portfolio (2013–2014).....	84
The demolition.	85
Deconstructing and Reconstructing a Research Trajectory	85
So, what have I learnt through this methodological deconstruction and reconstruction?	89
Section 2 Courtship: Getting to Know Autoethnography.....	89
The Ethics of Teaching and Autoethnographic Possibilities	89
Writing As a Method of Inquiry	90
Critical Autoethnography and Me	93

Section 3. A Complicated Relationship: Living with Autoethnography is not Straight Forward	95
Getting to Know the Autoethnography Crowd	95
Lunchroom banter.	96
How analytic autoethnographers would refute the self-indulgent accusation.	98
How evocative autoethnographers would refute the self-indulgent accusation.	99
My position.	99
Section 4. An Old Friend Comes to Stay: Smyth’s Model of Reflection as Autoethnographic	
Writing Method	101
Me and John	101
John, I’m only writing.	102
Ethical Considerations	104
Protecting myself.	104
Protecting others.	105
Conclusion	106
Chapter Six The Theoretical Framework	107
A Theory of Teacher Identity	107
Why is a theory of teacher identity important?	114
What is identity and what is teacher identity?	116
How is identity and teacher identity constructed? (Agency versus structure).	118
Can the theory of interpellation be useful in exploring teacher identity construction?	121
A revised theory of teacher identity construction.	123
Chapter Seven I was Wondering if it Could be Possible for Me to Do My Next Practicum at...?	
The Compassion Versus Regulations Dilemma	127
Introduction	127
Describe: In Which I Lay Out the “Facts” of My Ethical Dilemma in Four Acts	128
The practicum setting.	128
Act One: Hayden	128
March 2016.	128

Act Two: Sally	131
August 2016.....	131
Act Three: Meghan	134
September 2017.....	134
Act Four: Cassy.....	137
August 2018.....	137
Inform: In Which I Theorise my Ethical Decision Making.....	138
The industrial control room.....	138
The ethical control room.....	141
Confront: In Which I Interrogate and Analyse the Assumptions That Informed My Ethical Decision Making.....	145
A theory of teacher identity formation.....	145
Negotiating the identity of the caring compassionate teacher.....	146
Negotiating the identity of the managerialist neoliberal teacher.....	151
The answer is blowin’ in the wind.....	155
Chapter Eight I’m Afraid It’s Time for You to Leave: The English Language Dilemma.....	157
Introduction.....	157
Describe: In Which I Lay Out the “Facts” of My Ethical Dilemma.....	157
Meetings with James.....	157
Meeting with the bursar.....	160
Inform: In Which I Theorise My Ethical Decision Making	161
Confront: In Which I Interrogate and Analyse the Assumptions That Informed My Ethical Decision Making.....	168
Stage 1: The critical incident.....	169
Stage 2: Critical reflection from multiple perspectives.....	169
Stage 3: Confronting personal values, theoretical ethical orientation and professional socialisation.....	174
Stage 4: The decision.....	178
Stage 5: The implications.....	178

Conclusion	179
Chapter Nine The Conclusion: Reconstructing Myself as an Educational Ethicist.....	181
It is Hard to Say Goodbye.....	181
An Epiphany Over a Putt	181
Fear and Loathing in the State Library of Victoria.....	182
The Reconstruct Stage	183
A contribution: How does a university teacher experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching?	184
Methodological implications.....	185
Practice implications.....	186
A temporary landing place.....	186
Blowin’ about the tops: Closure of a sort.	187
References.....	189

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Dataset Analysis Using Shapira-Lishchinsky Categories of Ethical Dilemmas</i>	46
Table 2 <i>Dataset Analysis Using Newly Established Categories of Ethical Dilemmas</i>	46

Chapter One

The Introduction

Two educational ethicists walk into a bar. The first one asks, “**How does a university teacher experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching?**” The second one ponders the question for a moment before replying, “Very good question. Give me a sec. You get the beers in.” He quickly exits the bar leaving his friend to buy the drinks.

I Am “Becoming” an Educational Ethicist

In opening my thesis, I present my credentials as an aspiring educational ethicist. I explore how my interest in the ethics of teaching has pervaded my professional life as a teacher and researcher. I have always been “becoming” an educational ethicist.

I began teaching when I was 21 years old and spent over 10 years as a primary and middle school teacher in New Zealand and the United Kingdom. I have spent the last 19 years working in initial teacher education (ITE). Over my 30-year teaching and research career I have always been keenly aware of the ethical edge of educating. I still remember the weight of responsibility I felt on my first day teaching when I realised that within the four walls of the classroom, I was the ultimate arbiter of what was right and wrong. By the end of my first week I understood colleagues could be as ethically inspiring as they were morally disheartening. By the end of my first month I was theorising the motivations and consequences of my decision making through collegial discussions and individual reflection. I was becoming an educational ethicist.

Moving into ITE provided me with the opportunity to interrogate my ethical theorising. I would tell student teachers my war stories of ethical conundrums from the chalk-face and then publicly analyse these decisions through the lens of formal ethical theory and professional codes of ethics. I was becoming an educational ethicist.

My work as a teacher in ITE led me to consider questions such as: How do teachers make ethical decisions? Do professional codes assist ethical decision making? and *How does a university teacher experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching?* I pursue these questions as an educational researcher. I am becoming an educational ethicist.

Why an interest in the ethics of teaching as a classroom teacher?

I had an awareness and interest in the ethical nature of teaching from my first year in the classroom. One incident was particularly formative in demonstrating the sharp blade of my ethical decision making.

Tanya Waititi,

bone strong face, brown soft eyes.

Mother/child.

Dad works on the roads.

Tanya the first, then the boy, another girl...enough for a road worker's wage...then three babies out of the clear blue sky.

In the second year of my teaching career my principal retired and I had a new boss. Principal 1 seemed to me a gentle and sensitive man with a kindly way with children, Principal 2, on the other hand, was a tough and removed character. In my first year teaching it was expected that any serious incidents of behaviour would be brought to the attention of Principal 1. The purpose seemed to be for the principal to keep abreast of patterns of behaviour rather than to administer any form of further punishment. On the occasion I needed to take two boys to him, for fighting on their way home from school, he did not tear into them for their behaviour; rather he coaxed them through a process of moral reasoning that would hopefully lead to better decisions from these young people in the future. During my second year, another incident occurred that I deemed of sufficient severity to warrant the principal's attention. In this case, a girl in my Standard 2 (Year 4) class had gone into the cloak bay before school and stolen all lunch-order money from the bags of those pupils buying their lunch from the school tuck shop. Upon finding out about the theft, I questioned the class as to whether anyone had seen a person loitering around the cloak bay before school. Tanya Waititi was identified and after some questioning confessed through a flood of tears. Although Tanya was clearly remorseful, I believed the stealing of a considerable quantity of money was a matter that needed to be brought to the attention of both the principal and Tanya's parents.

I walked Tanya across the bustling early morning playground to the new principal's office and knocked on the closed door. A barely audible grunt signalled we could enter. I quietly explained the morning's main event while the 8-year-old Tanya looked silently at the floor. "Look at me, girl!" were the first words that launched what became a tirade of condemnation in Tanya's direction. Tanya looked scared. I looked shocked. Clearly the approach of this man was going to be markedly different from that of his predecessor. After completing his loud and aggressive rant the principal became quiet and still. His face now red from yelling, he slowly pulled open the top right-hand drawer of his wooden desk and removed a leather strap. My feelings moved from shock to disbelief at what I was seeing. The strap, a worn dark-brown leather, was folded over on itself. The principal gently placed it on the desk between himself and Tanya. There was a moment of complete silence in the office. The sounds of balls bouncing and children shrilling in the playground seemed very far away. "If I ever hear of you stealing money at my school again!"

Swish, thump! The air was cut with a crack like rifle fire as the strap was brought down violently on the surface of the desk. Tanya gasped; I jumped. A raised forefinger indicated we could take our leave. Dumbstruck, we made our way back to Room 7.

My head was racing all through the morning. I had clearly followed school procedure but at the cost of maintaining a trusting relationship with Tanya. The thing that I could not reconcile was that I had put Tanya into this abusive situation even though I knew some exceptionally difficult circumstances at home may have contributed to her behaviour. At 8 years of age, Tanya was the eldest of six children, with a younger brother of 7, a sister of 4 and triplet sisters of 2 months. The triplets were unexpected and put a lot of strain on the family financially and emotionally. Tanya had been expected to become a second mother to her 7- and four-year-old siblings, while her parents did their best to deal with the three babies in a small state house. Unsurprisingly, the 8-year-old Tanya had found this a tough ask and her usually calm and gentle demeanour had occasionally been interrupted by uncharacteristically rash decision making, the stealing being the most recent example.

I had a number of ethical decisions to make. Firstly, I knew it was illegal to use corporal punishment in New Zealand schools, as a recent insightful act of parliament had banned such practice. Should I keep quiet about my principal's seemingly illegal threats or should I report him? And, if so, to whom?

I also needed to decide whether to report this incident to the Waititi family, a family under considerable pressure.

Some 23 years later, this memory is still a painful one. In reliving this scene, I now recall the look in Tanya's eyes as we left the principal's office, a look that reflected the trust lost between a student and her teacher. A moment of shame for me as a teacher as I recall my own complicity in this act of violence by remaining silent.

Why an interest in the ethics of teaching as a university teacher?

In 2009 I was asked by my head of school at the University of Auckland to lead the writing of a new course entitled The Professional Teacher. The course was to be the final compulsory paper student teachers were to complete in the final semester of their 3-year Bachelor of Education (Teaching) programme.

I approached my course writing task with a mixture of trepidation and excitement. At this point in my tertiary career I had never been involved in writing a new course from the ground up, let alone leading such an enterprise. I had plenty of experience contributing to the development of

existing course content and assessment tasks, but I was always building on an established foundation. For The Professional Teacher, all I was starting with was a minimal template with a brief calendar prescription and the following five learning outcomes:

1. Explain the legal obligations of teaching in Aotearoa/New Zealand.
2. Explain how to address ethical dilemmas common in teaching.
3. Articulate a personal philosophy of teaching that integrates research, theory and practical experience.
4. Explain how to create a purposeful, safe and responsive learning environment that will promote success.
5. Provide evidence to demonstrate achievement of the teacher education graduate outcomes.

While I could see the value of all these learning outcomes, it was the second outcome focussed on the ethics of teaching that sparked my pedagogical and scholarly interest. For many years prior I had used the seminal documentary *A Class Divided* (Peters, 1985) to explore the moral nature of teaching in my ITE classes. In this documentary, an elementary school teacher, Jane Elliott, takes her class through an anti-discrimination lesson where, for 2 days, children are manipulated into believing they are superior or inferior beings based purely on eye colour, causing much emotional turmoil for children but proving a powerful learning experience on the nature of discrimination. I could see the potential of the documentary being of value in exploring the learning outcome “Explain how to address ethical dilemmas common in teaching.” I set about designing two sessions worth of learning experiences where students both viewed the documentary and participated in drama activities designed to help them engage with the ethical dilemmas inherent in the *Class Divided* experiment from a teacher’s perspective.

It was satisfying to have at least some content for the 20-session course partially developed. I was looking forward to teaching the sessions using drama and sharing this innovative teaching approach with my colleagues who were to teach on The Professional Teacher course. In my 2006 master’s dissertation I had explored how drama could be used as an effective teaching approach in ITE. I had identified how student-teacher participants in my study perceived that drama assisted them to better understand the content and concepts integral to the course in which they were studying (Heyward, 2010). Many participants in my master’s study commented on the possibility of more drama in the classes of their teacher education programme, as they believed it could benefit their learning (Heyward, 2008). I was pleased to have the opportunity to transform some of the implications for practice that emerged during my research, from words on a page to acts in the classroom. For a period of time I thought these drama sessions could possibly be the basis of a follow-up PhD study into the use of drama in higher education. This was ultimately a

misguided and ill-judged foray into doctoral study but it opened a door to the scholarship of ethics education. A new research question was forming and it had nothing to do with drama.

With some runs on the board in terms of course content I turned my attention to literature that would support my drama-based sessions on ethical dilemmas. Two books, both published in 2003, and both titled *The Ethical Teacher*, were foundational in introducing me to academic thinking and research on the ethics of teaching. The first of these books that came to my attention was written by the late Massey University Emeritus Professor, Ivan Snook (MNZM). I had the privilege of hearing Professor Snook speak at several educational conferences and at meetings of the Quality Public Education Coalition. I was always impressed with his reasoned advocacy for a socially just and ethical public education system. Snook's (2003) volume provided a nuanced account of how the ethical decisions teachers make are inextricably linked to the political conditions within which they find themselves. The second book, authored by Canadian ethicist Professor Elizabeth Campbell (2003), extended my understanding of the professional knowledge bases required by individual teachers by introducing me to the notion of ethical knowledge as a crucial kind of teacher knowledge. While Snook and Campbell chose identical titles for their books, the similarity went beyond mere words on the dust jackets. Both Snook and Campbell agreed on the importance of teachers needing to develop an acute awareness of the moral impact their ethical decisions have on children, whānau, colleagues, the profession and society. While accepting that much of the ethical nature of teaching is implicit, Campbell (2003) attempts to draw explicit attention to the ethical awareness that the most effective teachers "bring to their formal and informal exchanges and activities in schools" (p. 1). Similarly, Snook (2003) argues "so central is ethics to teaching that a teacher can never know too much or have reflected too deeply about basic ethics" (p. 14).

While there were clear similarities in these texts, the differences in the ethical focus taken by both authors provided opportunities to explore the ethical nature of teaching through different lenses in The Professional Teacher course. Campbell's (2003) emphasis on virtue-based, applied professional ethics provided opportunities for students to reflect on how their individual pedagogical decision making aligned with a shared understanding of accepted personal and professional moral virtues. For Campbell, the onus is on the individual to reflect on how their actions are consistent with the shared virtues of the profession and the kind of teacher they want to be, with the outcome of such individual reflection being the development of teacher moral agency. Snook (2003), on the other hand, draws attention to the collective nature of the ethics of teaching by asserting that ethics cannot be restricted to the individual but must take into account

the political and cultural conditions within which an individual's everyday ethical decision making is socially located.

I owe a debt of gratitude to both Snook and Campbell for not only helping me design The Professional Teacher course, but also redirecting my research interest from the pedagogical approach I used in the classes I taught, namely drama, to the actual content of these classes, namely educational ethics.

Why an interest in the ethics of teaching as an educational researcher?

Guided by my understanding of the centrality of ethics to effective practice I decided to research ethical dilemmas experienced by teachers, and what guides their moral and ethical decision making, for my Ed Doc. My review of the literature demonstrated limited research on how teachers make ethical decisions and the place of a code in this decision-making process. My doctoral thesis would explore: *how do teachers resolve ethical dilemmas in their practice and what place does the New Zealand Teachers Council Code of Ethics play in this process?* My research was to be guided Denzin's (2001) observation that, in the world of human experience, there is only individual interpretation of experience and it is a worthy goal for researchers to make these interpretations open to others so they can create better understanding of the major social issues of our day. As an educational ethicist I was interested in sharing teachers' interpretations of their ethical decision making in the complex social environment of the school. I intended to use a sociological symbolic interactionist approach to gather and analyse interview data so I could secure the biographical experiences of my participants and gain insights into their ethical dilemmas and decision making (Flick, 2006).

Writer's Block and a Methodological Turn

On November 18, 2014, I received confirmation for my Ed Doc research proposal. After 2 years of provisional doctoral status I had a question and methodology that the Ed Doc programme leaders, and guest academic assessor, deemed worthy of scholarly pursuit. However, as 2015 progressed, a writing paralysis set in that threatened to derail my doctoral ambitions. Looking back, I can attribute this writer's block to a range of factors. Firstly, I was exhausted. I had recently survived a staffing review and taken on a new programme leadership role on significantly less workload than my predecessor. This new position, combined with my usual teaching and parenting responsibilities, left little energy for writing. Secondly, I no longer needed to be regularly accountable to my Ed Doc cohort or programme leaders. I needed to rely on my own self-discipline. Finally, I had lost interest in my original research question.

As the summer of 2015 faded into autumn, then winter, the email correspondence from my supervisors became increasingly frustrated. I was failing to send through writing or engage with them in any kind of scholarly discourse. After one excuse too many I was summoned to a supervision summit.

Supervisor 1 suggested a change in data collection methods might kick-start the next phase of my doctoral journey. “You can’t fly in from high and interview people on difficult ethical dilemmas and expect fully candid responses. You will never get close to understanding how teachers make ethical decisions from disjointed and contrived interviews. As Andy Convery (1999) observes teachers are always likely to present their preferred identity in interview-based research. You need to go and sit in a school staff room for a year; embed yourself in the cafeteria culture and observe. That’s how you will authentically understand how teachers *experience* the ethics of teaching. You have the writing ability to turn your work in the field into rich compelling stories.”

Supervisor 2 then questioned me on my motivation to continue with my doctorate. “Do you really want to do this? If you do, you just need to bloody write! When you write your own stories, like the one about Tanya Waititi, your work is rich and compelling. I suggest you block out a few days and start writing your own stories of experiencing the ethics of teaching.”

While I could see the possibilities of the ethnographic method espoused by Supervisor 1, I did not have the extended periods of time need for the type of deep institutional immersion suggested, nor could I see such an approach being acceptable to the university ethics committee. However, as I left the meeting, two words continued to resonate: *experiences* and *stories*. Why not story my own experiences of ethical dilemmas as a teacher?

Following the supervision summit, I arranged a week of leave from work and set about the daily routine of writing. I was underway.

Writing Week, Day 1 (August 31 2015).

In my imagined future I was sitting in a quaint hotel room in Budapest. The rumble of traffic below and the electricity of a new city culture were to inspire writing of rigour and insight. The promise of a Hungarian lager at the end of long day’s intellectual toil was to be the reward. The Guardian had informed me Budapest was undergoing a quiet craft-beer revolution. That sounded like the type of Eastern European revolution I wanted to be in the middle of. However, this future was destined to remain imagined once the idea of attending a conference in Budapest was raised with my supervisors.

Dear Supervisors. I am looking at attending an educational research conference in Budapest that has a research strand on educational ethics. I see this as an opportunity to both engage with the research community and lock myself away in a hotel room for some sustained periods of writing. I will need your permission to access my Press Account funds to pay for flights. I look forward to hearing from you. Sincerely Paul

Dear Paul. That sounds like a lovely idea but there is only one problem. You won't write anything. Do you think I was born yesterday? Take the week you would have been in Budapest and write here. Sincerely Supervisor 1.

Dear Paul. I agree with Supervisor 1. If I was put up in a hotel room in Budapest for a week, I would be more interested in the beer than writing about ethical dilemmas. Sincerely Supervisor 2.

In my present reality I sit at my Nana's old oak pull-out table in my downstairs study while Johnny Cash leers at me from under a black Stetson with a Smith and Wesson laying menacingly across his lap. Johnny will make sure I walk the line on this writing retreat. The rain is falling steadily in Laingholm, Auckland.

I could have actually been on the shores of Lake Taupō this morning. Upon hearing I was pulling the plug on my Hungarian sojourn, a lovely colleague offered me the use of her bach. Her reasoning was sound; I had made space to go to Budapest; now this space was free; fill it with unencumbered writing time. The bach at Taupō offered me the opportunity to write free of the distractions of home and work. Unfortunately, the bach was double booked so lovely colleague offered to pay my accommodation costs at a writing retreat of my choice from her own HOD account.

My love: So exactly why are you going away again next week?

Myself: To write unencumbered by the worries of work and distractions of domesticity.

My love: Oh, that's right....so you can't do that from home?

Myself: There is a substantial body of research that shows academics produce more writing when away from routines and responsibilities.

My love: Oh, is there?...that's good...if you stayed home, I would cook for the week and make sure the kids didn't disturb you.

Myself: You miss the point. If I write from home, I am more likely to be drawn into habitual procrastination patterns.

I thought of the flowing waters of the river Danube and the lapping waves of the mighty Lake Taupō and realised I hadn't written a single word on my doctorate for the entirety of 2015. The place to write had become yet another ponderous distraction to getting on with it. I would write from home for the week. Johnny looks on with impatience.

Hey porter! Hey porter!
Would you tell me the time?
How much longer will it be till we cross
That Mason Dixon line?
At daylight would ya tell that engineer
To slow it down?
Or better still, just stop the train,
Cause I wanna look around.
(Cash, 1954)

The 31st of August, 2015, was the day I started to write again. It was the day I left the well-traversed northern lands of sociological symbolic interactionism and crossed the border into the southern wilds of critical autoethnography. It was the day I began a narrative journal into the ethical dilemmas I experienced as a university teacher. It was the day my research question became: **how does a university teacher experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching?** It was the day I jumped off the train and took some time to have a good look around the ethics of “my” teaching.

Educational ethicist Elizabeth Campbell (2003) argues that all teachers have a responsibility to engage in ethical reflection so that they can gain insights into how the contextual realities of their lives influences their ethical knowledge. Holman Jones (2016) suggests critical autoethnography enables the storyteller to continuously engage with their stories so that a progression of meaning and understanding unfolds over time. Frank (1995) teaches the reader of autoethnographic texts to think with the story and not to move on once the story has been read or heard. Frank argues for the importance of continuing to live in the story and add to the story from our own unique vantage points as readers. Through writing, reviewing and sharing my critical autoethnographic stories, I have been able to reflect on the broader social, cultural and political factors that impact on how I experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching in a university context. Through reading the texts of fellow autoethnographers I have attempted to live in their narratives and contribute to their stories from my own position as a university teacher. In the following section I will present my engagement with Andrew Sparkes' (2007) seminal evocative autoethnographic work on the perils of life in the audit culture of the

academy, “Embodiment, Academics, and the Audit Culture: A Story Seeking Consideration.” This work provides a preview to the nature of my methodological turn taken later in the thesis and my attempt to live with, and add to, Sparkes’s (2007) autoethnography from my vantage point as a university teacher and programme leader.

(What’s So Funny ‘Bout) Peace Love and Understanding? A Consideration of Andrew Sparkes’s Autoethnographic Account of an Academic Life in Neoliberal Times

Sparkes’s (2007) evocative and insightful autoethnography is a response to Ronald Pelias’s (2004) plea for a methodology of the heart, a methodology that allows academics to reveal their emotional and physical negotiations of life in a neoliberal university. Sparkes (2007) draws on a mythical and composite version of university life to share the story of career academic, Jim. The article serves as a vivid example of the type of emotional and physical toll inflicted by self-serving university hierarchies more interested in research outputs, and impact ratings, than faculty wellbeing. Sparkes concludes his article with the simple request that academics living in the audit culture of the neoliberal university take time to consider Jim’s story. Drawing on Arthur Frank’s (1995) work, *The Wounded Storyteller*, Sparkes invites us to “think with” his story, allowing it to be part of our experience, part of our becoming. In the short autoethnographic piece that follows, I consider and “live with” Jim’s story by imagining his shift from uncompromising student radical to a cynical and compliant academic. I then parallel my personal story of resistance and compliance within the audit culture of the university.

How I imagine student Jim.

It is 1978 and new wave punk rocker Elvis Costello confronts his listeners to identify “where are the strong and who are the trusted and where is the harmony?” in the wonderfully musically upbeat, yet lyrically dark “(What’s so Funny ‘Bout) Peace Love and Understanding?” (Lowe, 1979). A generation of the potentially strong, trusted and harmonious had just tuned in, turned on and dropped out, leaving, in their absence, Costello’s world of dark insanity. The song is a plaintive calling to those who could and would be the strong, the trusted, to reject the cynical nihilism of late seventies punk Britain and take action for the downtrodden and dispossessed.

I can imagine Jim sitting back in cramped student digs listening to Costello on a cheap mono record player with a cadre of neo-punk friends. Cheap cider is swilled, the spliffs circulate and a commitment to be the strong and trusted of their generation is made through the collective, harmonic bellowing of “what’s so funny ‘bout peace love and understanding?”

Some 30 years later, Jim looks back on this scene with a sense of shame. He had longed to be the strong and the trusted of his generation. He entered the world of the university as a self-appointed radical, a hero for the people, a change agent, an actor. Now established in the university machinery he still is very much the actor but he is no longer writing the script.

If Bob Geldof could keep true to the cause, why couldn't he???? If Bob can say fuck it to "The Man," why is he such an acquiescing lily-livered shit?

Who are the strong and the trusted?

The Director of External Faculty Relationships (DEFR) is not happy. He has got wind of an automatic reply I have running on Microsoft Outlook. The automatically generated email reads:

I am currently limiting my working hours to the 40 hours per week indicated in our academic collective agreement. As my workload is usually well over 40 hours, this may result in delays in attending to some tasks: your patience is appreciated.

We TEU members are advocating for fairer pay and working conditions, in particular for professional staff. Of course, if a genuine, substantive, acceptable pay offer were made by the university, I will rather happily go back to working my usual (expansive) hours.

...otherwise I will get back to you as soon as I can.

A month earlier I sat in a meeting with my Teaching Education Union (TEU) colleagues. The days when a lecture theatre was needed to host such a gathering were long gone, a small classroom now adequate. Our union organisers updated us on the lack of progress in our latest contract negotiations with the VC. Another topic of angered discussion was the recent docking of an hour's pay from all TEU members' most recent salary. Senior university management had responded to an hour-long lunchtime strike aimed at publicising TEU claims by reducing members' pay packets for the hour of academic labour lost to the institution. The decision caused widespread outrage as academics, usually valued for their intellectual and social contribution to society, were reduced to labourers on an hourly rate. Goodwill between the employer and the employees was in short supply.

As the shaking of heads and general tut-tutting at the senior management's punitive response to our lunchtime industrial action subsided, the inevitable cry of "what are we going to do about it?" was heard from the floor. Strike action was immediately proposed; however, the appetite for such a measure was tempered by concerns about the impact a strike would have on students. A quieter member of the quorum spoke up.

Why don't we play them at their own game? If we are simply salaried workers whose annual financial package is worked out on an hourly rate based on a 40-hour week, let's agree to keep to working a 40-hour week. No more. No less.

I join in: Yes, we could include in our email footer a message that we are working to a 40-hour week as an industrial action to the VC's lack of engagement in the latest contract negotiations.

Next minute...

I sit outside the DEFR's office looking at the framed inspirational quotes on the wall. I have been here before on occasion and I always wait. The black leather chair I sit in is comfortable but never comforting. I know when I pull myself up from this temporary embrace, shuffle past the potted plants into the DEFR's cool office, it will be game on. Niceties will be kept to a respectful minimum.

Even though I have called this meeting with the DEFR, I can't help but feel like I have been summoned. My mouth suddenly paper and sweat forming on my temples despite the cool, I begin.

"Thanks for seeing me, Eric..."

The meeting is relatively short and I leave feeling vulnerable. We establish early on that we are mutually surprised at each other. I express surprise that Eric would question my legal right as a union member to engage in industrial action through automatic email replies. Eric expresses surprise that I am surprised that he would question my engagement in industrial action through automatic email replies. Surprise dealt with, we move onto concerns.

Eric's concern is that my role as Associate Director of the Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Primary) is an outward-facing position and therefore my email correspondence has potential consequences for the university's reputation. For Eric, the industrial dispute is an internal matter that should not be brought to the attention of teachers and schools as they would not only lack understanding of the industrial issues at stake but would have little sympathy given the poor working conditions they labour under compared to university lecturers.

My concern is the feeling I am being muzzled for the sake of public relations. I have a range of arguments ready to put to Eric. I prepared a list.

1. The point of an industrial action is to be visible, not subtle, so an action that draws attention from the wider educational community and public is an effective action.

2. I think teachers are more than capable of understanding the point of industrial action, particularly when we are advocating fair pay for professional staff, some of whom are receiving wages below the living wage. Again, the point of industrial action is to raise awareness of concerns around pay and working conditions to put pressure on the employer to act in a fair manner. This includes raising concerns with our external partners.
3. I take my responsibilities for building university–school relationships very seriously and feel I put a great deal of energy and good will into this enterprise. The Grad Dip Primary programme has had excellent relationships with our school partners. I believe this is largely due to the commitment of the professional staff who work closely with our school partners. I believe that in standing up for the professional staff who make the programme work so successfully, I am continuing to build relationships of integrity with our school partners.
4. My friends and relatives who work as teachers and school leaders and who see me regularly working 60-hour plus weeks certainly do not see their conditions as less favourable than my own. Quite the opposite in fact.

Rather than reading the list, I attempt to provide Eric a well-rounded and erudite argument as to why I should persist with the TEU-endorsed email action. Unfortunately, the paper in my mouth remains and the office temperature increases. My argument emerges from my mouth as loosely connected verbal candy floss.

The meeting draws to a conclusion. Arguments had been made and considered. Surprise had been expressed. Eric closes the meeting.

I am not telling you to turn off your email message but you may want to consider blocking the emails for correspondents outside our organisation while leaving those inside of the university on. However, the final decision is up to you.

I leave the office. Word has got around about my stoush with the DEFR. Given we live under the cloud of an imminent staffing review, the reactions are mixed. There are those impressed with my intestinal fortitude and commitment to the cause. “Kia kaha comrade! We are with you!” There are those who worry about my whānau. “Is it really worth going there, bro? Keep your head down.” There are those who see me as a crash-test dummy. “You are the first TEU member to have been asked to pull down their message in any faculty we know of. None of our senior academics have received such treatment. It will be interesting to see how this plays out.”

I return to the sanctity of my office. It is warm from the early morning summer sun. I bring up my automatic message. I look at the words I wrote in defiance less than a month before.

I go to the AUTOMATIC REPLIES OUT OF OFFICE field in the “Outside my Organisation” tab of Outlook and press the TURN OFF button. I feel weak and subservient. I close the lid of my laptop and I stand up and pace. “Oh, what the hell, if I am selling out, I might as well go gangbusters.”

I open the lid of my laptop and navigate to Outlook. I open the AUTOMATIC REPLIES OUT OF OFFICE field in the “Inside my Organisation Tab” and press the TURN OFF button. My weakness and subservience return to relief. My summer holiday beckons. I feel tired.

Am I the strong Mr Costello? No.

Am I the trusted Mr Costello? Possibly not.

Am I an acquiescing lily-livered shit? Certainly feels like it today.

Where is the harmony?

It is 11.00am and I feel like a drink to slow the whirring and clunking wheels in my brain. I am strangely in luck. It is the day of the faculty Christmas Party, complete with free glass of bubbly upon midday arrival and a coupon for the cash bar. I arrive, find some comrades, grab a bubbles and secure a table. On the far side of the function room, I see Eric enter and politely move his way through the large crowd until he arrives at our table. We crossed swords less than 2 hours ago and now he is going to sit at our table!

“You have to be kidding,” I think. “We meet again,” I spurt. Eric smiles and takes his seat next to mine. I instantly worry about what would count as appropriate small talk in such a situation. As long as I don’t mention the war, I should be alright. I needn’t have worried. Eric is besieged by colleagues attempting to tie up close-of-the-year loose ends.

“Now it is time for the party game,” announced our MC. Each table has a Christmas carol taped to its underside. The game is for each table to perform their allocated Christmas carol in a style of their own choosing. We are all given 5 minutes to prepare our performances. Some groups choose mime, others use creative dance and some even rap over a beatboxing colleague. Our group is an even split of men and women and our carol is Away in a Manger. Quickly we settle on a basic performance structure, the men will sing while the women encircle the male ensemble with a flowing interpretive dance.

Our group is first. A relief as there is no time to overthink but there is also no time to rehearse. We stand looking out on the smiling faces of our expectant audience. I am shoulder to shoulder with Eric. A superior I had been sparring with only 2 hours earlier.

The most confident singer begins "Away in a manger." The dancers begin to move from on low to on high. The rest of us singers join in "No crib for a bed."

I am surprised how well the DEFR and I harmonise.

Overview of Thesis Parts and Chapters

I completed this Ed Doc thesis over six and a half years between March 2013 and October 2019. The thesis is presented in two parts that reflect the distinct change to my methodological orientation that occurred over this time.

The Ed Doc qualification is a professional doctorate designed to be taken part-time and to prepare candidates to be expert practitioners and leaders in education. For the first 2 years of my Ed Doc, I was part of a cohort of students who completed a structured research portfolio that led directly to a thesis proposal. In my original proposal, I stated that the purpose of my study was to explore how New Zealand teachers make ethical decisions, and the place a code plays in this process. Part 1 of my thesis reflects this particular research focus and consists of Chapters 2, 3 and 4.

In Chapter 2, I review the literature on the ethical nature of teaching, ethical decision making and professional codes of ethics. I argue that there needs to be more research into how teachers make ethical decisions and the place of a code in the decision-making process. In this chapter, my development in becoming an educational ethicist is characterised by my increased knowledge of the field of educational ethics.

In Chapter 3, I present an empirical study into the nature of ethical dilemmas experienced by student teachers while on practicum in New Zealand primary schools. This chapter was an early version of an article I subsequently re-wrote with Dr Maree Davies for publication in the *British Education Research Journal*. My thematic analysis of 100 student-teacher reflective statements on ethical incidents experienced in schools enabled me to develop a taxonomy of typical ethical dilemmas experienced by student teachers. My research provides insights into *why* particular ethical dilemmas emerge for student teachers and *how* they deal with them. I discuss implications for how university-based initial teacher educators can support student teachers to negotiate the ethical complexity of teaching. The intention for this study was to provide tentative understandings of the process of ethical decision making that I could further pursue through empirical research with more experienced teacher participants. In this chapter, I am becoming a researching educational ethicist.

Over the first 2 years of my Ed Doc there was a governmental review of the New Zealand Teachers Council, the professional body which oversaw the development and implementation of *the Code of Ethics for Registered Teachers*. As a result of the review it was decreed that the *Code of Ethics*, which had been in place since 2004, be replaced with a new code of conduct that would give the Council more punitive power to bring unethical teachers to account (O'Neill, 2016). I understood these changes were going to impact on both my practice as an ethics educator in ITE, and on my developing research proposal. Chapter 4 is an account of my engagement in these policy debates about the purpose of a code of ethics in the New Zealand education system. I include my submission to the Education Council on the *Draft Code of Professional Responsibility*, an opinion piece for the news website *Educational Central* on the impact of the revised code on free speech and a letter to the Minister of Education on the 2018 Education (Teaching Council of Aotearoa) Amendment Bill. Here I express my concerns about the proposed legislative shift from a code of ethics for teachers to a code of professional responsibility. In this chapter, I am becoming an activist educational ethicist.

At the point in my doctoral journey I wrote this chapter, I had commenced my turn towards the autoethnographic as is evident in the personal story I weave into this account. Autoethnographic method is central to Part 2 of my thesis and consists of Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8. In these chapters, I change the focus of my research question inwards and ask **how does a university teacher experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching?**

I begin Chapter 5 with a story of how I met my wife, Stephanie. I use the metaphor of my romance with the love of my life to reflect on my relationship with the seductive and mysterious methodology of autoethnography. I continue the use of metaphor in this chapter by drawing on the recent renovation of my neighbour's house to explore my methodological turn from symbolic interactionism to autoethnography. John Smyth's (2001) model of critical reflection is introduced as my method of inquiry into how I experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching. In this chapter, I redefine what it means to become a researching educational ethicist.

Chapter 6 establishes the theoretical framework of teacher identity that I use to analyse the autoethnographic case studies of my ethical decision making as a university teacher. I draw on sociocultural theory, teacher life-history research, and Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser's theory of interpellation to establish a theory of teacher identity that provides unique insights into *how a university teacher experiences and negotiates the ethics of teaching*. In this chapter, my development as an educational ethicist is characterised by my increased understanding of theories of identity construction and their relationship to the ethical nature of teaching.

Two fictionalised case studies of how I have managed ethical dilemmas as a university teacher are the basis for Chapters 7 and 8. Chapter 7 focusses on ethical issues I have experienced in dealing with student requests regarding professional experience placements (practicums) in schools. Chapter 8 deals with making the decision to fail a student teacher on practicum. In both chapters, the *describe*, *inform*, and *confront* stages of Smyth's model of critical reflection are used to structure an examination of ethical dilemmas I have experienced as a university teacher. The describe and inform stages allow me to engage in an evocative, playful and creative writing process where I combine my emerging knowledge of moral philosophy with a range of plot devices, settings and writing genres to present my stories. My moral philosophising at the inform stage is from the perspective of a practitioner rather than a moral scholar. At the confront stage, I turn to a more analytical approach to autoethnography by employing my theoretical framework of teacher identity construction to analyse my decision making. In these chapters, I become a theorising educational ethicist where I discuss how **experiencing and negotiating the ethical nature of my university teaching** is an act of continual identity construction and reconstruction within the dilemmatic world of university teaching.

In the conclusion chapter, I draw on the reconstruct stage of Smyth's model of critical reflection to consider how my positioning in the dilemmatic space of university teaching has contributed to how I have experienced social injustice. I take an active reflective stance in identifying how my insights have implications for teaching and research. In this chapter, I am becoming the reflective educational ethicist.

Significance of Research

The increased interest in the ethics of teaching over the last 40 years has coincided with the rise of neoliberal managerialism in education and the systematic de-professionalisation of teachers' work. This thesis both explores and speaks back to the neoliberal impulse of accountability and the positioning of the ethics of teaching as another constraint in an audit culture of blame. In writing this thesis, I attempt to contribute to re-establishing the ethics of teaching as an act of re-professionalisation where the ethical teacher continually questions the assumptions they bring to their practice and the sociopolitical context from which these assumptions arise.

Part One

Chapter Two

The Ethical Nature of Teaching Under Review

To become an educational ethicist, one needs to know something of the scholarship on the ethical nature of teaching. In this chapter, I move my tacit understandings on the ethical nature of teaching towards the more formalised academic knowledge of the expert educational ethicist.

Introduction

The notion that teaching is an inherently ethical and moral activity has gained much currency over the last 40 years. Educational ethicists have challenged teachers to view the very act of teaching itself as being essentially moral in nature (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2001; Campbell, 2003; Snook, 2003; Strike & Soltis, 2009; Tom, 1984). As Griffith (2005) observes, “many moral scholars proclaim ethics to be embedded in the practice of teaching” (p. 98). Traditional ideas that the moral nature of teaching is primarily about shaping the beliefs of students have been supplemented by an understanding that the heart of the moral and ethical nature of teaching lies in the daily actions of teachers. Forster (2012) alludes to this dual responsibility when she describes teachers needing to be both “values educators and moral agents representing the integrity of the profession” (p. 0). When considering teaching as a moral activity, the moral beliefs of a teacher are less important than the actions that form their daily practice (Griffiths, 2005). A teacher may have a very clear idea about the moral stance they wish to persuade their learners to adopt, but the essence of the moral nature of teaching is that they have the power to determine this intention in the first instance and the ability to act in a way that fulfils this intention. It is in the determination of the ends and the realisation of the means that the moral nature of education resides for the teacher. Inextricably bound to the conception of teaching as a moral endeavour is the notion of the ethical teacher. Starratt (2004) suggests that ethics are the principles, beliefs, values and assumptions that characterise the moral life. For Starratt, the subtle difference between morals and ethics is that ethics are external to the person while morals are internal. As much of the literature uses the terms *moral* and *ethical* interchangeably, this discussion will combine the terms to encompass both the external and internal aspects of the moral/ethical nature of teaching.

In accepting that teaching is fundamentally moral and ethical in nature it is important to examine how teachers go about their day-to-day practice and what guides their moral and ethical decision making. What are the key considerations for teachers when deciding on actions to deal with

situations where there seem to be competing moral and ethical demands? To help teachers deal with ethical dilemmas, many jurisdictions have developed a professional code of ethics or conduct. Forster (2012) observes how professional ethics “articulate a profession’s special obligation to society in which it holds a position of trust and relative autonomy over a specialised area of knowledge and practice” (p. 2). In this literature review I examine the historical thinking around the moral and ethical nature of teaching and explore research into how teachers go about the task of making moral and ethical decisions. I explore what constitutes a code, why codes are developed, how codes are developed and conclude by evaluating how codes have to be used to assist teachers in their decision making. I contend that there is a need for more research into how codes are used by teachers to manage their ethical dilemmas.

Section 1: The Moral Nature of Teaching: Why Do Teachers Need to Be Ethical?

The increased scholarly inquiry into the moral act of teaching over the last 40 years has been attributed to the failure of curricula and traditional pedagogical practice to develop children and young people in a moral and ethical sense (Terhart, 1998). Governments, academics and educators have sought to address the growing crisis of confidence in public education by developing an awareness of “the ethical dimensions and obligations of teaching” (Terhart, 1998, p. 441). Campbell (1997) and Ehrich, Kimber, Millwater, and Cranston (2011) also point to the explosion of interest in the ethical dimensions of educational policy and practice in the 1990s. Ehrich et al. observe how, “over recent decades, the field of ethics has been the focus of increasing attention in teaching. This is not surprising given that teaching is a moral activity that is heavily values laden” (p. 173). This increased interest in ethics has corresponded with many countries developing formalised codes of ethics/conduct for teachers (McKelvie-Sebileau, 2011).

A number of writers suggest the centrality of forming relationships with others as being the reason why teaching is a profoundly moral activity. For example, Goodlad (1990) suggests that teachers’ conduct is profoundly moral as they are constantly in relationship with others. McCadden (1998) defines morality as the “active process of constructing understandings and meanings relating to social interactions” (p. 66). Noddings (1988) argues that relational ethics of caring should be the primary moral concern for teachers. While moral principles may inform a teacher’s ethical decision making, what is more important, in Noddings’s view, is how their decision making impacts on the emotional relationship of caring they have with those influenced by their actions. Given the nature of teachers’ work involves them interacting with students,

colleagues, parents and the community on a constant basis it is not surprising that teaching is considered as having a strong moral dimension.

The most crucial relationship to consider when examining the moral nature of teaching is the relationship between the teacher and their students. The fact that teachers spend a large part of their working day deliberately attempting to change their students' behaviour, and thinking towards particular desirable ends, places the teacher in a position of moral and ethical authority (Campbell, 2003; Johnston, Juhasz, Marken, & Ruiz, 1998; Snook, 2003; Tom 1984).

Buchmann (1986) argues that what teachers do is neither natural nor necessary but is always based on a choice of what they believe is best for their students and/or themselves. Even a teacher who chooses to run a classroom programme based on the most democratic of educational principles makes this decision, as they believe their students' participation in the running of the classroom will lead to improved social and academic outcomes. To Murphy and Alexander (2007), the heart of the moral nature of teaching lies in the ethical choices teachers make between valuing the meanings their students bring to the pedagogical interaction and their professional responsibility to challenge and change these meanings where necessary. Snook (2003) frames this tension as the "conflicting obligations to respect the learner's state of mind and also move her towards a more adequate understanding and a more enlightened practice" (p. 26).

A key ethical choice all teachers are required to make is to what extent they allow their ideas to be subject to the critical scrutiny of their students. Snook (2003) identifies how teachers are expected to be an authority in two different senses. Firstly, they are to be seen by the students in their care as the authority who establishes and manages a sense of safety and moral order in the classroom. Secondly, they are an authority on the knowledge disciplines they teach. Buzzelli and Johnston (2001) identify the importance of teachers making the effort to understand this duality of teacher authority. Snook (2003) suggests that, in presenting the truth the teacher has learnt in their own study of these disciplines, it is important that students understand the teacher, even though an authority, is not the source of this knowledge. "A major task for all teachers is to ensure their pupils come to understand both the importance and limitations of all authorities" (p. 36). Murphy and Alexander (2007) argue that it is crucial teachers make their beliefs about the content they are teaching transparent to their students so their ideas are open to critical scrutiny. In advocating a *persuasive pedagogy* that attempts to balance students' perspectives with the teacher's intention to grow their understandings, Murphy and Alexander argue that teachers must help students to think rationally and analytically about their own beliefs and those garnered from sources of authority including the teacher.

While the relationship between the teacher and the student is at the heart of the ethical nature of teaching, relationships between colleagues can also be fraught with ethical tensions. Campbell (2003) argues one of the most common and stressful dilemmas teachers confront is balancing collegial loyalty and their responsibility to their students. Campbell's extensive interviews with both elementary and secondary teachers reveal overwhelming feelings of fear, powerlessness and self-preservation when dealing with unethical colleagues. Similarly, Shapira-Lishchinsky's (2011) study of the ethical dilemmas of 50 Israeli secondary school teachers found that loyalty to colleagues versus a commitment to school norms was a commonly experienced dilemma. Campbell (2003) argues the primary cause of teachers feeling powerless to act as autonomous moral agents when faced with the unethical behaviour of colleagues is the unionisation of the teaching profession and its attendant priority for solidarity. "It constrains teachers' moral authority as autonomous moral agents by demanding uniformity of belief and behaviour...thus preventing individuals from pursuing courses of action that may in fact be ethically preferable" (p. 95). For Campbell, teachers cannot hope to act ethically if they relinquish their individual decision making to the dogma of the union. Vokey (2005) critiques Campbell's portrayal of pro-union teachers as more unethical than their non-union colleagues as contradicting her own advice on teachers remaining impartial on controversial issues. Furthermore, he suggests, in attacking unions as the single greatest hindrance to ethical professionalism, Campbell serves to perpetuate the entrenched adversarial climate between teachers and their employers. Such an individualistic anti-union stance is also rejected by Sachs (2003) who instead advocates a democratic professionalism that requires teachers to take ethical responsibility beyond their individual classroom and contribute to the collective responsibilities of teachers themselves as a group and to the wider community.

Ethical issues are central to teaching as the daily decisions teachers make have consequences for their relationships with students, colleagues, whānau (family), and school administrators. It is to the process of ethical decision making that we now turn our attention.

Section 2: Teacher Decision Making

Much has been written about how teachers go about the task of solving ethical dilemmas. However, Lyons (1990) reminds us that it is beyond teachers to be able to actually solve such ethical problems. The very nature of an ethical dilemma denotes that any decision will have negative consequences for at least one party so is therefore beyond solution as Groundwater-Smith, Cusworth, and Dobbins (1998) remind us when they define an ethical dilemma as "a complex problem, for which there is more than one solution, each solution having varying degrees of advantage or disadvantage for different people concerned" (p. 303). According to

Lyons (1990), the best teachers can hope to do is “manage” the outcomes of an ethical dilemma. Similarly, Snook (2003) observes how “ethics is a process of thinking about matters of concern, not about producing neat answers” (p. 18). The focus of the following section initially centres on how teachers distinguish between having an ethical dilemma and simply having to deal with a difficult situation. I then move onto an examination of research into *how* teachers make ethical decisions before concluding with an overview of different perspectives regarding how teachers *should* resolve ethical dilemmas.

How do teachers know they have an ethical dilemma?

Clark (2005) suggests that an ethical dilemma becomes distinct from a mere challenging situation when teachers become aware of the competing perspectives at play. Similarly, Ehrich et al. (2011) identify how an ethical dilemma is revealed when a teacher involved in a critical incident becomes aware of the biased points of view of those involved in the incident, the broader sociopolitical contextual forces that have contributed to the emergence of the incident, and their own value position on the incident. It is in the consideration of the multiple perspectives that the ethical dilemma is revealed. Take, for example, the relatively mundane case of a teacher deciding how to allocate time to children in an instructional reading session. One could argue that this is just one of the many challenges of teacher time management and not an ethical dilemma of any consequence. However, considering the perspectives of others involved, in this issue of time management, the dilemma emerges. In reflecting on how to best use time during a reading session the teacher may take into account the perspective of the board of trustees and principal who are under pressure to show student movement against the national standards in literacy from the Ministry of Education. The children most likely to move from “not achieved” to “achieved” may be those who require extra teacher time in an instructional reading session. Perhaps a recent conversation with a parent particularly concerned with their child’s low reading level and lack of interest in books will persuade the teacher that extra instructional time is best directed at the lowest achievers. Maybe the postgraduate university course on teaching gifted and talented students the teacher is completing has convinced them that they need to concentrate more time on a group of students often overlooked due to their ability to work independently? It is in the consideration of the multiple perspectives on the best use of teacher time that the true ethical nature of the dilemma becomes evident (Clark, 2005; Ehrich et al., 2011).

How do teachers make ethically challenging decisions?

A range of researchers has explored how teachers go about managing ethical dilemmas. Ehrich et al. (2011) construct a staged model of ethical thinking that depicts ethical decision making as

a somewhat linear process. The first stage is the critical incident that triggers the dilemma. The second stage is “a set of competing forces, each of which illuminates the critical incident from its own particular bias” (p. 179). These forces include professional codes of ethics or conduct, legal issues, organisational/institutional culture, societal expectations, and the global socioeconomic context. The third stage contains the individual and their own personal moral values and the fourth stage is the choice the person makes between competing alternatives. “It is through deliberating alternatives that the ethical dilemma emerges” (p. 179). The final stage is the deliberate consideration of consequences of an ethical decision for the various interested parties. However, Fransson and Grannäs (2013) challenge this discrete, linear and individualised account of ethical decision making by arguing dilemmas are highly relational, complex and ever-present. Drawing on Honig’s (1996) theory of dilemmatic space, Fransson and Grannäs (2013) contend that in conceptualising dilemmas as existing in ever-present dilemmatic space, rather than being isolated critical events, teachers are more likely to avoid self-blame and understand the ongoing structural conditions that envelop their professional lives. While Ehrich et al. (2011) and Fransson and Grannäs (2013) view the “process” of ethical decision making somewhat differently, both agree that, in experiencing dilemmas, the tensions between broader contextual influences and teachers’ personal moral values are illuminated.

A range of decision-making models from the field of business emphasise the clash between the values of the individual and the organisational/institutional culture within which they operate (Bommer, Gratto, Gravander, & Tuttle, 1987; Ferrell & Gresham, 1985; Preston, Stamford, & Connors, 2002). Similarly, educational researchers interested in the ethical decision making of teachers discuss the inevitable incompatibility of personal values and institutional practices that educational professionals routinely experience (Campbell, 1997; Duffy, 1998; Forster, 2012; Pope, Green, Johnson, & Mitchell, 2009). Forster’s (2012) exhaustive document analysis of codes of ethics for teachers across the states and territories of Australia demonstrates a key tension in the various approaches teachers are expected to take when using a code of ethics to guide their ethical decision making. There are those codes that expect teachers to be trusted and autonomous in their professional judgements when applying codes and then codes that emphasise the collective responsibility of teachers to uphold the agreed values of the teaching profession through adherence to rules. Pope et al. (2009) and Campbell (1997) suggest a similar tension between personal values and broader institutional and professional values in the day-to-day decision making of teachers.

Pope et al. (2009) looked at the factors American university teachers take into consideration when managing dilemmas related to the high-stakes assessment of students. The ethical

dilemmas of 103 university teachers revealed that the proliferation of large-scale testing over the last 20 years had resulted in educators developing greater sensitivity to issues of score pollution. Score pollution is defined as “any practice that improves test performance without concurrently increasing actual mastery of the content tested” (p. 779). Common examples of score pollution include practice tests before actual tests that distort mastery for memorisation, teachers taking into account factors unrelated to content mastery such as effort or a student’s background situation. Pope et al. found that while teachers were aware of institutional demands to reduce possibilities of score pollution, they also had to consider the importance of the impact of assessment on student wellbeing. Teachers believed that their own professional values of putting students’ needs first often conflicted with institutional standardised assessment demands. Similarly, Shapira-Lishchinsky’s (2011) study of ethical dilemmas experienced by Israeli secondary school teachers found the background situation of students is a common concern for teachers when making assessment decisions. Of the 50 participants interviewed in the study, 18 discussed the tension between rewarding the effort of students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, and objectively applying the standards and criteria of the school. Both Pope et al. (2009) and Shapira-Lishchinsky (2011) point out that institutional and professional requirements not only impose dilemmas on teachers when they assess learners, but also when they choose instructional methodologies, classroom management approaches and other areas of day-to-day classroom decision making.

Campbell (1997) suggests that, when making an ethical decision, teachers often need to consider the needs of the children against the demands of school leadership. These demands can come from a district level or school level and require the teacher to balance their own pedagogical values and the requests made of them by senior management or district officials. From her extensive analysis of teachers’ ethical dilemma narratives, Campbell has found that although, ideally, the professional values of teachers and the values of school leadership should be compatible, this is often not the case. Campbell identifies three possible ways teachers can manage the balancing of institutional demands of leaders with their own professional values. Firstly, they may consider taking a public stand based on their own values/morals even when they consider such a stand may risk a clash with leadership. Secondly, they could suspend their own sense of morality to avoid potential conflict with leadership even though their own professional values may be compromised. Finally, they can simply comply with the perceived moral authority of their leaders. Similarly, Goodman (1986) discusses how when preservice teachers have different pedagogical values to their associate teachers, they can either actively transform, critically comply or overtly comply with established classroom practice. Forster (2012) warns that when teachers become accustomed to deferring to authority in making ethical

decisions, they can lose their sense of moral confidence as they are discouraged from exercising genuine moral agency. Such a warning is borne out by Campbell's (1997) research, when she concludes that in most instances where a teacher's professional values clash with demands from leadership, teachers tend to consider the consequences a conflict with management may have on their ongoing work over their own moral stance. The dutiful enforcement of policy often undermines a teacher's sense of moral responsibility to students.

While understanding empirical and philosophical perspectives of how the process of ethical decision making occurs is illuminating, such research does not address the essentially moral question of how should teachers make complex ethical decisions? To attend to this question, researchers and philosophers of educational ethics argue for the professional development of teachers in the theory of ethics (Campbell, 2003; Clark, 2005; Haynes, 1998; Martin, 2013; Maxwell & Schwimmer, 2016; O'Neill, 2016; O'Neill & Bourke, 2010; Strike & Soltis, 2009). Martin (2013) argues that if philosophical ethics are to make an educational contribution to teacher development then the abstract philosophical ethics "need to be tempered by a meaningful relationship with teacher practice" (p. 206). O'Neill (2016) advocates a multifaceted approach to ethics education that includes a formal study in the ethics of teaching where teachers apply ethical concepts to dilemmas. Campbell (2003) suggests that teachers need to understand the complexity of ethical knowledge by exploring how their ethical standpoints are influenced by traditions in ethical thinking, including neo-Aristotelian virtues, utilitarian consequentialism, Kantian deontology and the ethics of care. Similarly, Clark (2005) points to three broad ethical theories that teachers should be made aware of to assist with their ethical development: the teleological (consequences) theory, deontological (rules) theory and virtues (personal qualities). It is to these three ethical theories I now turn my attention in exploring how teachers *should* make ethical decisions through utilitarianism, Kantian universalism and neo-Aristotelian virtues. I will use the example of an ethical dilemma I experienced as a teacher to illustrate how proponents of these ethical theories would view how the described situation is managed.

The school camp dilemma: As the teacher in charge of taking a group 100 Year 6 children to Motatapu Island for a 5-day camp, I faced many decisions. Most of these decisions were purely organisational but a few were acutely ethical. At a camp planning meeting I made it clear I wanted all Year 6 children to attend as I had seen the social, physical and academic benefits for those who attended and the contrasting long-term isolation felt by non-attendees.

"What about Harper?" asked Janine, a senior teacher in the Year 5 and 6 syndicate.

"As I said, I want all children to attend. That includes Harper." I replied.

“That is a ridiculous decision!” blurted Janine. “You know with Harper’s violence issues we can’t guarantee the safety of other children. Harper has been doing well lately as you have established clear boundaries and routines. He is responding well to this. But I tell you, Paul, the moment you remove those routines he will lose it just like he has at the last three schools he has been expelled from!”

“Harper is a Year 6 student at this school. Year 6 students at this school go to camp. Harper will go to camp. Harper will enjoy the same wonderful experiences as all the other Year 6 students. If there is any Year 6 student likely to benefit the most from the opportunities offered at camp, it is Harper. Do you know the ferry trip will be his first time on a boat?”

“Look Paul I know you have Harper’s best interests at heart” said Janine striking a more conciliatory tone, “but you need to think of his safety as well his social wellbeing. You know he’s a runner when he loses it. What would happen if he did a runner on an isolated island dotted with steep cliffs and surrounded by surging tides? Are you willing to take that risk?”

How should teachers take consequences into account when making ethically challenging decisions? A teleological utilitarian perspective.

It has been suggested that when people consider only the consequences of how the resolution of a dilemma will impact on them personally, they are an ethical egotist. For a teacher who is an ethical egotist “an act is right if it produces more good for him/her and wrong if it causes personal harm” (Clark, 2005, p. 23). Rachels and Rachels (2015) suggest that ethical egotism is defended by some moral philosophers as it is compatible with common sense morality. While my decision to take Harper to the school camp may have been motivated by an egotistical desire to impress my principal with the first-ever 100% attendance of students at the Year 6 camp, thus improving my chances of promotion, this desire is concomitant with a duty of care to all my students. Clark categorises those who primarily consider the consequences of an ethical decision to be influenced by the teleological school of ethical theory. The key issues considered by those who favour a teleological approach to managing dilemmas are the possible harms and benefits which may result from their actions. From a teleological perspective, whether an action is right or wrong is dependent on the maximisation of good (Dresscher, 2008). Of course, not all those who follow teleological ethical theory are self-centred egotists who only consider how decisions will maximise good for themselves.

Strike and Soltis (2009) discuss how a consequentialist approach to ethical decision making can move beyond pure hedonism towards the philosophy of utilitarianism founded by Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806–1873). A cornerstone to utilitarian philosophy is the importance of freedom from pain and the intensification of pleasure, or what

Mill termed “happiness” (Miller, 2010). For Mill (1861), happiness was the only thing that had the intrinsic value of an end in itself, “all other things being only desirable as means to that end” (cited in Rachels & Rachels, 2015, p. 112). Likewise, Bentham (1843) believed morality was not about pleasing God, nor being faithful to abstract rules, but rather morality was about “making the world as happy as possible” (cited in Rachels & Rachels, 2015, p. 99). A utilitarian approach to ethical decision making requires people to consider the consequences of their decision for all relevant parties and make their decision based on the greatest good, or happiness, for the greatest amount of people (Clark, 2005; Miller, 2010; Rachels & Rachels, 2015; Strike & Soltis, 2009).

When considering the school camp dilemma, it could be argued that senior teacher, Janine, was taking a utilitarian stance in objecting to Harper’s attendance at camp. Janine’s concerns were primarily centred on maximising the wellbeing and happiness of the vast majority of students on the camp as she was aware of Harper’s history of physically and psychologically harming others, as were his classmates. While Harper would be unhappy if he was not allowed to attend camp, this was a small price to pay for the overall happiness of the majority. Critics of utilitarianism argue that this form of ethical decision making relieves an individual of needing to distinguish between what is right and what is good (Rawls, 1971). When the only factor that needs to be taken into account when resolving ethical dilemmas is the overall happiness of the majority, the rights of the minority can be ignored. Rachels and Rachels (2015) argue a major flaw in the utilitarian doctrine is it leads to the “tyranny of the majority” where the majority of people can “take pleasure in someone’s rights being abused, because the pleasure of the majority outweighs the suffering of the one” (p. 116). In the case of Harper, his suffering in missing out on the Year 6 camp could be justified from a utilitarian perspective as the majority of students were likely to be happy this threat to their own physical and psychological wellbeing had been removed. However non-consequentialists, those from the Kantian universal school of ethics, would not be so quick to dismiss Harper’s rights.

How should teachers take rules into account when making ethically challenging decisions?

A deontological Kantian universalist perspective.

Non-consequentialists or deontologists argue that when people only consider the greatest good for the greatest number, resulting decisions can be morally questionable (Clark, 2005; Strike & Soltis, 2009). Take, for example, the camp dilemma. The potential that Harper may cause harm to other children in the risky context of an outdoor environment led Janine to argue for his exclusion from the camp to protect others. However, deontologists would argue such a decision is ethically flawed as Harper has a right to a fully rounded education, including education outside the classroom. Excluding Harper from the camp would undermine the fundamental

principle of “inclusion” inherent in the New Zealand education system where all children have the right to be fully included in school life regardless of the special educational needs they may have (O’Neill, 2016).

Those from the deontological/non-consequentialist school are influenced by Kantian philosophy whereby the most important consideration is the principle of whether the ethical act is categorically right in and of itself. Kant distinguishes hypothetical imperatives, which are possible purely because we have desires to make them so, from categorical imperatives, which are possible because we have the ability to reason (Rachels & Rachels, 2015). Hypothetical imperatives are driven by our desire to improve a non-moral aspect of our life such as getting fit. If I want to get fit I “ought” to go to the gym. As this imperative is governed by a hypothetical desire, I can escape the grip of this ought by deciding I no longer have the desire to get fit. However, when it comes to the moral life, Kant suggests that *ought* is always non-negotiable. For example, if I want to be a good person I ought to be helpful. To Kant this moral ought is “derived from a principle that every rational person must accept” (Rachels & Rachels, 2015, p. 130). The categorical imperative “holds that moral laws apply to all relevantly similar situations and are binding on all people who find themselves in such situations” (Clark, 2005, p. 65). Therefore, there is no escape from my duty to be helpful to others. From a deontological perspective, whether an action is right or wrong is independent of consequences and the maximisation of good (Dresscher, 2008) and completely dependent on whether the act is consistent with universal moral laws (Rachels & Rachels, 2015). In regard to the school camp dilemma, the principle of inclusion and respecting Harper’s rights to be involved in the camp should supersede consideration of consequences. Kantian universalists would critique Janine’s position as, in supporting the transgression of the principle of inclusion, she is essentially sanctioning the exclusion of all students from camp who might cause her or others problems.

It is also possible to see how my decision to include Harper in the camp could be seen to be immoral from a Kantian universalist perspective. Central to Kant’s philosophy is the intrinsic worth and dignity of every human being. Unlike things or animals, humans are rational agents capable of making their own decisions. Where it is permissible to use an animal or an object as a means to achieve a desired end, this should never be the case for a human. “Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in of another, always as an end and never as a means only” (Beck, 1959, cited in Rachels & Rachels, 2015, p. 139). If my interest in including Harper on camp was driven by a desire to impress my principal and boost my promotion chances, rather than by the principle of inclusion, Kantian universalists would condemn my iniquity in using Harper as means to my career-enhancing ends.

How should teachers take virtues into account when making ethically challenging decisions? A neo-Aristotelian virtues perspective

While the consequential and non-consequential duality provides a useful framework to view how teachers should go about ethical decision making, both approaches have been critiqued for overlooking the virtues that motivate moral decision making (Clark, 2005; Rachels & Rachels, 2015). Wynne and Ryan (1997), as cited in Campbell (2003), point out that while the teacher may draw on different philosophical perspectives when resolving ethical dilemmas, it is the character of the individual teacher that “goes to the heart of the teacher’s moral responsibilities” (p. 24). Similarly, Clark (2005) suggests that a virtues theory of ethics can reveal how virtues are exemplified in a teacher’s ethical decision making. Aristotle views virtues as favourable habits that build a person’s character and become second nature in their interactions with the world (Campbell, 2003; Rachels & Rachels, 2015). Sockett (1990) identifies honesty, courage, care, fairness and practical wisdom as virtues essential for a professional teacher. Maxwell and Schwimmer (2016) also identify the virtues of trustworthiness, care and fairness as being common all 13 Canadian teaching codes. Fallona (2000) suggests that the expression of virtues is realised through “teacher manner.” How teacher manner is evident in the daily decision making of teachers is of central concern of those who promote virtuousness.

A virtues perspective provides an interesting lens to view the school camp dilemma. On the one hand, it could be argued I was demonstrating the virtue of fairness when insisting Harper should attend the school camp. However, it could also be argued that, in applying the principle of inclusion in such a categorical manner, I overlooked the impact this decision would have on my relationship with Janine and the other children in Year 6. Both the utilitarian and universalist positions on moral philosophy have been subject to feminist critique for focussing on the impersonal balancing of competing interests, and obligations to moral duty, at the expense of valuing personal relationships (Rachels & Rachels, 2015). In feminist educational philosopher Nel Noddings’ influential work on the ethics of care in teaching, the virtue of care is positioned as central to the educational enterprise of growing caring, loving and loveable persons (Hollon, Kolis, McIntyre, Stephens, & Battalio, 2010; Noddings, 1988). Perhaps my assumption that Janine was acting as an ethical egotist in wanting Harper excluded from the camp was mistaken for a genuine ethic of care for the wellbeing of both Harper and the other students. As Noddings (1988) observes, an ethic of care requires teachers to be sensitive to “the relations in which we all must live” (p. 219).

While consequential, non-consequential and virtues ethical theories provide a useful framework to analyse ethical decision making, I believe, in reality, few teachers would commit fully to any

of these theoretical camps. Teachers may well consider the virtues they are wanting to portray as a decision maker, the consequences of their decisions on others, or universal moral principles at stake, but as Rawls (1971) observes, they will also be heavily influenced by the sociocultural context they find themselves in and their own unique biographical experience of similar situations. For the teacher faced with the decision of whether or not to exclude the violent student from camp, a range of contextual factors will impact on the decision-making process including: the home background of the child, the opportunities the child has for other outdoor educational experiences, and their past experience of the student's violent behaviour, to name a few. I agree with Strike and Soltis (2009) when they contend that many people make good ethical decisions without the need for abstract philosophical theory; however, "the distinction between consequentialist and non-consequentialist theories does enable us to ask good questions about hard cases" (p. 118). While teachers need not commit to an ethical theory, the different questions illuminated by considering these perspectives should lead to more considered decision making. In the case of excluding a violent child from school camp, questions about whether the child in question should have access to the full curriculum other children experience is an important deontological consideration. However, it would be remiss of the teacher not to consider the consequences of the violent child's inclusion on the wellbeing of the other students and the impact of this inclusion on faculty relationships. It is the nature of the types of questions which these different ethical perspectives elicit that makes an understanding of ethical theory important to ethical decision making. To help teachers think through the multiple theoretical perspectives that maybe relevant to resolving ethical dilemmas, educational ethicists have suggested that ethics education programmes should involve local codes of ethics (Campbell, 2003; Clark, 2005; O'Neill, 2016).

Section 3: A Code of Ethics/Conduct: How Might a Code Help Ethical Decision Making?

What is a code of ethics/conduct?

In exploring how teachers go about the complex task of ethical decision making, a common recommendation has emerged across the literature and in educational policy. To assist educators in managing ethical dilemmas, researchers, practitioners and policy makers have called for the development of a core set of ethical principles to guide decision making (Campbell, 1997; Ehrich et al., 2011; Pope et al., 2009). Ethical principles have been put forward by thinkers as a way of providing guidance on how to live. These principles have often been systemised by professional bodies into a code of ethics or conduct that gives guidance on what counts as acceptable and unacceptable behaviour for practitioners in a range of professional fields (Ehrich

et al., 2011). Banks (2003) defines a code of ethics as “usually a written document produced by a professional association, occupational regulatory body or other professional body with the stated aim of guiding the practitioners who are members, protecting service users and safeguarding the reputation of the profession” (p. 133). Similarly, Haynes (1998) identifies a code of ethics as “a strategy that gives general guidelines for educational practices” (pp. 41–42). Forster (2012) also suggests that a key characteristic of a code of ethics is the guidance it provides to teachers around recognised issues in teaching through the articulation of shared professional values. Although these definitions can be useful, McKelvie-Sebileau (2011) notes that there is often confusion as to where the territory of a code of ethics begins and disciplinary legislation of the state begins. Schwimmer and Maxwell (2017) observe how laws differ from codes in that legislation is a statement of what society expects of professionals, while a code outlines “what professionals have collectively agreed to expect of themselves” (p. 144). In many cases, the development of a code of ethics or conduct is a legislative requirement (Schwimmer & Maxwell, 2017). For example, in New Zealand, the 1989 Education Act empowered the New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC) to develop a code of ethics for registered teachers. The New Zealand code applies to registered teachers and to those persons who are granted a “Limited Authority to Teach” (NZTC, 2004). Similarly, the Victorian Institute of Teaching was obliged to establish a code of ethics to comply with the 2006 Education and Reform Act (van Nuland & Poisson, 2009).

Most jurisdictions governing teacher behaviour develop a code of conduct or ethics. Van Nuland and Poisson’s (2009) review of a wide range of international codes found that the terms *code of ethics* and *code of conduct* have been used interchangeably. However, other researchers have suggested that there are traditional differences between a code of conduct and a code of ethics. A code of ethics tends to be aspirational in tone, identifying the broad professional ideals and values that a teacher should consider in their daily professional interactions, while a code of conduct emphasises the specific behaviours expected of teachers (Banks, 2003; Campbell, 2013; Forster, 2012; Schwimmer & Maxwell, 2017). Raiborn and Payne (1990) argue that a code of conduct should be characterised by clarity, comprehensiveness and enforceability. The notion that a code can be used to enforce acceptable behaviours through the punishment of unacceptable behaviour seems to be a key distinguishing feature between a code of ethics and a code of conduct. McKelvie-Sebileau’s (2011) comparative study of codes of conduct in 24 countries found that educators involved in their development and implementation believed codes should be precise in their aims, concrete in nature and that teachers not respecting the code should be sanctioned. It is clear from the literature that while there are some shared understandings of the differences between a code of conduct and a code of ethics, these

perceptions are by no means universal. For the purposes of the current discussion I shall use the term *codes* to encompass both codes of ethics and codes of conduct.

Why develop a code?

The literature shows that there are a range of reasons why codes are established. Three key purposes for a professional code consistently cited in the research are:

- to enhance the reputation of the profession;
- to regulate members so the people they serve are protected from unethical behaviour;
- to educate and inspire teachers to be ethical practitioners.

It is suggested here that the multiple purposes of a code can prove problematic to those developing and using codes as the varying rationales can prove to be contradictory in both spirit and application. It is therefore important to explore the different purposes of a code in greater depth.

The code as reputation enhancing: When Education International developed the “Declaration on Professional Ethics” a key objective was to enhance the status and respect of the teaching profession (Dresscher, 2007). Gordon and Sork (2001) discuss how the widespread development codes in education stem from a desire to enhance the status of the teaching profession. An example of the status-enhancing purpose of a code can be found in the Ontario College of Teachers’ (OCT; 2003) “Code of Conduct” where it is stated that a primary purpose of the code is to “enhance the dignity of the profession and to acknowledge the contribution made by the teaching profession to Ontario society” (p. 8). The idea that the primary purpose of a code is to enhance the esteem of a professional group is a theme picked up by a number of researchers. Lovat (1998) argues that the development of a code of ethics for teachers would “signal a new maturity for the profession and bring it into line with other high-status status professions” (p. 4). Similarly, Campbell (2000) suggests that when teachers become familiar with the values inherent in a code their practice is improved and their professionalism enhanced. In her international survey on the implementation of codes, McKelvie-Sebileau (2011) discovered that 81% of respondents from countries with a code of conduct believed a main objective of a code was to promote a positive image of the teaching profession, while 67% of teachers thought that the implementation of a code had increased the esteem of teachers in the community. Forster (2012) discusses how an extrinsic rationale for the *Code of Ethics for the Teaching Profession in South Australia* is to uphold the professional image of teachers in the community. Interestingly, Forster questions whether the public expect teachers with whom they interact with to be honest and trustworthy because teachers have a code of ethics that demands such values or they

intrinsically expect such values in all individuals, particularly those who choose to be teachers. Wilding (1982) is sceptical of a code of ethics that is overtly focussed on increasing professional status. He argues that such a focus on public esteem can lead to professional elitism and codes being used more for gaining political traction for a profession than genuinely providing behavioural guidelines for its practitioners. The purpose of a code contributing to the public veneration of a profession is closely bound with the notion of increased professional accountability.

The code as regulatory: Campbell (2000) argues that the most obvious function of a code is to provide a mechanism for public accountability and internal discipline. Schwimmer and Maxwell (2017) define a code of ethics as a “pact between a group of professionals who provide an important public service...and the people who rely on their service” (p. 142). The importance of a pact between professions and society is increasingly evident in the developing world where codes are seen to be a potential weapon in the fight against corruption in the public service (McKelvie-Sebileau, 2011; van Nuland, 2009; van Nuland & Khandelwal, 2006). In her international survey of 24 countries’ implementation of codes, 16 of which were from the developing world, McKelvie-Sebileau (2011) found that 71% of respondents who worked with a code believed it should be aimed at improving the regulation and control of teachers.

An example of the regulatory purpose of a code can be found in the OCT (2003) code of conduct where it is stated that a primary purpose of the code is to “assist the College in fulfilling its mandate to govern the practice of teaching in the public interest” (p. 8). Banks (2003) argues that the recent proliferation of codes in the professions, particularly those in the public service, is due to a perceived crisis of public confidence and increased calls for accountability. Cook (2013) suggests that a source of this crisis in public confidence in teachers is partly derived from their portrayal in popular culture as selfish, cruel and violent egotists. Cook argues that although educators in the West are committed to ideals of tolerance, community and personal growth, the more negative stereotypes of teachers continue to be reproduced in popular culture.

The news media can also be seen as contributing to public suspicion of the professionalism of teachers. As Leskinen (1993) observes, “hardly a day goes by without news about unethical behaviour by our elected officials, our fellow educators, business leaders, and ordinary citizens” (p. 6). A range of authors critique the traditional notion that the news media simply hold up a mirror to society and reflect the social reality of that society. Critical media theorists such as Noam Chomsky (Chomsky, Mitchell, & Schoeffel, 2002) argue that the mirror metaphor is misleading and suggest the way the media hold the mirror can distort reality rather than re-represent reality. What they are suggesting is that the media contribute to the construction of

social reality rather than simply mirroring it. One of the key ways that the media help construct our reality is by adhering to certain values that guide the selection of what is deemed newsworthy, and what is not, and therefore what makes the screens of our televisions and the pages of our newspapers. A key value that can be seen to contribute to a crisis in the public's confidence in teachers is "negativity." Media theorist Stuart Allan (2010) describes how bad news is usually favoured over good news and how negativity is a key value that shapes the selection of certain events over others. In the case of teachers, I would argue they are more likely to be seen on the front pages of a newspaper due to a drink-driving conviction than a ground-breaking pedagogical intervention. I would agree with Banks (2003) that one of the main purposes behind a code is to address issues of public accountability for a profession rather than necessarily assisting the decision-making process. The call for teachers to be publicly accountable is more often based on the distortedly shrill cries of the news media and the antiquated stereotypes presented in popular culture than the actual substance of teachers' work.

Although it has been argued here that the regulatory functions of codes can be the result of public hysteria rather than genuine ethical issues confronted by practitioners, Banks (2003) points out that the calls for regulation can also come from within professions. In her study of four different codes from the field of social work, Banks found that calls for a code to regulate the conduct of professionals through clear standards, and consequences for breaching such standards, came from practising social workers themselves. Banks discusses how the (American) National Association of Social Workers (NASW) has developed an increasingly rule-oriented code that requires members to participate in NASW adjudication hearings and abide by any rulings made. Banks suggests that given the long history of American social work, and the diverse range of public, private and voluntary settings where practice happens, a code with clear regulatory functions is valued by the professional community as providing a sense of professional identity. Similarly, Gordon and Sork's (2001) survey of 261 adult educators, on the potential value of codes to their profession, found that a frequently cited reason for supporting a code included the belief a code would increase professionalism and accountability.

The code as educative: The notion that a code can have an educational purpose and inspire educators to be more ethical in their decision making is a common theme in the literature on codes. Forster (2012) expresses the purposes of a code as a duality between codes being educative or "aspirational" and codes being regulatory or "procedural." These different purposes frame the moral nature of teachers' work in distinctive ways. When the purpose of a code is primarily regulatory, teachers are more likely to defer to authority and therefore lose motivation to be genuine moral agents. However, when codes are educational in intent, teachers are more

likely to gain confidence in their ethical beliefs and judgements. Aspirational codes are open ended and flexible and require teachers to “reflect on what it would mean to embody the ideal of professionalism articulated in the code and continuously strive to reach that ideal” (Schwimmer & Maxwell, 2017, p. 143). Of the 261 participants in Gordon and Sork’s (2001) study of codes in adult education, 72.8% believed there was a need for a code, with the majority agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement: “A code of ethics instructs the practitioner about what is good practice” (p. 209). Many participants revealed their support for a code was based on a belief a code could act as a guideline or reference point for acceptable behaviour and ethical decision making. The researchers were surprised at the detail participants provided when responding to open-ended survey questions on ethical dilemmas they had confronted. The complexity and diversity of the issues dealt with led Gordon and Sork to conclude that “the willingness of practitioners to share their experiences of ethical issues highlights the need for continuing dialogue within the field about ethics of practice” (p. 215). An example of the educative purpose of a code of conduct can also be found in the OTC (2003) code of conduct where it is stated that a primary purpose of the code is to “clarify the knowledge, skills and values implicit in the practice of teaching and provide the basis for ongoing personal and professional growth” (p. 8).

Campbell (1997) argues that while teachers and their educational leaders may be able to agree on the shared values of the profession in the abstract, how they believe these values play out in the context of practice may vary greatly due to their different perspectives on the educative act. Campbell promotes codes as a mechanism for making multiple perspectives on educational issues transparent to all stakeholders. In the field of education, Ehrich et al. (2011) suggest that a professional code should educate teachers to isolate their professional ethics from other influences on the decision-making process, including the organisational culture, institutional context and their own individual values. They go on to argue that there are no easy steps for managing ethical dilemmas, but it is important for teachers to educate colleagues about how their professional code of ethics can be used in daily practice. Pope et al. (2009) recommend that to assist teachers in dealing with ethical issues in assessment, particularly score pollution, it is important that clear ethical principles are developed to assist teachers in making ethically sound choices when assessing student work. However, the idea that a code is some kind of panacea for ethical dilemmas in teaching is rejected by some. Sumsion (2000) concedes that codes that are educational in intent tend not to acknowledge the competing priorities that distort the realisation of ethical principles in action. They can provide some broad guidelines but no specific answers. Similarly, O’Neill (2016) argues that codes with an educational or aspirational purpose can be too vague to be useful for teachers, particularly inexperienced teachers. Educational codes are

also criticised for not having the required regulatory teeth to clearly assist teachers making ethical decisions (Foster, 2012).

I have suggested that codes serve the multiple purposes of enhancing the status of teachers, regulating their professional behaviour and providing education on how to make ethically challenging decisions. Shortt, Hallett, Spendlove, Hardy, and Barton (2012) observe that when writers attempt to develop codes that attend to all these purposes, ethical confusion results. The authors are critical of the code of conduct governing teachers' work in England for setting up an irreconcilable tension where teachers are at once expected to promote the critical thinking of students while simultaneously being expected to fulfil the role of the passive obedient public servant. Similarly, Schwimmer and Maxwell (2017), citing Ladd (1998), argue that codes that attempt to integrate regulatory and educative purposes end up causing intellectual and moral confusion.

I would suggest that the multiple purposes that can inform codes are all underpinned by the erosion of public confidence in the teaching profession. The increased focus on the moral and ethical nature of teaching in the last 30 years has emerged from a moral panic that young people have lost their collective ethical compass. Neoliberals have argued that direction has been lost due to the failure of the public education system to produce citizens of moral worth, and therefore the ethics of the teaching profession must be addressed so society can re-establish its bearings (Clark, 2005; Snook, 2003). Neoliberals, whose policies led to the rise of competitive individualism with all its ethical shortcomings, are now placing the ethical heat on teachers to tame the morally bankrupt beast of its own creation through the codified control and monitoring of teachers' ethical conduct (O'Neill & Bourke, 2010). Codes are being increasingly seen as an effective whip in the ongoing discipline of the teaching profession.

How are codes developed?

While the purposes of professional codes vary, how they are developed and implemented in teaching is reasonably similar. In her project on how codes are used in 24 different countries, McKelvie-Sebileau (2011) found that most often codes were developed by teacher unions and teacher-training institutes. These organisations would commonly consult with teachers, analyse existing codes and organise teacher workshops when developing codes. The dissemination of the code was usually performed by teacher-training institutes, national public authorities and schools. The majority of countries in the study took longer than a year to develop the code. We can see this pattern of development in the establishment of the OCT *Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession* (OCT, 2006). Initially, staff of the OCT considered codes of ethics and conduct from a variety of international teaching organisations. Workshops were organised

exploring issues and complexities of ethics in teaching. Draft standards were then reviewed by representatives of primary stakeholder groups including teacher federation representatives and principal groups. The development of the OCT *Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession* took a total of 18 months. While the OCT put time and resources into the development of the code, van Nuland and Khandewal (2006) critique the lack of effort put into its implementation. The poor implementation of the standards was reflected in the lack of knowledge teachers had of the code in the years immediately following its introduction. Although an independent, self-regulating professional body, the fact that the OCT was initially convened by government meant teachers were sceptical as to whether their interests were really being served. This mistrust led some teachers to disengage from the development and implementation of the professional standards. As van Nuland and Khandewal (2006) conclude, “mere formulation of codes (with limited participation) does not ensure their effective implementation” (p. 105).

Campbell (2000) suggests that, before a code is developed, it is essential that those involved in the development address a range of fundamental issues. If any progress is to be made by those involved in writing and implementing a code, thought must go into resolving what Clark (2005) describes as the “subjective” versus “objective” ethical controversy. Those charged with writing a code need to question whether the values they are espousing are objective truths that can be justified beyond mere self-interest or whether they are no more than relative and subjective opinions. Hick (1998) argues that in a globalised world, with its accompanying plurality of values, applying universal ethical norms in a code is impossible. However, Campbell (2000) and Soltis (1986) contend that, for a code to work, the perils of moral relativism must be confronted. Similarly, Appiah (2006) believes it is possible for cross-cultural conversations about values to end in agreement as long as we are willing to acknowledge that even if we cannot agree *why* something should be done, it is often possible to agree *what* should be done.

So, do we accept the idea that it is only individual teachers who can define what is right or wrong from their own subjective position, or do we view the articulation of clear principles of practice as essential to being an ethical professional? To Campbell (2000), the answer is clear: we “must reject the prevailing relativism and subjectivism that so influences contemporary beliefs about ethics, by the very act of attempting to codify objective ethical principles as valued ideals that should govern the practice of individuals” (p. 209). Campbell’s view is consistent with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation’s (UNESCO) position that cultural diversity should be treated as a dynamic treasure, rather than a rigid heritage, that is therefore capable of change to prevent segregation and fundamentalism that can threaten basic human rights (Dresscher, 2008).

I agree with Campbell and UNESCO that a code should make clear the principles of practice that govern the decision making of teachers. These principles should be developed through thorough consultation with the profession, implemented through collaborative reflective discussion and open to review. Schwimmer and Maxwell (2017) suggest that, in developing formalised codes of ethics, writers prioritise open and flexible obligation statements and encourage reasonable dissent to protect the interests of students. When teachers are provided with the flexibility to discuss how principles have been considered and applied in the light of genuine ethical dilemmas, subjective interpretations can be scrutinised for their rigour, clarifications made and shared understandings established. My position is consistent with Forster (2012) who argues that while the principles in a code may leave teachers confused, they also provide an opportunity for ongoing ethical reflection. A code that is underpinned by moral relativism denies the opportunity for teachers to make meaningful decisions based on professionally agreed upon principles, as, much like a boat that has broken free from its moorings, direction is likely to be defined by the prevailing tide and wind. Objective principles provide the necessary anchor points to allow professional ethical discussions shared starting points, although this does not deny the possibility of the anchor chain dragging in particularly challenging ethical seas.

How have teachers used codes?

As discussed earlier, a code often fulfils the purpose of educating professionals about the moral nature of their work and inspiring them to act ethically. Forster (2012) discusses how codes that fulfil an educative function usually provide guidance on how to make ethical decisions, yet there is little research into how teachers have made use of codes in their ethical decision making. Forster goes on to argue that teacher education programmes at both graduate and undergraduate levels should encourage the reinterpretation and contestation of the values expressed in codes so as to enhance the ethical decision making of teachers. Van Nuland (2009) notes there is little objective evidence on how codes have impacted on teacher decision making although Cherubini (2008) has explored how OCT's *Ethical Standards for the Teaching Professions* have been used by preservice student teachers in developing their professional identities. Using a series of four increasingly complex case studies, Cherubini found participants perceived that the standards did impact on their identities as prospective teachers; however, the relationship between the standards and student-teacher decision making was not explored. The OCT ethical standards have also been studied by van Nuland and Khandelwal (2006). Following teachers' involvement in workshops exploring authentic case studies of ethical dilemmas, participants described how these workshop experiences had helped make the standards personally meaningful to them.

There have been studies into teachers' perceptions of how codes can improve performance and assist ethical decision making. In her international comparative study, McKelvie-Sebileau (2011) found that 98% of research participants in schools of countries where codes had been implemented believed that codes had improved the quality of teaching. Participants reported improved feelings of professional identity, reduced misconduct, improvement in the ethics of the profession and increased confidence from the community towards teachers. Similarly, van Nuland and Khandelwal (2006) found that teachers in Bangladesh and India perceived that a code of practice or conduct "had a limited but positive impact on teachers' professional ethical behaviour" (p. 158). In Bangladesh, of the 120 teachers who completed a structured interview, 78% believed codes had improved the performance of staff, while in India, 95% of the 221 participants endorsed the view that codes had improved performance. While van Nuland and Khandelwal concludes that codes have some visibility in assisting teachers to solve ethical dilemmas, this research does not explore how teachers made use of the codes. Indeed, many of the teachers in this international research project report having poor access to codes, with only 25% of teachers reporting easy access to their respective codes. So, while the international research cited above gives some indication of how beneficial teachers believe codes of ethics to be (or potentially be), it does not provide us with insights into how codes have been used by teachers to guide their ethical decision making.

The purpose of this study is to explore how New Zealand teachers make ethical decisions and the place a code plays in this process. The literature reveals an increased interest in the moral/ethical nature of teaching and the place of codes in helping teachers address ethical challenges in their practice. However, there is a dearth of research into how teachers actually make sense of and implement codes when faced with ethical dilemmas. It is hoped the current study will go some way to inform the ongoing discussion about the purpose and utility of codes in the teaching profession.

In Chapter 3, I present a small-scale empirical pilot study where I analyse the types of ethical dilemmas experienced by student teachers while on practicum placement in schools. My original rationale for this study was to generate preliminary understandings on how preservice teachers make ethical decisions that I could subsequently take forward into researching the ethical decision making of qualified classroom teachers and the place of codes in this process (see purpose of proposed study, above). As explained in Chapter 1, a case of "writer's block" and a methodological epiphany led me to abandon my empirical-research goals in favour of the autoethnographic. While the empirical promise of this pilot study is not realised in subsequent chapters, it is included here because the chapter charts my beginning venture into becoming a

researching educational ethicist and provides unique insights into how student teachers experience the ethics of teaching while on practicum.

Chapter Three

Between a Hard Place and a Hard Place: Comparing Ethical Dilemmas in Teaching¹

Introduction

It has been claimed that teachers feel powerless and lack adequate tools to cope with ethical dilemmas in their work with children (Campbell, 1997; Ehrich et al., 2011; Pope et al., 2009). In developing a taxonomy of ethical dilemmas for secondary teachers in Israeli schools, Shapira-Lishchinsky (2011) hoped to develop a shared moral vocabulary that would assist teachers to address the complexity of moral judgements they must make in their daily work. The purpose of the current study is to establish if the Shapira-Lishchinsky taxonomy could be used to categorise the ethical dilemmas of student teachers in the cultural context of New Zealand primary schools and, in doing so, discover the possibilities of developing a universal moral vocabulary for teachers. A selection of 100 student-teacher reflections on ethical dilemmas experienced on practicum formed the data base for this study. An analysis of these third-year assignments was carried out grounded on Shapira-Lishchinsky's taxonomy of categories of ethical dilemmas. A thematic coding approach informed the data analysis.

Through the development and application of her ethical decision-making taxonomy, Shapira-Lishchinsky (2011) has successfully contributed to the development of a moral vocabulary for teachers that will assist them in addressing the complexity of ethical judgements they have to deal with when making decisions regarding the welfare of children. However, the current study has found that the dilemmas teachers are faced with are always going to be culturally located; therefore it is vital that educators continually expand their understanding of the types of dilemmas they are likely to face in their differing cultural contexts so they can develop both a universal and local moral vocabulary. Such a vocabulary should meet local expectations while paying regard to universal criteria.

Theoretical Background

The last 30 years has witnessed an increased interest in the moral and ethical nature of teaching (Campbell, 1997; Ehrich et al., 2011; McKelvie-Sebileau, 2011; Terhart, 1998). There has been a growing awareness that teachers, by virtue of the power they hold in schools, are constantly

¹ I originally wrote this chapter for possible publication in the *Teacher and Teacher Education* journal. I subsequently re-wrote the article with Dr Maree Davies for publication in the April 2019 *British Educational Research Journal*.

required to make ethical choices about the “right” way to proceed in a myriad of situations. These decisions vary from pedagogical choices on how to deliver the curriculum to personal decisions about how best to deal with the unethical behaviour of a colleague. Along with this heightened awareness of the moral agency of teachers there have been increased calls for teachers to receive assistance in using their agency in an ethically sound and professional manner.

In exploring how teachers go about the complex task of ethical decision making, a common recommendation has emerged across the literature and in educational policy. As discussed in Chapter 2, core ethical principles systemised into professional codes have been developed to assist educators in managing ethical dilemmas (Campbell, 1997; Ehrich et al., 2011; Pope et al., 2009). Campbell (2001) has provided a persuasive argument about the place of codes in the development of an ethical profession. While an observance of a code’s rules and guidelines in isolation may provide an individual teacher with some sense of comfort they have satisfied their judicial requirements as a professional, it will not necessarily assist teachers to do what is “right.” Campbell suggests some clear actions schools can engage in to move beyond the perfunctory use of codes to seeing a code as embodying clear ethical principles to guide practice. Firstly, teachers and their school leaders need to have open discussions about difficult questions such as whether there is a shared belief that commitment to students comes before collegial loyalty. Secondly, schools could use hypothetical dilemmas to establish some shared meanings over principles such as honesty, care and fairness within the community of practice. Once these shared principles have been established, it is the responsibility of everybody to help one another to honour these ethical norms. Finally, when any school policies are devised or reviewed, ethical implications are considered before expediency and utility. If the suggestions above are followed, it is possible that the internalisation of ethical principles called for by Campbell and others (Starratt, 1994; Strike, 1999) may indeed occur. Similarly, Forster (2012) argues if teachers are to move beyond seeing codes as merely perfunctory documents, teacher education programmes at both graduate and undergraduate levels should encourage the reinterpretation and contestation of the values expressed in codes so as to enhance the ethical decision making of teachers. The reflective statements drawn on as the data set for the current study required undergraduate student teachers to analyse how an ethical decision they had made on practicum honoured and/or compromised the NZTC (2005) *Code of Ethics*. The aim of this analysis was to move students beyond seeing the code as another tool of control and compliance that they must demonstrate some knowledge of in order to complete their degree, and, rather, to engage them in reinterpreting and contesting the code in light of their lived experiences as practitioners.

When looking for the type of ethical dilemmas commonly experienced by student teachers on practicum, the literature is not particularly revealing as to specific categories of dilemmas likely to be encountered. However, there are some valuable insights into why student teachers may experience ethical dilemmas in the practicum environment. Allen and Peach (2007) discuss the role strain students experience within the preservice teacher practicum experience. Role strain occurs when an individual prioritises some role dimensions over others to decrease feelings of stress. In the practicum environment, the student has many different role dimensions to fulfil in being a student teacher. They have the role of colleague to their associate teacher and other teachers in the school. They have the role of teacher to the pupils in their class with the responsibility of ensuring learning to all members of this group. They have the role of educational scholar armed with important understandings of learning theory. They have the role of university student needing to demonstrate to faculty the pedagogical skills and understandings required to pass the practicum. Luehmann (2007) argues that the tension between theory-based recommendations and the value of this theory-based knowledge, in light of their experiences in the classroom, throws up some of the challenging situations student teachers will be confronted with in their teacher education. In times of stress, where students are faced with challenging decisions, Allen and Peach (2007) suggest that some of these role dimensions will take precedence while others may be completely abandoned.

Method

Participants and data collection.

A qualitative interpretive approach informed the study. Data was collected through 100 written reflective statements completed as an assignment for a Bachelor of Education (Teaching) degree course. Therefore, the main form of evidence used in this study was the narrative accounts of ethical dilemmas from student teachers. My reason for choosing student-teacher written reflective statements was that they would provide me with valuable participant interpretations on the main categories of ethical dilemmas experienced by student teachers in New Zealand primary schools. I agree with Denzin's (2001) observation that in the world of human experience, there is only interpretation and it is a worthy goal for researchers to make these interpretations open to others so they can create better understandings of the major social issues of our day.

Data analysis.

A thematic approach to data analysis was used in analysing the 100 student-teacher written reflective statements on ethical dilemmas experienced on practicum (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The data set was initially analysed deductively by attempting to locate each written reflection

within the five categories of the Shapira-Lishchinsky (2011) taxonomy. A total of 48 of the ethical dilemmas were able to be categorised within this taxonomy (See Table 1).

Table 1

Dataset Analysis Using Shapira-Lishchinsky Categories of Ethical Dilemmas

Number of Dilemmas	Shapira-Lishchinsky Categories of Ethical Dilemmas
15	Caring climate versus formal climate
1	Distributive justice versus school standards
6	Confidentiality versus school rules
16	Loyalty to colleagues versus school norms
10	Family agenda versus educational standards

Where written reflections could not be accommodated within the existing framework, I set about analysing the data for latent themes that could be useful in describing the unique nature of the student-teacher ethical dilemmas. Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that when the researcher searches for latent themes that give meaning to their data, they are not just seeking to describe the data but rather to theorise the data. Following a second analysis of the 52 ethical dilemmas not able to be accommodated in the Shapira-Lishchinsky taxonomy, the subsequent framework was developed (See Table 2).

Table 2

Dataset Analysis Using Newly Established Categories of Ethical Dilemmas

Number of Dilemmas	Newly Established Categories of Ethical Dilemmas
31	Personal pedagogical beliefs versus associate teacher/school pedagogical practice
9	Dealing with the challenging behaviour of children appropriately versus protecting a safe learning environment
11	Demonstrating cultural and religious sensitivity versus adhering to associate teacher instructions
3	Fear of accusations of misconduct versus meeting the needs of children

Findings

Findings will be reported in two stages. Initially, I will discuss how 48 of the ethical dilemmas within the current study were accommodated within the Shapira-Lishchinsky taxonomy. I will then provide a description of four newly created categories that have arisen from a thematic analysis of the 52 ethical dilemmas that did not fit within the existing taxonomy of dilemmas.

Dilemmas that could be accommodated within the Shapira-Lishchinsky taxonomy (48 incidents).

The most frequently discussed type of ethical dilemma for teachers in Shapira-Lishchinsky's (2011) study fell into the category *the caring climate versus formal climate*. In this category, 36% of the teachers in the study discussed the tension between having the flexibility to do the best by individual learners and needing to obey rules so all learners are seemingly given an equal chance to succeed. In the current study, 15% of student-teacher ethical dilemmas were categorised as issues that required negotiation between the caring and formal climate of the school.

Another common dilemma experienced in the Shapira-Lishchinsky (2011) study involved the tension between *distributive justice and school standards*. Distributive justice refers to the fairness of outcomes for diverse students, while a school standard focusses on set criteria for reaching decisions regardless of diverse circumstances. While 13% of the participants in Shapira-Lishchinsky's study discussed this type of dilemma, only one dilemma in the current study could be located in this category.

In the category *loyalty to colleagues versus school norms*, teachers need to resolve the tension between remaining loyal to a colleague or informing superiors of a colleague's unprofessional behaviour (Shapira-Lishchinsky, 2011). In Shapira-Lishchinsky's study, 12% of teachers reported this category, whereas, in the current study, slightly more participants experienced this type of dilemma at 16%.

Shapira-Lishchinsky's (2011) category of *the family agenda versus educational standards* refers to incidents where teachers may be conflicted by the wishes of parents and their own pedagogical understanding of what is best for the student. A total of 8% of teachers in the Shapira-Lishchinsky study reported this category of dilemma, while 10% of students in the current study described the same type of dilemma.

The final Shapira-Lishchinsky (2011) category features *confidentiality versus school rules* where teachers must choose between maintaining a trusting relationship with a student and disclosing

information to ensure the enforcement of school rules. In the Shapira-Lishchinsky study, 18% of participants experienced this type of dilemma as compared to 12% of students in the current study.

I will now describe four newly created categories that have arisen from a thematic analysis of the ethical dilemmas that could not be accommodated within the Shapira-Lishchinsky taxonomy.

Personal pedagogical beliefs versus associate teacher/school pedagogical practice (30 incidents).

This category focuses on the inherent power imbalance in the relationship between the associate teacher and the student teacher. Even when an associate teacher allows opportunities for student teachers to try out their own pedagogical ideas in the classroom, the student teacher will often feel compelled to conform to their associate's approach. There are five subcategories within this overall category and each demonstrates the tension between adhering to the associate teacher's practice or following personal pedagogical beliefs.

The first subcategory relates to *making decisions about how to effectively teach children with special needs*. These needs ranged from dealing with extremely high-needs children with diagnosed learning delays to adequately catering for low-ability groups in numeracy and literacy. The 13 dilemmas within this subcategory were often expressed as a tension between either spending too much or not enough time with special-needs learners. The first example from this subcategory is from a student teacher who is concerned that her associate teacher's approach to a special-needs child comes at the expense of the rest of the learners.

My associate teacher spent much of her day supporting Jeffrey in his learning, often at the expense of many other children in the classroom.

The next example from this subcategory is from a student teacher who is concerned that her associate teacher's approach to special-needs learners is inadequate to meet the needs of these children.

In other guided maths lessons, they would be given "busy work" like colouring which was supposedly fractions, although they were colouring half of everything with no actual mathematical understanding behind it.

The second subcategory relates to *making decisions about how to effectively cover curriculum content*. The eight dilemmas within this subcategory were often expressed as a tension between covering the curriculum in the depth required for meaningful learning to occur and providing children with access to a broad, balanced curriculum. The following example from this

subcategory is from a student who is concerned that her associate teacher's approach to delivering the curriculum does not provide sufficient time for learning to occur in any depth.

My first option was to stick with my associate's general weekly plans that contained the allocated time for all learning areas but compromised the in-depth learning for writing and social studies.

The next example from this subcategory is from a student who is concerned that her associate teacher's approach to delivering the curriculum does not provide children with a broad and rich curriculum experience.

It seemed whenever something was moved out it was a less important subject like PE or the arts. Which to me was a bit of a moral dilemma as those subjects like PE and the arts are invaluable to students developing as a whole person.

The third subcategory relates to *making decisions about implementing a child-centred pedagogy or a curriculum-centred pedagogy*. In the four dilemmas within this subcategory, the students discussed how they felt pressured to pitch their teaching to the whole class rather than following a more child-centred pedagogy.

My initial awareness of this dilemma began as I was making observations,...I saw that this teacher used a traditional rote-based pedagogy.

The fourth subcategory relates to *making decisions about how strict to be when teaching*. In the four dilemmas within this subcategory, the students discussed how they felt pressured to be stricter and more authoritarian with children than they wanted to be.

My associate teacher's behaviour management strategy was to shout and humiliate her students, which only created a hostile environment in the classroom...she told me that in order to effectively manage behaviour "you have to show them who's boss."

The fifth and final subcategory relates to *making decisions about teaching to the test*. In the two dilemmas within this subcategory, the students discussed how they felt pressured to prepare learners for high-stakes standardised tests and, in doing so, compromised their ability to meet the learning needs of children.

At that particular time, I could only see two options. The first was to "teach to the test," which I did not believe was the right approach as it was inconsistent with my beliefs and teaching practices.

Dealing with the challenging behaviour of children appropriately versus protecting a safe learning environment.

Here the focus is on how the student teacher deals with the inappropriate behaviour of children. There are three subcategories within this overall category and each demonstrates the tension between meeting the needs of the misbehaving student and maintaining a positive learning environment for the rest of the class.

The first subcategory relates to ensuring *children who engage in inappropriate behaviour are still given access to the learning*. In the four dilemmas within this subcategory, the students discussed their uncertainty when faced with the disruptive behaviour of individual children and the impact of this behaviour on the learning of the remainder of the class. While students were aware that physically isolating a disruptive child from the rest of the class would improve the learning environment, it would also deny the offending child access to education.

I was aware that by sending him out of the classroom he would miss an important lesson; however, by keeping in the group he could still be a distraction to other students' learning,

The second subcategory relates to *ensuring the safety of the child displaying inappropriate behaviour while demonstrating appropriate responsible care to the remainder of the class*. In the three dilemmas within this subcategory, the students discussed incidents where disruptive children run from the classroom because of having their inappropriate behaviour challenged. In these emotionally charged situations, students report feeling torn between their duty of care to the whole class and their responsibility for the welfare of the child who has absconded.

At that moment all I could think of was to run after the student, which was an option but I couldn't do that because I was alone in the gym and I didn't want to lose control of the class because they were under my care. This was a hard decision to make because the student who ran off was in danger too because of the state he was in.

The third subcategory relates to *making decisions about how to respond appropriately to negative behaviour of children with high needs*. In the two dilemmas within this subcategory, the students discussed how having children with diagnosed behavioural issues could lead to uncertainty as how to respond to inappropriate behaviour. Students reported feeling conflicted as to whether or not they should relax their expectations of behaviour for these particular children when faced with deliberate acts of defiance.

A lot of the time if it had been another child acting the same way they would have been punished for their actions as they were considered unacceptable in the classroom.

Demonstrating cultural and religious sensitivity versus providing equal time and value to all learners.

This category depicts the dilemma between a student teacher's desire to respect the cultural and religious diversity of children while spreading teacher time equitably within the classroom and giving equal value to all cultural beliefs, particularly those they may personally disagree with.

There are five subcategories within this overall category.

The first subcategory relates to *making decisions about helping children from different cultures fit into the classroom environment*. In the six dilemmas within this subcategory the students discussed difficulties in deciding how much time and attention to give to students who had recently immigrated to New Zealand and who spoke English as a second language. Some admitted to feelings of insecurity due to their lack of skills and experience working with children from non-English speaking backgrounds while others had been directed by their associate teachers to limit the attention they spent on these children, particularly if they were foreign fee-paying students.

She emphasised the importance of getting through the lessons with the intended learning outcomes and to disregard the learning needs of the other international students as the students in our class should take priority.

The second subcategory relates to *making decisions about being inclusive of diverse cultural and religious beliefs and practices*. In the three dilemmas within this subcategory, the students discussed the complexity of exploring cultural and spiritual practices in classrooms made up of children from a variety of cultures and belief systems. Even when attempting to explore the cultural beliefs of different groups in the classroom from an objective, inquiry-led perspective, students found they could cause cultural offence to some children and whānau.

Religious aspects can be contentious and subjective; therefore, I needed to consider how appropriate it would be to engage students in discussion that may prove as a discomforting situation.

The third and final subcategory relates to *making decisions about needing to focus on priority (Māori and Pacifica learners)*. In the single dilemma within this subcategory, the student discussed how she felt uncomfortable giving a particular Māori learner extra assistance purely because of their ethnicity.

I was unsure of how much time I should devote to this one student compared to other students. He was Māori and underachieving and the school had a big push for raising Māori achievement so I was aware that I did need to give him the help he needed.

Fear of accusations of misconduct versus meeting the needs of children.

Student teachers are often faced with situations where they need to make a choice between protecting themselves from accusations of professional misconduct or meeting the learning needs of children. In this single-item category, student teachers discussed how they found themselves in circumstances where they needed to balance assisting a child in difficulty with the possible repercussions of their good intentions being misinterpreted as possible abuse or misconduct. Here a student discusses finding a missing child distraught due to difficulties experienced while toileting.

Here I am a student teacher, standing in an open foyer of an upper-class school, alone with a young boy who has his pants down and is crying. Further to that I am a male. Going through my head is the worst scenario; a “concerned parent” sees this and I end up in jail for the foreseeable future.

Discussion

Shapira-Lishchinsky's (2011) study provides a valuable contribution to research on ethical dilemmas in schools. Through the development and application of an ethical decision-making taxonomy, Shapira-Lishchinsky has helped shape a shared moral vocabulary for teachers that could assist them in addressing the complexity of moral judgements they have to deal with. By laying bare the critical incidents that teachers are faced with in their careers, but would often rather conceal, the ethical dilemmas that emerge from these critical incidents are made public in a way that allows educational professionals to potentially deal more successfully with their own ethical challenges. In applying the taxonomy to the critical incidents described by the student teachers in my study it became clear that some dilemmas faced by educators are universal while others are more context specific. While Shapira-Lishchinsky attempts to provide a universal taxonomy to assist teacher ethical decision making I would argue my findings demonstrate the need for a more situated theory of teacher ethics. While a taxonomy of ethical dilemmas provides an important reference point for discussion of ethical dilemmas, it is important that those interested in ethical dilemmas continue to theorise the particular sociocultural factors that inform the nature of teacher practice in context-specific environments.

In order to provide a deeper contextual understanding of ethical dilemmas it is important to be able to answer the following four questions. *Who owns the ethical dilemma? When and where did the ethical dilemma take place? Why might certain types of dilemmas occur in this type of environment to these kinds of teachers? How did teachers deal with these dilemmas?* In the current study, it is a relatively straightforward task to answer the first two of these questions;

“student teachers in the third year of their Bachelor of Education Teaching degree” takes care of the *who*; while the *when* and *where* is during the final practicum experience in a New Zealand primary school. A more complex task is discussing *why* certain types of dilemmas occurred in this particular environment to these student teachers and *how* they came to deal with these dilemmas.

In the current study, ethical dilemmas were drawn from the unique context of New Zealand student teachers’ practicum experiences. Of the 100 student-teacher ethical dilemmas analysed, 48 were able to be accommodated within the Shapira-Lishchinsky taxonomy. The category of dilemma from the taxonomy most commonly experienced by these students was the tension between *loyalty to colleagues versus school norms*, with 16 of the students describing this type of dilemma. Ferrier-Kerr (2009) and Beck and Kosnik (2002) have found that student teachers on practicum not only view their role as a learner and observer but also as a professional colleague of their associate teacher, therefore it seems reasonable that this category should feature so predominantly. Shapira-Lishchinsky (2011) explains this category as the tension between the need to remain loyal to a colleague and the need to report unprofessional conduct to a superior. In discussing this category of ethical dilemma, Shapira-Lishchinsky concludes that, often, the reason teachers fail to report the unprofessional conduct of colleagues is to maintain a sense of comradeship and a positive work climate. Similarly, Campbell (1996) observes that many teachers are willing to ignore the misconduct of a colleague in an attempt to avoid “rocking the boat.” The current study also reveals that students were reluctant to report the unprofessional conduct of colleagues to superiors. As students come to view themselves as colleagues to their associate teachers, rather than mere classroom visitors or observers (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Ferrier-Kerr, 2009), it is possible to see why student teachers in the current study were motivated by a sense of collegiality when they failed to report the inappropriate behaviour of a colleague. However, I would argue another strong motivation for students to refrain from testifying against colleagues was self-preservation. In each of the 16 dilemmas in the category *loyalties to colleagues versus school norms*, the colleague in question was the student’s associate teacher. Where, in the Shapira-Lishchinsky study, teachers discuss tensions of outing a colleague of a similar status, the students in the current study were dealing with reporting the unprofessional behaviour of a superior, a colleague who had a considerable say in whether or not they passed their final practicum. While participants in both studies reported the ethical challenge of reporting the unprofessional behaviour of a colleague, their compulsion to protect their colleagues was motivated by very different sociocultural contexts with their own unique power structures.

Differences between the two studies also emerge from an analysis of how participants dealt with their dilemmas. Shapira-Lishchinsky reports that teachers in her study dealt with loyalty dilemmas by either ignoring their colleague's professional indiscretion or reporting the breach to relevant stakeholders. Students in the current study all dealt with their dilemma by ignoring their associate teacher's unprofessional behaviour even when this meant enduring an unfulfilling practicum experience. It would seem the students' lack of power contributed to their lack of agency when dealing with such dilemmas.

The category of ethical dilemmas in the Shapira-Lishchinsky taxonomy that was most underreported in the current study was *distributive justice versus school standards*. In the former study, 26% of participants had a dilemma that fell within this category compared to only 1% of participants in the current study. Shapira-Lishchinsky (2011) describes how dilemmas within the *distributive justice versus school standards* category are focussed on how school criteria are applied for reaching decisions and how fair the outcomes of these decisions are when determining implications for children. When the context of the work of teachers in the Shapira-Lishchinsky study is considered, it is possible to see why this type of dilemma would occur more frequently than in the current study. The teachers in the Israeli study are all secondary teachers and as such would need to make high-stakes decisions on student performance for credentialing purposes. High-stake assessment decisions often involve teachers balancing the need to fairly apply assessment criteria while also considering the outcomes for students. In the case of students in the current study, the outcomes of assessment decisions on the potential life chances of children are not as immediately apparent as they are for secondary teachers making decisions that will ultimately lead to qualifications children leave school with.

Within this discussion I have compared how similar types of dilemmas experienced by participants in the Shapira-Lishchinsky study and the current study have very different origins. To understand why such categories of ethical dilemmas emerge for teachers in different settings we must understand the nature of the varying sociocultural contexts in which they work. For the remainder of this discussion I will focus on ethical dilemmas in the current study that could not be accommodated within the Shapira-Lishchinsky taxonomy. I will explore *why* such dilemmas may emerge for student teachers on their final practicum and *how* these dilemmas were managed.

The most common category of dilemma experienced by students in the current study involved resolving the tension between a *student teacher's personal pedagogical beliefs and their associate teacher's pedagogical practice*. Within this category, students discussed a range of dilemmas that saw them compromising their developing pedagogical beliefs when they were

asked to adapt to their associate teacher's approach to learning and teaching. Given the unequal power relationship between the associate teacher and the student teacher, it is understandable that this type of dilemma should feature so predominantly. Ferrier-Kerr (2009) acknowledges that "the relationship between an associate teacher and student teacher is a crucial aspect of the practicum experience in pre-service teacher education" (p. 790). Similarly, Ralph (2003) argues the quality of the practicum experience for student teachers relies heavily on the supervisory style of the associate teacher.

There are a number of reasons why this category of dilemma maybe so prominent for student teachers in their final practicum. Firstly, this practicum involves assessment of how students have demonstrated the learning outcomes of the course through a combination of observations, discussions and planning audits carried out by the associate teacher and a university-based visiting lecturer. The final assessment decision is decided through a triadic assessment process where a consensus on a pass is agreed between the student teacher, the associate teacher and the visiting lecturer. Cochran-Smith (2001) suggests that the student teacher has the least power in this practicum triad and therefore the least confidence to "teach against the grain" (p. 3). Given the influence the associate teacher has on the outcome of the practicum course, it is understandable why student teachers choose to conform to the associate teacher's pedagogical approach. Peach and Allen (2011) argue that the largest impediment for student teachers to successfully complete practicum-based assessment tasks is the disparity between expectations of university staff and their associate teacher. The fact students tend to abandon the role of diligent university student completing assessment tasks, as defined by the university staff, in favour of compliant colleague willing to follow the demands of their associate teachers, demonstrates that in times of role strain students are more compelled to align themselves with the role of dutiful colleague than the role of critical student. When one considers the large amount of time students spend with their associate teachers, compared to the visiting university staff, while on practicum, and the way the practicum serves as a pseudo job interview for a beginning teacher position, it is not surprising that the role of supportive colleague is prioritised. As Peach and Allen (2011) argue, unless established synergies of practice and beliefs exist between the university and schools, "students will abandon university learning in order to privilege workplace practice" (p. 13).

Secondly, given these particular students are only a few months from completing their degree, the pressure to pass their final practicum course is even greater than previous years of the degree. These students will have accrued significant student loans over their course of study so will be eager to complete their degree in order to secure a beginning teaching position to ease

their debt. Furthermore, through the previous two and a half years of the degree they would have seen the reality of peers failing previous first- and second-year practicums and will have been made aware that poor relationships between associate teachers and student teachers have been a contributing factor in a number of these failures.

Finally, I would argue that these students may have formed some strong pedagogical principles based on the large amount of study they have put into learning and teaching over the previous two and a half years. When student teachers enter their final third-year practicum, they do so backed by both previous experience in schools and a body of evidence-informed theory about how learning and teaching should take place in schools. I would argue that in their final practicum student teachers are in a more knowledgeable place to think critically about the practice of their associate teacher than they would have been in earlier practicums. This heightened awareness of what constitutes effective practice could make demands to participate in practices perceived as ineffective more pedagogically jarring than might have been the case in previous practicums. A number of researchers have commented on the disconnections between understandings that have been arrived at in the university context and the realities of succeeding in the practicum environment (Cochran-Smith, 2005; Ferkins & Fleming, 2004; P. Jones & Linn, 2004; Luehmann, 2007; R. Thomas & Goc, 2004). Luehmann (2007) argues that when student teachers perceive a fracture between the theory learnt at university and their practice-teaching experiences they often feel unsupported in trying to reflect on their own practice. Instead of being rewarded when they attempt to make sense of their own practice through critical reflection, student teachers are often directed towards the tried and true teaching approaches of their associate teachers. The disconnect between theory and practice is picked up on by some student teachers in research by Allen and Peach (2007), one of whom commented, "We are just the puppets in other teachers' classrooms. But there is not a better solution so we persevere" (p. 28). Student-teacher participants in a study into the components of a good practicum placement were unanimous in their desire to be provided with the flexibility to try out their own pedagogical ideas (Beck & Kosnik, 2002). However, it is clear from many of the ethical dilemmas experienced by students in the current study that this flexibility is often absent and instead replication and adherence are the expectation.

When we look at how students dealt with the tension between *their personal pedagogical beliefs and their associate teacher's pedagogical practice*, a range of options were chosen. Of the 31 dilemmas experienced in this category, 14 were dealt with by the student agreeing to conform to their associate teacher's pedagogical approach, nine students negotiated a compromise with

their associate teacher and eight students completely disregarded their associate teacher's pedagogical advice.

In managing dilemmas that dealt with the tension *dealing with the challenging behaviour of children appropriately versus protecting a safe learning environment*, students demonstrated a heightened awareness of balancing the needs of children demonstrating challenging behaviours and the welfare of the rest of the class.

A significant reason for issues of behaviour management featuring strongly in the dilemmas of students is the strong emotion elicited when students dealt with the challenging behaviour of children. More than in any other category of dilemma, students described strong feelings of guilt and anger when dealing with behaviour management issues. Guilt arose from the concern that they felt it impossible to ensure the welfare of both the child or children demonstrating challenging behaviour and the remainder of the class. Students also reported feelings of anger at the misbehaving child or children, as often their behaviour involved insults and in one case physical violence being directed towards the student. While students are well versed in theories of behaviour management, and how to effectively deal with diverse learners, in their course work, no research article or text book can replicate the emotions of fear, anger and anxiety that arise when faced with deliberate defiance and/or abuse and the guilt engendered when reflecting on such incidents.

In all incidents of behaviour management, students discussed needing to prioritise either the needs of the misbehaving child or children and the remainder of the class. When deciding how to deal with such dilemmas, students in the current study predominantly chose to ensure the welfare of the class over the needs of the disruptive child.

Given the increasingly multicultural nature of New Zealand schools, particularly in areas of Auckland, it is not surprising that a major category of ethical dilemma was *demonstrating cultural and religious sensitivity versus providing equal time and value to all learners*. Within this category, students discussed difficulties in demonstrating cultural and religious sensitivity to all groups within the classroom when the beliefs of one cultural group in the class could offend the values of another group.

As mentioned above, a major reason for why dilemmas around cultural and religious sensitivity arose for student teachers is the increasing multicultural profile of Auckland primary school classrooms. As part of their coursework, students are taught the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi and the place of Māori as tangata whenua in New Zealand. The notion of catering for learners from diverse cultures is also a predominant theme in coursework for students. However,

as students come to teaching with their own cultural and religious values, they are faced with difficulties in putting these aside when dealing with students who adhere to different belief systems, particularly if these directly challenge their own cultural and/or religious principles. It is perhaps the expectations on students, to act neutrally in situations regarding issues of culture and belief, that heighten their awareness of when situations within their practicum classrooms are leading towards the clash of cultural beliefs for children.

When students discussed how they resolved such complex dilemmas around culture and diversity, all mentioned how that they were aware that in dealing with such issues they had to be sensitive to all cultural groups not just the most dominant group or the one they most strongly identified with. However, in taking a cautious approach, students conceded that opportunities for genuine learning were lost as they needed to close down learning conversations that were heading in a direction that may have caused cultural or religious offence. Zembylas and McGlynn (2012) argue that teachers need to take some risks in creating a sense of personal vulnerability and discomfort for children in order to create meaningful learning opportunities around issues of cultural sensitivity. They stress that a “pedagogy of discomfort,” though ethically challenging, should be used with care in diverse classrooms to empower children with understandings to deal with the challenges and opportunities of living in a multicultural society.

The final category of dilemma included in this discussion focusses on the tension, *fear of accusations of misconduct versus meeting the needs of children*. A significant factor in incidents of fear of misconduct featuring in this study is the media hysteria around issues of child abuse in schools and early childhood centres in New Zealand. Following the Christchurch Civic Crèche case of the early 90s, where one teacher was jailed for abuse, on what some regard as flimsy evidence, there has been much teacher anxiety about wrongful accusation. The media have continually drawn attention to accusations of child abuse in schools even before the accused have a chance to defend themselves in court. Even when charges are dropped or successfully defended the stigma of abuse remains. With such heightened media awareness of issues of abuse in schools, it is not at all surprising that students should be sensitive to these types of dilemmas on while on practicum. A. Jones (2004) argues that this media hysteria has turned all teachers, particularly men, into potential paedophiles and deprived children of human touch, thus depersonalising the teaching professionals who have withdrawn touch as part of their work with children.

When students describe how they dealt with concerns of accusations of misconduct they discussed how they needed to consider protecting themselves or dealing with the immediate needs of the child concerned. In two of the three cases within this dilemma, the students

explained how they honoured their commitment to the learner over self-protection. In the remaining dilemma, the student acknowledged that protecting herself from unwarranted accusations took precedence over the needs of the child.

Conclusion and Implications

It is clear from this study and other ITE research that the student-teacher–associate-teacher relationship is the most influential in the practicum environment (Allen & Peach, 2007; Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Ferrier-Kerr, 2009; Ralph, 2003). The current study has shown that a common type of dilemma for student teachers is whether to follow their own pedagogical principles or those of their associate teachers. Given the predominance of this dilemma for students, it will be important for associate teachers to give space for students to not only observe strategies to manage the classroom but also opportunities to reflect and learn from their own autonomous pedagogical decisions. Ferrier-Kerr (2009) suggests that associate teachers could assist their student teachers to become reflective practitioners by being open to explicitly re-examining their own beliefs and values about learning and teaching.

The current study also demonstrates the importance of developing a moral vocabulary for dealing with ethical decision making in ITE, a time where the foundations for what counts as ethical practice are formed for future teachers. Some of the findings reported above illustrate the unique, culturally bound dilemmas experienced by student teachers in the setting of New Zealand primary classrooms. It is important that initial teacher educators build time for ethical reflection on the issues that face preservice teachers in the practicum environment. While some of the categories of dilemmas reported above may have connections to a universal student-teacher experience of the practicum placement, I would argue it is vital that local ethical tensions are explored in further research. Such research can build on the increasingly rich and layered understanding of what it means to be an ethical professional in diverse sociocultural contexts.

While in this small study I have found that the type of ethical dilemmas teachers and student teachers experience depends on the cultural context of their work, there do seem to be some core dilemmas that occurred both for teachers in the Shapira-Lishchinsky (2011) study and the students in the current research. However, what I have found most interesting in analysing the types of ethical dilemmas experienced by secondary school teachers in Israel and primary school student teachers in New Zealand is not so much the categorising of dilemmas but rather why these dilemmas emerged for participants and how they dealt with them. In answering these why and how questions we get much closer to understanding how the uniqueness of the sociocultural context of teachers' work impacts on teachers' ethical decision making.

My empirical study into the types of ethical dilemmas experienced by student teachers on practicum gave me some tentative understandings on the process of ethical decision making for preservice teachers. These understandings have subsequently informed how I prepare student teachers for practicum as well as my professional development work with associate teachers. With a literature review on the ethical nature of teaching complete, and a small-scale empirical study on the ethical dilemmas of student teachers now informing my university teaching practice, I felt more and more like a fair dinkum educational ethicist. However, to truly stake my claim as an educational ethicist I needed to get involved in the policy context of the ethics of teaching in Aotearoa New Zealand. It is to the political context of teacher professionalism and professional ethics in New Zealand that I now turn my attention.

Chapter Four

Engaging in Debates on Professional Ethics in Teaching: A New Zealand Tale

Introduction

This chapter is a record of my engagement, as an educational ethicist, in policy discussions around professionalism and the ethics of teaching in New Zealand over a significant period of change. Firstly, I give a brief overview of recent changes to the professional body for New Zealand teachers and to the professional code this body oversees. I present my submission to the Education Council of Aotearoa New Zealand, Matatū Aotearoa (EDCANZ) on the 2017 *Draft Code of Professional Responsibility and Standards for the Teaching Profession* (DCoPRS; EDCANZ, 2017a), where I voice concerns at the move away from a high-trust, aspirational code to a low-trust, behaviourally prescriptive code. Next, I use an opinion piece submitted to the education news website, Education Central, to express my concerns about how the gazetted 2017 *Code of Professional Responsibility and Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CoPRS; EDCANZ, 2017b) has the potential to be perceived as restrictive to teachers' freedom of speech. I call for teachers to resist such a passive interpretation of the code and instead be active participants in defining how the CoPRS can empower professional agency and independence of mind. Finally, I close with a letter to the Minister of Education on the 2018 *Education (Teaching Council of Aotearoa) Amendment Bill* in which I call for a return to a high-trust, reprofessionalising code of ethics for New Zealand teachers

Overview of Professional Ethics in Teaching in New Zealand (2013–2018)

The professionalism of teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand has come under intense scrutiny over the 6 years I have spent engaged in my doctorate. The fact that the name of the overseeing national body for teachers has changed three times over the course of my study is testament to the political volatility regarding the professional status of teaching. The centrality of professional ethics is also reflected in the political discourse of teachers' work in New Zealand over recent years. In 2013, when I started my doctorate, the professional body for teachers was known as the New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC), and the professional code was the aspirational and principle-based 2004 *Code of Ethics for Registered Teachers* (CoE). While the CoE may have held ethical sway over teaching in New Zealand in 2013, change was in the air. A 2012 ministerial-directed review of the NZTC had already recommended a more rigorous, behaviourally directive "code of conduct" replace the existing principle-based, aspirational CoE

(NZTC, 2012). Recommendations from the 2012 review ensured that, in July 2017, the NZTC became the ECANZ. While the name change may have seemed insignificant, the shift in democratic structure was profound. Whereas the NZTC had designated council members directly elected by the profession, the ECANZ council members were all ministerial appointees (O'Neill, 2016). The CoE was consigned to the status of historical artefact and was replaced with the CoPRS (ECANZ, 2017b), complete with a lengthy companion publication of examples of good and bad teacher behaviours (ECANZ, 2017c). At the time of writing, October 2018, the national teaching body has changed names once again to the Teaching Council of Aotearoa New Zealand. While the last 6 years of change have left the beltway branding agencies of Wellington a little more prosperous, many of my teaching colleagues have spoken of feeling increasingly isolated from, and indifferent towards, their professional body. As an ever-aspiring educational ethicist, I felt it important to rise above the understandable change fatigue of my colleagues and engage in the policy debates surrounding teacher professionalism in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Why the Shift from a Code of Ethics to a Code of Professional Responsibility?

The 2017 change from the NZTC to ECANZ reflected a distinct lack of trust in teachers to effectively oversee their own profession. The National-led government of the time had tasked the new ministerially appointed council to replace the CoE with a code of conduct. The rationale for this change is made clear in a 2013 cabinet briefing paper prepared for the minister of education, where the CoE is criticised for lacking sufficient punitive power to bring poor teachers to account (Office of the Minister of Education, 2013, cited in O'Neill, 2016). A prescriptive, behaviourally oriented code of conduct was a direct way the government, through the ministerially appointed council, could gain further control over teachers' work. While the minister would argue the new council would be completely independent, the lack of direct representation from the profession meant the real power lay with the minister. A clear message was sent to both the profession and the public; teachers could not be trusted to govern their own profession. In the 2015 Education Amendment Act it was decreed a new code for teachers would be established by July 2017. A task force had hurriedly developed a draft of the new code. Sensitive to the punitive connotations that the term *code of conduct* had for teachers, the new code was to be named a "code of professional responsibility." A 3-month consultation period ensued followed by the publication of the ECANZ (2017a) DCoPRS. What follows is my submission on the draft.

Submission on the Education Council New Zealand Draft Code of Professional Responsibility

Dear colleague

In my work as an initial teacher educator I have been responsible for introducing student teachers to the Education Council New Zealand (ECANZ; 2004), formerly the New Zealand Teachers Council (NZTC), *Code of Ethics for Registered Teachers* (CoE). I have designed courses to ensure student teachers can attest to the NZTC (2007) Graduating Teaching Standards specifically related to the CoE. Those being:

7(a) uphold the Education Council New Zealand Code of Ethics/Nga Tikanga Matatika.

7(b) have knowledge and understanding of the ethical, professional and legal responsibilities of teachers.

My work with the code has involved designing learning experiences and assessment tasks that engage student teachers in thinking deeply about their ethical responsibilities as educators. My teaching in this area has led me to carry out research into the types of ethical dilemmas commonly experienced by student teachers in the practicum environment and to read widely in the area of the moral and ethical nature of teaching.

I have backgrounded my experience working with the CoE as these experiences are an influential reference point for how I have analysed the *Draft Code of Professional Responsibility and Standards for the Teaching Profession* (DCoPRS) and subsequently framed my feedback.

The Education Act 1989 empowered the NZTC to develop a CoE. This Code was to apply to all registered teachers and, after a period of lengthy consultation with the teaching profession, the NZTC published the CoE in 2004 (O'Neill, 2016). In March 2017, the chief executive officer of ECANZ, Dr Graham Stoop, requested feedback on the new DCoPRS that is to replace the CoE. While the DCoPRS maintained the former commitments of its predecessor, the principles of the old code were gone. In his introduction to the DCoPRS, Dr Stoop states that as the code is close to 15 years old there is an obvious need for updating. In this submission, I question whether the age of the code is sufficient rationale for redevelopment. I consider how the principles arrived at through lengthy consultation in the 1990s and early 2000s have been so easily discarded. I analyse what the absence of the CoE principles of autonomy and truth could mean for the nature of teachers' work, the public perception of teaching as a profession, and the way that children and young people are positioned in society. I conclude with some recommendations that should be taken into account when developing the final version of the new code.

The principle of autonomy is essentially about the development of agency in children and young people. It requires teachers to empower their students to become self-determining and develop rational independence. The image of the child or young person implicit within this principle of the CoE is one of power and capability. The image of the teacher is that of a person who is committed to the empowerment of others (NZTC, 2004). On reviewing the DCoPRS, there is little evidence of this agenda of agency and empowerment. Rather children and young people are cast as innocents in need of protection. Principle 2.1 of the draft code states that teachers will work in the best interests of learners by “promoting their wellbeing and protecting them from harm” (ECANZ, 2017a, p. 11). The idea of the teacher as protector of the vulnerable child feeds into current discourses around child protection. The code continues this discourse by portraying teachers as people who could potentially perpetrate harm on children. In the DCoPRS guidance notes on examples of behaviour that would be in breach of expectations, teachers are portrayed as potential drug dealers, sexual deviants, racists, sexists, homophobes, pornography distributors and violent offenders. The positioning of teachers as potential agents of harm seems to undermine the key aim of the DCoPRS to “honour teaching as a profession of high trust” (ECANZ, 2017a, p. 8). I contend that the negative view of teaching promulgated in the DCoPRS is more likely to harm the status of the profession than enhance it. Furthermore, the positioning of children as innocents in need of protection denies children the capability to act and determine action for themselves as autonomous human beings (Woodrow, 1999).

The principle of truth positions teachers as knowledge seekers committed to the pursuit of truth in a complex and diverse world. The CoE requires teachers to show independence of mind when deciding upon actions that would best lead to the discovery and continued pursuit of truth. The implicit view of the teacher in this principle is that of a critical thinker capable of demonstrating rational independence when considering actions in relation to their commitment to the profession, learners, whānau and society (NZTC, 2004). An analysis of the DCoPRS reveals a more technocratic view of the truthful teacher.

In analysing the DCoPRS for statements with explicit or implied reference to notions of truth or honesty, I was able to compile the following list of positive examples of teacher behaviour towards children, parents, the profession and society that would honour the code:

- treating personal information about children as confidential and using it only for proper purposes with care (p. 21).
- upholding principles of integrity, transparency, reliability and honesty when assessing the progress or performance of learners (p. 27).

- being open and honest (p. 29).
- obeying the law (p. 35).
- using professional resources carefully and only for their intended purposes (p. 35).
- performing professional duties in accordance with the law and standard procedures (p. 35).
- disclosing and managing any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest (p. 35).

On the other hand, I was able to compile the following list of negative examples of teacher behaviour towards children, parents, the profession and society that would be in breach of the code:

- deliberately withholding information about children's rights (p. 22).
- taking, publishing or sharing images or recordings of them without required consent or when not authorised to do so (p. 22).
- accessing or using their information, contact details or other records inappropriately without a valid context (p. 22).
- using bias when assessing the progress and performance of learners (p. 27).
- disclosing personal information about them in public or on social media (p. 30).
- deliberately withholding or giving false information about children's learning or wellbeing (unless this is deemed to be in the best interests of the learner) (p. 30).
- breaking the law or displaying a pattern of behaviour which suggests disregard for the law (p. 35).
- having a perceived or actual conflict of interest which has not been disclosed or properly managed (p. 35).
- misusing the position for personal gain (p. 35).
- plagiarism or falsifying assessments of a learner's work (p. 35).
- using professional resources inappropriately or for personal gain (p. 35).
- using information and communication technology inappropriately, illegally or irresponsibly (p. 35).

- deliberately misleading or withholding information about their qualifications, experience and skills (p. 35).
- deliberately misleading or withholding information which may impact on their suitability or fitness to teach or hold a practising certificate (p. 35).
- failing to inform relevant authorities after being charged with, or found guilty of, a criminal offence; been dismissed or suspended from work; or having resigned for reasons relating to competence or conduct (p. 35).

There is a fundamental shift in how the truthful teacher is constructed in the CoE and in the DCoPRS. Whereas, in the CoE, teachers are seen to be professionals engaged in the quest for truth, in the draft code they are portrayed as administrators engaged in the accurate transfer and management of information. The majority of guidance statements indicate the teacher's role to be truthful when gathering, storing, using and sharing information.

While the construction of the truthful teacher as a professional who manages information in an honest way is in no way a bad thing, the erosion of their role as an independent decision maker is concerning. This is particularly the case when the increased emphasis of the DCoPRS on what teachers do in their private lives is taken into consideration. I provide a brief case study to demonstrate how the two codes could be used to assess the ethics of a teacher's actions in very different ways

Case study.

The year is 1981. I am a pupil at a large Auckland coeducational college. One cold July morning I arrive at school to find a stream of excited teenagers heading around the back of two adjoining prefabricated classrooms. I follow the flock. The reason for the gathering becomes immediately clear. "Webber is a Wanker" adorns the white fibro walls in 6-foot-high red graffiti spray-paint font. Mr Webber (pseudonym) is my science teacher, known for his short temper, but this does not explain the extremity of the vandalism. There is conjecture among the excited throng as to the perpetrator and motive. The speculation is swiftly brought to a halt when a large lock from the 1st XV hoists the front page of the New Zealand Herald aloft. There in black and white is a close-up photo of an enraged Mr Webber tearing at the perimeter fence of Auckland Airport. On the other side of the fence, the visiting South African rugby team disembark their plane ready to begin their first tour of New Zealand since 1965.

Mr Webber did not turn up to school on that cold July day. There were rumours he was among the numerous protestors arrested the day the 1981 Springboks arrived.

Some 36 years later, Mr Webber would be viewed by many as a social justice warrior. I would go as far as to suggest, in protesting against the South African government's racist segregation policy of apartheid, Mr Webber embodied the principle of truth in the CoE. He was committed to the quest of truth by drawing attention to the racism that the 1981 tour supported and implicitly perpetuated. He showed independence of mind in deciding to use his democratic right to protest to shine a critical light on this truth. Furthermore, I would suggest he was upholding the principle of "responsible care" (NZTC, 2004) by actively promoting the human rights of those oppressed under the apartheid regime.

In applying the DCoPRS to the case study described above, an altogether different assessment of Mr Webber's actions can be arrived at. Firstly, his actions are in direct breach of the commitment to society to behave lawfully and demonstrate "high standards of integrity" (ECANZ, 2017a, p. 12). In breaking the law in his protest actions, he is clearly in breach. Furthermore, it could be argued he also breached his commitment to the teaching profession by his failure to "understand that [his] behaviour, whether... in a professional or private capacity [as anti-apartheid protestor], can affect others' confidence in the profession" (ECANZ, 2017a, p. 10). I would argue that in 1981 the majority of pupils and parents at my relatively socially conservative high school would have viewed the image of a protesting Mr Webber with a degree of antipathy and derision. While parents would have been shocked at the act of vandalism directed at the protesting science teacher, I would argue many would have agreed with the sentiment and openly questioned Mr Webber's suitability to teach.

When Mr Webber woke up on that cold July morning back in 1981, he made a decision. The decision had consequences for him personally, the students he taught, and the nation as a whole. If he had at his disposal the CoE to guide his decision making, I would argue the principles of truth and responsible care would have strengthened his resolve to engage in the anti-tour protest. Alternatively, if he had the opportunity to draw upon the DCoPRS to guide his decision making, I would suggest he would never have participated in a protest movement that so fundamentally changed the social fabric of Aotearoa. There is nothing in the draft code to promote the independence of mind and action that Mr Webber demonstrated; rather there is a pervasive threat that your private actions are never private if you are a teacher.

Direction given to teachers in using the Code of Ethics and the Draft Code of Professional Responsibility and Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Both codes give teachers a brief preamble as to the purpose of the code and how the code should be used. It is in these brief descriptions that the shift in how teachers' work is constructed between the two documents is most starkly illustrated. The notion of the teacher as a trusted

“ethical decision maker” characterises the current CoE, where teachers are given freedom to interpret how the code may be applied in the light of different circumstances. Furthermore, teachers are advised that, given the complex nature of their work, there may not be one correct solution to dilemmas they may encounter, and the ethical principles need to be referred to in the decision-making process (NZTC, 2004). In the introduction to the DCoPRS, this view of teaching, as a complex activity that requires thoughtful interpretation of circumstance and context, is replaced with the idea of teaching as compliance. Teachers are assured there are “right decisions” and that these decisions need to be made “every day.” The code should be the basis of this decision making and failure to “comply” would lead to “the Code being used as a guide to assess professional conduct” (ECANZ, 2017a, p. 22).

In positioning the teacher as compliant, I would argue the DCoPRS is in fact a code of conduct. Campbell (2003) identifies that the most obvious function of a code of conduct is to provide a mechanism for public accountability and internal discipline. The DCoPRS is a clear attempt by ECANZ to increase their control of teachers’ work. In her work on codes of ethics in Australian education, Daniella Forster (2012) observes how, when codes are regulatory in intent, teachers tend to lose their motivation as genuine moral agents and defer decision making to superiors. However, if codes are educative, teachers are more likely to gain confidence as decision-making professionals. I am concerned that in replacing the aspirational and educational tenets of the CoE with the regulatory and procedural requirements of the DCoPRS, teachers will lose their motivation to be genuine moral agents and simply defer to authority, whatever the ethical consequences.

Recommendations.

Having expressed my concerns about the way the DCoPRS frames the nature of teachers’ work and constructs particular images of children and young people, I recommend a more principled approach to the final code.

Recommendation 1: The new code should be a standalone document separate from professional standards. The new code should continue to embody the fundamental principles of justice, autonomy, responsible care and truth. These principles should guide the complex act of teacher decision making.

Recommendation 2: In continuing with a principled approach to professional ethics, more attention and funding needs to be put into assisting teachers to deal with the tensions that occur between and within these principles. The CoE guide to making ethical decisions states that:

Resolving the competing claims of different ethical principles and different interest groups is usually best achieved through reflective professional discussion where the interests of learners are regarded as being of prime concern. The process requires practice and is worthy of inclusion in both the pre-service education of teachers and their continuing professional development. (NZTC, 2004)

I would argue the commitment and resources directed at supporting teachers to understand the ethical nature of their work have been remiss. A principled approach to ethics requires opportunities for teachers to share their ethical dilemmas and the tensions they are experiencing in their work. Such conversations should be guided by principles in the context of the real work of teachers. In my view, leadership and funding are required to ensure these conversations are a regular part of ongoing professional development. In suggesting a collaborative approach to professional ethics, I reject the individualistic view of ethics inherent in the DCoPRS where individual teachers are expected to base their ethical decision making on the 23 pages of “dos and don’ts” provided in the “Code Guidance” section.

Conclusion.

The claim that the *Code of Ethics* needs to be replaced with a code of professional responsibility, as the former is past its use by date, is disingenuous. The principles of autonomy, justice, truth and responsible care, which were foundational to the CoE, were arrived at after thousands of years of philosophical thought, and not at the whim of some Wellington bureaucrat. To suggest such principles are no longer relevant to the professional work of teachers either demonstrates a disturbing lack of ethical insight from our professional leaders, or a desire to curb the ethical autonomy of teachers. In my opinion, the DCoPRS is the direct result of a neoliberal government acting to assert their control over teachers’ work through a prescriptive code of conduct. The use of the term *code of professional responsibility* is misleading. The draft document is clearly a response to government-influenced calls for a “code of conduct to be drawn up and promulgated as an essential guide to what constitutes acceptable and appropriate behaviour in the New Zealand teaching profession and to link breaches of the code to clear disciplinary actions” (NZTC, 2012, p. 47). This is further reinforced in the DCoPRS which states the “Code can be used as a framework to assess professional conduct” (ECANZ, 2017a, p. 9). If ECANZ is to ignore the calls I have made here to retain a principled approach to ethics in their redevelopment of the code then they should at least be bold enough to call a spade a spade.

Yours sincerely

Paul Heyward

An Unexpected Invitation

Not long after the gazetting of *Our Code, Our Standards. A Code of Professional Responsibility and Standards for the Teaching Profession* (ECANZ, 2017b), I received an invitation to be interviewed for the quarterly teacher union magazine, *Education Aotearoa*. Journalist Kate Drury was interested in my views on how the new code impacted on teachers' rights to speak out on controversial issues (Drury, 2017). As a budding educational ethicist, I was excited by this invitation.

I was aware that the issue of teachers speaking out on controversial issues was quite a “controversial” issue for educational ethicists. For Ivan Snook (2003), there are just reasons why teachers should speak out if, in doing so, they are assisting their students' development of rational autonomy. Snook (2003) argues that more than any other group in society, “teachers have an obligation to respect and foster the self-development of the child...therefore, they have a right to encourage that self-development in the face of parents or community which would prevent it” (p. 62). Snook suggests that, in speaking out on issues that undermine the autonomy of children, teachers are fulfilling their roles as ethical professionals. In the case of Mr Webber, it could be argued that by speaking out against an apartheid regime, with its inherent creed of white supremacy, he was protecting his students, particularly his non-European students, from a doctrine that had the insidious potential of eroding student confidence, agency and autonomy. Elizabeth Campbell (2003) is far more reticent in sanctioning teachers who promote their personal views on controversial issues. While Campbell acknowledges that teachers “may” deal with controversial issues in a cautious, balanced and reasoned way, she warns against the deliberate expression of personal views if it is for the purposes of “biasing students on matters that have in no way been decided publicly, historically, intellectually, philosophically, empirically, or morally” (p. 79). In 1981, there was certainly no public accord on New Zealand's ongoing sporting ties with apartheid-controlled South Africa. The country was divided. There were those who were anti-tour for obvious ethical reasons; then there were those who were pro-tour, as they believed that politics has no place in sports. From Campbell's perspective, it is possible to conclude that Mr Webber's actions were unethical. Through his private protest action, he ended up publicly expressing his beliefs on a highly divisive issue. While Mr Webber conducted his protest as a private citizen, the moment his actions were captured by a press photographer his roles as both private citizen and influential teacher began to blur.

With the wise, if contradictory, words of both Ivan Snook and Elizabeth Campbell pervading my thoughts, I sat down for the interview. Two months later, when I read the published article, I was relieved to see I had made some reasonably cogent points. I also recognised my tendency to go

off on tangents that never quite return to the point of origin. However, the article did garner some attention and, in late 2017, the faculty communications and marketing manager asked me to develop my ideas about the rights of free speech for teachers into an opinion piece for the Education Central news website. The opinion piece reads as follows.

Opinion: Paul Heyward – Get Up, Stand Up

The new code is entitled *Our Code, Our Standards*. Paul Heyward discusses the new code and how it can be used to empower teachers to speak out on issues of educational and social importance.

Published by Education Central November 13, 2017

*The year is 1981. I am a pupil at a large urban coeducational college. One cold July morning I arrive at school to find a stream of excited teenagers heading around the back of two adjoining prefabricated classrooms. I follow the flock. The reason for the gathering becomes immediately clear. "Webber is a *****" adorns the white fibro walls in 6-foot-high red graffiti spray-paint font. There is conjecture among the excited throng as to the perpetuator and motive. The speculation is swiftly brought to a halt when a large lock from the first XV hoists the front page of the New Zealand Herald aloft. There in black and white is a close-up photo of an enraged Mr Webber tearing at the perimeter fence of Auckland Airport. On the other side of the fence, the visiting South African rugby team disembark their plane ready to begin their first tour of New Zealand since 1965.*

For many, the notion of a teacher speaking out on a controversial issue such as the Springbok tour is unethical and unprofessional. The teacher should be impartial on such issues and, rather than promote their own position, especially publicly, they should cultivate rational debate on issues among their students. For others, the decision to speak out on controversial issues, particularly those impacting on their students, is fundamental to being an ethical professional.

The recent replacement of the *Code of Ethics for Registered Teachers* with the new *Code of Professional Responsibility* by the Education Council of Aotearoa New Zealand has highlighted these different ideas on the ethics of teachers speaking out on controversial issues. The former *Code of Ethics* outlined the four ethical principles of justice, autonomy, responsible care and truth that teachers need to consider when making ethical decisions. The principle of justice reminded teachers that they should strive for equitable outcomes for disadvantaged groups, while the principle of justice encouraged teachers to show independence of mind and action when that is required. I suggest that these principles could have been used to justify Mr

Webber's historical decision to speak out on the Springbok tour; however, I have some doubts whether the current *Code of Professional Responsibility* would offer such ethical guidance.

The current *Code of Professional Responsibility* no longer retains the key principles mentioned above; rather, the code now has a focus on four fundamental commitments to the teaching profession, learners, families and whānau and society. Examples of acceptable behaviour and unacceptable behaviour are provided against each of the commitments. One such example of acceptable behaviour is that teachers take care that their actions outside of work do not affect the integrity or standing of the teaching profession. I have no doubt that back in 1981 there were some teachers, parents and students who viewed Mr Webber's actions as unbecoming of a teacher and as such the new code could potentially have been used to censure his actions.

In losing the principles of the old code, it could be argued teachers have lost some protection to speak out on controversial issues. However, I am reminded of educational ethicist Elizabeth Campbell's call for teachers not to rely on others to define their professionalism but rather to exercise moral responsibility in defining what it means to be an ethical professional. There is much in the new code that could promote teachers to speak out on educational issues. An example of a professional behaviour that upholds a commitment to the profession is "leading and engaging in professional conversations about ethical conduct," something I have endeavoured to do in this opinion piece.

The new code is entitled *Our Code, Our Standards*. Let's make it "our" code by using it to empower teachers to speak out on issues of educational and social importance. I suggest we start by challenging whether a professional organisation that purportedly champions teachers can truly represent teachers when the profession has no say over who sits on its governing council.

Taking It to the Top: Letter to the Right Honourable Chris Hipkins, Minister of Education

Life in 2018 started under a new Labour-led government and an early piece of legislation on their agenda was the Education (Teaching Council of Aotearoa) Amendment Bill. I was delighted to see the Bill intended to reinstate democratically elected teacher representatives to the council. Maybe the minister of education read Education Central. I decided to drop him a line.

Kia ora Chris

Congratulations on a great start to 2018. It is pleasing to know we have a Labour-led government who is committed to raising the status of teachers and returning to a high-trust

relationship with the profession. In proposing to restore direct teacher representation on our professional body, your government are sending a strong message to the public about the high regard you have for our profession. I have conveyed these thoughts on the Education (Teaching Council of Aotearoa) Amendment Bill in a submission to the Education and Workforce Select Committee.

As I was writing my submission, I took care to ensure my points related to specific clauses in the Bill. However, there is one area the current amendment Bill does not address that I think needs serious consideration, and that is Section 387 of the Education Amendment Act 2015. This section of the Act consigned the *Code of Ethics for Registered Teachers* to history and allowed for the establishment of a code of conduct. While the Education Council have called the new code the *Code of Professional Responsibility* it is nevertheless defined by the 2015 legislation as a code of conduct, and that is exactly what it is.

A review of the literature reveals a professional code of ethics for teachers tends to be aspirational and educational in tone, identifying the broad professional beliefs that teachers should consider in their daily professional relationships with stakeholders. A code of conduct, on the other hand, emphasises the specific behaviours expected of teachers. The notion that a code of conduct can be used to enforce acceptable behaviours through the punishment of unacceptable behaviour seems to be a key distinguishing feature between a code of ethics and a code of conduct.

The last National-led government clearly moved away from the educative high-trust code of ethics towards a punitive low-trust code of conduct in drafting and then enacting the 2015 Education Amendment Act. I believe if the current government are fully committed to returning to a high-trust relationship with teachers they would repeal Section 387 in favour of the development of a revised educative and aspirational professional code.

In reading through the 2012 *Review of the New Zealand Teachers Council: A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century. Report to Hon Hekia Parata, Minister of Education* (NZTC, 2012), it is clear the Review Committee were committed to a more punitive code of conduct from the outset. They infer that the lack of a code of conduct was a possible reason why “relatively few serious matters progress immediately to the Disciplinary Tribunal” (p. 47). Given the minister also directed the review team to take into account recommendations of the Ministerial Inquiry into the Employment of a Convicted Sex Offender, it becomes clear this report is about giving the council teeth to deal to issues of misconduct and nothing to do with developing within, the teaching profession, a shared understanding of the ethics of teaching. The

NZTC Report makes reference to the government's vision "of a more flexible, skilled and culturally intelligent professional education workforce" (p. 19). I would argue that a culturally intelligent workforce would be far more likely to emerge from a profession where the ethics of teaching is lived, breathed and contested in relation to a principled code of ethics than from a workforce who are treated as potential liabilities controlled by a code of conduct.

The current *Code of Professional Responsibility* has moved away from the high trust afforded in the *Code of Ethics*. Where the *Code of Ethics* challenged teachers to uphold the principle of autonomy (te whanonga mana motuhake) "and act to empower others to claim their rights by helping them to be self-determining within the limits of social responsibility" the code of conduct (or *Professional Responsibility*) warns teachers to avoid "making derogatory comments about the heritage, language, age, gender, identity or culture of a colleague." The patronising tone of the new code casts teachers as potential transgressors of ethical norms instead of trusted professionals with an ethical responsibility to their profession and society.

The original *Code of Ethics for Registered Teachers* was enabled by the 1989 Education Act. It took 16 years of debate and consultation within the profession before the code was eventually published in 2005. In 2017, teachers were given 6 weeks to consult on the *Draft Code of Professional Responsibility and Standards for the Teaching Profession*. I believe the thoughtful development of the original code was driven by the question: What does it mean to be an ethical teacher in Aotearoa, New Zealand? My hunch is that the hasty assembly of the latest code was driven by the question: How do we ensure the Minister of Education is never again embarrassed by a rogue teacher?

The current code conflates the aspirational intent of autonomous ethical decision making with the constraints of acceptable conduct, and in doing so does a disservice to the profession of teaching. A repeal of Section 387 of the Education Amendment Act 2015 and the development of a new code of ethics would empower the profession to intellectualise, debate and live the ethics of teaching rather than submit to a professional life of unreflective compliance.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Ngā mihi nui

Paul

Conclusion

I have yet to hear back from the minister but can report the *Code of Professional Responsibility and Standards for the Teaching Profession* introduced under the last National-led government is still very much in place at the time of writing (September, 2019). My engagement in policy debates around teacher professionalism and the ethics of teaching in New Zealand has strengthened my resolve as an educational ethicist. While I may not have achieved my desired end of ensuring a principled approach to the newly developed code, the arguments I have made are now part of the public debate on the ethical nature of teaching. Reviewing my Chapter 4 responses to the new codes, and the arguments I assembled in the Chapter 2 literature review, I believe my most persuasive writing occurs when I draw on my own lived experiences such as the Motatapu Island school camp or Mr Webber and the 1981 Springbok tour. My discovery of how autoethnographic methodology has the potential to be both emotionally engaging and critically analytical powers the remainder of this thesis. The turn has been made...we're about to go about...mind the boom.

Part Two

Chapter Five

The Love Affair: A Methodological Turn

Introduction

My methodology chapter continues a significant turn away from the empirical approach, which made a cameo appearance in my ethical dilemma study of Chapter 3, towards the more autobiographical form of writing that featured occasionally in Chapters 2 and 4. In assisting the reader to understand my shift to autoethnography, I have drawn on an extended metaphor of my romantic relationship with my wife, Stephanie, to provide insights into this methodological turn. Each part begins with a reflection my life with Stephanie, before moving into an increasingly in-depth exploration of the methodology of autoethnography. In section 1, I fall in love with autoethnography and embark on a complete deconstruction and reconstruction of what it means to be a researcher, in much the same way falling for Stephanie required me to re-evaluate what being in a relationship meant for me as a young man. I have used the recent renovation of my neighbour's house as an additional metaphorical device to assist me in unpacking and reconstituting my relationship with research. In section 2, I explore how my extended courtship with autoethnography reveals unforeseen sophisticated and critical dimensions to our relationship. Section 3 deals with the tensions and complexity of my long-term relationship with autoethnography. Section 4 concludes with how my relationship with autoethnography has reinvigorated my friendship with John Smyth and his model of critical reflection so that I can successfully explore the question *how does a university teacher experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching?*

Section 1. An Introduction of Sorts: How I Met Autoethnography

I am 18 years old. I wind the Mazda 808 down the steep cul-de-sac. It is a hot, late-summer afternoon and I hear the tyre tread crackling through sticky Auckland asphalt. My friend Steven is waiting by his front gate. The moment I pull to a halt Steven leaps into the passenger seat. He jumps out again just as quickly. The black vinyl of the 808's bucket seats has been grilling in the sun all day. While Steven's high-cut Canterbury rugby shorts do show off his quads, they offer little protection from the scorching plastic. After the scream of indignation stops echoing around the suburban valley, I reach into the rear foot-well and retrieve a crumpled beach towel. Steven's legs now protected; we head to the beach. Steven clicks open a cassette cover, slides the tape into the Alpine car stereo, and "Small Town Boy" by Bronski Beat streams out of the Mazda's open windows as we head west.

"Pushed around and kicked around, always a lonely boy," we sing with fervent teenage enthusiasm, before catching each other's eye, then dissolving into laughter.

"Choice tape. When did you buy that?"

"Borrowed it off my friend Stephanie. The one who is at training college with you."

"Stephanie?"

"You know, you went to her birthday with me a few months back?"

"Nah, don't know her mate. Remember I had to work that night, so you went with Lee instead."

"Oh yeah. That's right. You'd like her. She's cool. She was in the A stream at my school last year and is super smart. Oh yeah and she is a spunk too. I reckon you should her ask her out. I can see you as a couple."

"Maybe." I reply doubtfully. Stephanie sounds out of my league.

I am 19 years old. I sit on the campus lawn in the warm March sun eating hot chips from the training college café. A tall, beautiful girl approaches.

"Are you Paul?"

"Yes I am." I gulp, swallowing a hot chip whole. I feeling a sliding burning sensation through the length of my oesophagus.

"Hi I am Stephanie. You're friends with Steven, right?"

"Yeah that's right." I exhale doing my best to disguise my digestive distress.

"Cool. Do you have my Bronski Beat tape? Steven said he lent it to you."

"Ummm, oh yeah, but it's at home."

"Could you bring it in tomorrow? I can meet you here at lunch?"

"Sure."

"Cool, see ya."

Stephanie turns and drifts away just as seductively as she arrived.

I am in love. I will go on to marry Steph and we will have three beautiful boys. But that is another story. This story is about me and autoethnography.

My association with autoethnography, or AE as her friends like to call her, started in a similar way to my relationship to my soulmate Steph. For the first year or so I knew of her by distant reputation. Mutual friends had assured me I would like her and I should make the effort to get to know her. I was unsure. Did I have the writing chops for such a creative and seductive methodology?

I am 46 years old. It is 9.00 a.m. on Friday November 14, 2014. Staff and students of the Faculty of Education have been invited to attend the Doctor of Education (EdD) Confirmation Seminars for the 2013 EdD cohort. I stand before an assortment of faculty colleagues and my Ed Doc cohort peers. I offered to present first, but now the nerves are kicking in. I feel my vocal cords contracting. A sip of water and I am underway.

*Tanya Waititi,
bone strong face, brown soft eyes.
Mother/child.
Dad works on the roads.*

Tanya the first, then the boy, another girlenough for a roadworker's wage...then three babies out of the clear blue sky.

I read the poem first and then the story that led to the poem [see introduction]. I immediately pick up an unusual level of engagement from my audience. The feigned interest of nodding heads and empty eye contact that usually accompany my attempts at an academic presentation are strangely absent. Instead, attendees lean forward with what seems like authentic attentiveness. The interest soon wanes as I get into the meat and veg of my presentation: the review of the literature, the gap in the research, the methodology, the data collection methods.

It is 6.00 p.m. on Friday November 14, 2014. The 2013 Ed Doc cohort sit crowded around a wooden bar table at the De Poste Belgian pub in Mt Eden. Although most of us are nursing a drink after a long day of talking about, and listening to, educational research proposals, no one is relaxed. The assessment panel is still meeting. We drink and chat in uncertain limbo. Around 6.30 p.m., the Ed Doc programme leaders arrive with our supervisors in tow. Smiles. Congratulations. Clinking of glasses. We are confirmed doctoral students!

"Shit, you can write, mate!" says my secondary supervisor, Associate Professor Peter O'Connor, before taking a sip of his celebratory pint of Stella.

My main supervisor, Professor Saville Kushner, agrees. "You tell a great story. You need to write your stories of how 'you' experience ethics. Forget about semi-fuck-ing-struc-tured-inter-views with other fuckers. Write your own stories."

"Can I do that? Is that research?"

"Of course it is!" Peter and Saville chorus.

In 2015, I begin my role as Associate Director of the Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Primary) Programme. With my supervisors' advice in mind, I start to keep a narrative diary of responses to the ethical issues I experience as a university teacher and programme leader. I hadn't met autoethnography yet, but I had a sense of her presence. It would take me another 2 years to introduce myself formally.

I am 49 years old. My main supervisor has left the University of Auckland. On a late January morning, I meet with Professor Peter O'Connor and Associate Professor Barbara Grant in a recently vacated office in which my main supervisor had once resided. Friendly greetings are exchanged in an atmosphere of conviviality and postsummer holiday glow. I had called this meeting with Peter and Barbara in the hope of convincing Barbara to come on board my doctoral supervision team as my second supervisor. Peter had graciously agreed to step into the role of main supervisor, but another recruit was required. Barbara had some questions she wanted answering before agreeing to become the fifth supervisor on my long and bumpy quest to get Dr in front of my name.

Question 1: "Why do you want to complete a doctorate?"

Although I had expected this question, and prepared my response, I failed to answer in full candour.

- *"To explore what it is to be an ethical teacher."*
- *"To make a unique contribution to the field of educational ethics."*
- *"To contribute to the research outputs of my faculty."*
- *"To position myself for a possible career with a research trajectory."*
- *"To have a creative outlet through writing."*
- *"To finish something I have put 4 years hard slog into."*

A poetic interlude.

Bullet Point Poem

Here is a summary of my achievements to date

- *Sucked in*
- *By the lure*
- *Of the clean*
- *Linear bullet*
- *Point*
- *That does a disservice*
- *To your intelligence*
- *And negates*
- *Any hope of*
- *Story*

“To be honest, Barbara, the fundamental reason for continuing a journey towards a doctorate is ego. A raw, unrefined EGO that drives me: to be the first person in my immediate and extended whānau to be conferred with the title Dr; to join my colleagues, from the pre-amalgamation Auckland College of Education, who now enjoy the kudos of being an academic doctor at an internationally renowned research-driven university; to prove to my friends and family I did have something ‘to say’ and ‘said it,’ and those weekends, evenings and holidays spent in isolation were worthwhile.”

The pursuit of ego may not be particularly noble but it needs to be acknowledged front and centre.

Question 2: “What is your research question?”

I look quizzically at Peter. Since the successful completion of my Ed Doc portfolio, I have abandoned the notion of a question. My previous main supervisor had suggested that research questions can be cumbersome and detrimental to an authentic and rich research project. “The question should emerge from the research,” Saville intoned somewhat mystically. My lived experience as a programme leader and university teacher was going to be the case study from which my question would arise.

Question 3: “OK then, what theory informs your research?”

“Is interpretivism a theory?” I ask hesitantly.

“Sort of, not really. A bunch of theories I think.” Barbara replies.

“Is autoethnography a theory?” I gamble.

“Sort of, not really? More a methodology that produces modes of research.”

Sort of, not really!! I begin to feel the summer glow receding as trepidation takes hold. The realisation that the foundations of my doctorate are at best shaky and at worst non-existent leaves my mouth dry. There is serious structural work to be done if I have any chance of building a work of intellectual rigour.

The conversation in the room winds down. There is some discussion as to what to do with the cartoon-orange throne of the recently abdicated main supervisor. I am more interested in the potential resuscitation of my stalled study. I cut to the chase.

“So, Barbara, are you willing to come on board?”

A pause. A glance downwards. A nod. A possibility.

Structural integrity.

My neighbour and good friend Rob is renovating his ridgeline residence to take full advantage of the sea and bush views offered by his West Auckland home. The renovations started 2 years ago with the actual decision to renovate, followed by the process of engaging architects and engineers to gain the required consents to begin the project. The physical work is to begin next Saturday.

Rob has expressed his frustration at the time and substantial money taken to achieve something that is purely abstract. There is essentially nothing to see after 2 years and 150k. I reassure him the time and money are both worth it and essential.

“When you have finished you will have a house that not only suits your family’s growing needs but a house that is going nowhere. The foundations are well worth the money and time. No one will admire a marble bench top that’s ended up halfway down a gully because of a night of heavy rain.”

Time to heed my own advice.

While I acknowledge the building metaphor is tired and overused, I do feel it can be of some use to me at this point in my doctoral journey. When I think about the work the architect and structural engineers have conducted on my friend’s house over the last 2 years, their first task was to establish the integrity of the existing foundations. This involved the architect poring over the original plans of the house and evaluating the impact of any alterations made. Meanwhile, the structural engineer tested the strength, density, compaction and sand content of the soil beneath the dwelling to assess their impact on the renovation project. Like the architect and engineer, my

starting point needs to be an inventory of the intellectual foundations that have informed my research career to date. It is only when these fundamentals are established that I can hope to build on them or discard them.

An Inventory of My Intellectual Foundations

Master of Education research project (2004–2006).

My research journey began with my Master of Education. I embarked on my first foray into postgraduate study in July 2000, when my oldest boy, Billy, was 18 months old. Two more boys, Tom and Archie, and 5 years of part-time study later, I secured my Master of Education with First Class Honours. The title of my dissertation was “Reflecting from Multiple Perspectives in Multiple Worlds: Drama as an Approach for Engaging Student Teachers in Critical Reflection.” The study emerged from my interest in assisting children to learn through drama, an interest developed over a decade as a primary school teacher and my new role as a preservice teacher educator encouraging neophyte educators to engage in the act of critical reflection on educational issues, particularly issues of practice.

The question that guided the study was *In what ways do drama approaches assist student teachers in reflecting, from multiple perspectives, on educational issues?* I was interested in how student teachers perceived their engagement in drama assisted their ability to critically reflect on educational issues. My interest in discovering how participants defined their own experience of drama and critical reflection saw my research sited squarely in the interpretivist research paradigm as I attempted to interpret the self-understandings revealed by my participants through interviews and qualitative survey questions (Newman, Ridenour, Newman, & De Marco, 2003). The theories that informed the development of the research design were based on theories of learning through drama and theories of the teacher as a critically reflective change agent. In this way, my research was also influenced by the critical social paradigm as the study was predicated on an assumption that developing the capacity for critical reflection in student teachers is an essential goal of ITE. The research would therefore fit with Moody’s (1992) definition of critical social research as there was a concern with initiating change in the unequal power relations between social groups by critiquing ideology to reveal hidden interests.

Once I had gathered individual perceptions of the participants’ experiences of drama, I drew on a grounded theory-based approach to analyse this data. Through the use of open, axial and selective coding, I was able to develop my own theoretical framework grounded in the qualitative data gathered from my participants (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Doctor of Philosophy (2009–2011).

Following the completion of my master's, I took a break from study and concentrated on being a present father to my young family, publishing from the recently completed thesis, and my teaching. Four seasons as a “dad soccer coach,” and a couple of articles and two book chapters later, the institutional pressure to recommence formal study was building. It was becoming increasingly apparent, if I wanted to be taken seriously as a research-informed university teacher, I would need Dr before my name. So, reluctantly, I enrolled in my PhD and kicked around the ideas of critical reflection and drama in higher education for a couple of despondent years. I was the academic equivalent of a lost soul in Gilmour and Waters's (1975) fish bowl, in “Wish You Were Here,” covering “the same old ground” “year after year” only to find the “same old fears”: the fear I had nothing new to say about drama and critical reflection in higher education. However, my teaching in the area of the ethics of teaching was piquing my scholarly interest.

Doctor of Education confirmation portfolio (2013–2014).

Following my short, and ultimately aborted, attempt at a PhD, I struck out again to achieve doctoral status through the Ed Doc programme. Over 2 years, I developed a research proposal that was confirmed through the presentation of a doctoral portfolio in November 2014. Like my previous master's study, I continued to situate my research within an interpretivist paradigm. The purpose of my proposed study was to evaluate how New Zealand student teachers have made use of the NZTC *Code of Ethics* when dealing with challenging ethical decisions. As with my master's research, I was interested in isolating individual perceptions, in this case perceptions of how a code of ethics had played a part in dealing with challenging ethical decisions.

I suggested that the theory that would inform my study would be symbolic interactionism. For the symbolic interactionist, the best way to explain the social world is by studying the subjective meanings and individual meaning-making of those being observed (Flick, 2006). The meanings individuals attribute to events and objects influence how they act in the social world; these meanings are the product of social interaction rather than external causes (Donmoyer, 2006). From this epistemological stance, humans have no direct access to reality as reality can only be known through the symbolic representations (such as language, film, art) we use in our social interactions with other humans (Denzin, 2001). The symbolic interactionist is less interested in establishing cause and effect in the social world and is more concerned with how people communicate their perceptions of themselves and their world through available social representations. Symbolic interactionism seemed an appropriate theory to inform my research

into how teachers make ethical decisions. There is no way I can observe the thinking process that occurs when people make ethical decisions, but I can record, analyse and interpret how people communicate their perception of the ethical decision-making process through language. My question for my doctoral study would therefore be: *how do student teachers think they resolve ethical dilemmas in their practice, and what place does the New Zealand Teachers Council Code of Ethics play in this process?*

The demolition.

Last weekend, the demolition of my neighbour's basement occurred as renovations on his house got underway. Being a good friend and neighbour, I helped out. The first task was to identify the load-bearing beams and studs. Once established, the joyful smashing of walls, girders, joists, struts and beams began in earnest. Timber flew as sweat poured until the previously partitioned basement became one large space, open to the elements.

The fun part of the job done, we were then left with a large pile of wood and debris to be sorted into firewood or rubbish for the skip. Once the firewood was sorted and cut for burning, it needed to be transported and stacked. I scored the job of transporter and stacker. The reward, a few cold ones and the strange satisfaction of transforming an unwieldy pile of discarded timber into an orderly stack of firewood. As I stacked, I was able to identify different parts of the recently demolished basement. There were the jagged and split panels of what were once internal walls, irregular and difficult to organise. Then there were the more uniform studs and struts with their smooth, milled surfaces that slotted together like an oversized Jenga puzzle.

Deconstructing and Reconstructing a Research Trajectory

Mutch (2013) suggests that the researcher's world view will determine the theories of organisation that the researcher thinks best explain the nature of social relationships between individuals and groups in the social world. When I review the two questions that have guided my master's and pre-conferment doctoral research, both reveal an interpretivist's world view. The questions reject the notion that there is an objective absolute truth that can be known about:

- a) How do drama approaches assist student teachers in reflecting, from multiple perspectives, on educational issues?

And

- b) How do student teachers think they resolve ethical dilemmas in their practice, and what place does the NZTC *Code of Ethics* play in this process?

The theory I attempted to use to explain the social relationships between individuals and groups in the social world, in my master's research, was grounded theory.

The theory I proposed to use to explain the social relationships between individuals and groups in the social world, in my Ed Doc portfolio, was symbolic interactionism.

Having attempted to deconstruct the theoretical foundations of my master's study and Ed Doc portfolio, I am getting some sense of the makeup of the pile of intellectual theories that lie around me.

The questions I now need to consider are:

1. What theories, research paradigms and methodologies that I have used historically will continue to give structural integrity as I construct my new research study?
2. What theories, research paradigms and methodologies have served me well but may not support my new structure?
3. What new theories, research paradigms and methodologies may I now need to incorporate into the foundations of my study to improve structural integrity?

To answer these questions, I first unpick the biographical threads that led to the development of my original Ed Doc question, *how do student teachers think they resolve ethical dilemmas in their practice, and what place does the New Zealand Teachers Council Code of Ethics play in this process?* I then revisit whether or not this is a question worth pursuing given my recent introduction to autoethnography, and writing as a method of inquiry.

As an ITE university teacher, I have retained my fully certificated teacher status with the ECANZ. The ECANZ (previously the New Zealand Teachers Council) published a code of ethics for registered (now known as certificated) teachers in 2005. As an initial teacher educator, I have worked to both introduce student teachers to the *Code of Ethics*, and provide them with opportunities to engage with the principles and commitments of the code. An arts-based pedagogy has informed some of this teaching.

The two primary ITE programmes I have taught across are both approved and monitored by the ECANZ. One of the Graduating Teaching Standards the ECANZ expect students to demonstrate upon completing their qualification is to “uphold the Education Council New Zealand Code of Ethics/Nga Tikanga Matatika.” (ECANZ, 2007, n.p.). There was therefore an institutional requirement that the courses I teach engage students in discussion about the principles and commitments of the ECANZ code of ethics.

Over the decade I have been engaged in working with students on the *Code of Ethics*, I have become increasingly interested in the theories of moral philosophy that inform both the code and how the code is used. While the *Code of Ethics* provided a gateway into my interest in the ethics of teaching, the code is now more peripheral in my thinking about the moral and ethical nature of teaching.

My initial attempt at a PhD, started in 2009 and abandoned in 2013, had a focus on my teaching of the *Code of Ethics* to students (with a particular emphasis on my use of drama as a teaching approach) and the ethical decision making of practising teachers. Following my enrolment in the Ed Doc programme in 2013, my research question became focussed on the ethical decision making of student teachers and the place a code of ethics plays in this decision making.

As discussed earlier, the day of my Ed Doc confirmation seminar proved a turning point in my doctoral journey. It was the day I started to trust in myself as a writer. It was the day I had an inkling I could use writing as a method of inquiry. It was the day I started to look into autoethnography as a legitimate research activity. Fitzpatrick and Mullen (2019) describe writing as a method of inquiry where the researcher utilises visceral and emotional experiences to generate, analyse and present stories. From 2015, I began interrogating the elusive notion of the ethical teacher through writing my own lived experiences of ethical dilemmas and moral quandaries. My narrative diary became a site where I explored the complexity of ethical decision making. I could see myself on the page. A character in a script. A character whose decisions could at times work to reproduce the privilege of dominant discourses, and a character whose decisions could also work to challenge neoliberal institutional norms (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). These stories left stains of blood and tears on the page. Words of fear, pain and hope trailed from left to right and back again. Importantly they were my tears, my blood, my words, my hope.

Ellis (2016) talks of autoethnography being more than a way of knowing about the world, and rather a way of being in the world. Through this way of “being,” the autoethnographer consciously seeks to understand their actions, feelings and motives.

Autoethnography requires that we observe ourselves observing, that we interrogate what we think and believe, and that we challenge assumptions, asking over and over if we have penetrated as many layers of our own defences, fears, and insecurities our project requires. (p. 10)

In reviewing my narrative diary of ethical dilemmas and moral quandaries, I have come to understand that I am indeed an autoethnographer. Through my narratives, I reflexively challenged the assumptions that have informed my ethical decision making and laid bare my human weaknesses and maybe, at times, some human virtues (Anderson & Glass-Coffin, 2016). So, would this turn towards autoethnography help with my research project and enable me to discover how *student teachers think they resolve ethical dilemmas in their practice, and what place does the New Zealand Teachers Council Code of Ethics play in this process?*

A rhetorical question with an obvious answer: No! My research question had been disrupted by my affair with autoethnography. Autoethnography would not be interested in hanging out with me if this was the type of question I was interested in pursuing. If I were to maintain a focus on the ethical decision making of student teachers, I could only deal with their reported accounts of how a code and other factors had impacted on their ethical decision making. I had come to agree with Van Maanen's (2011) observation that "there is no way of seeing, hearing, or representing the world of others that is absolutely, universally valid or correct" (p. 35). The responses to my research questions would always be mediated by the unequal power relationships between the researcher and the researched and would be further exacerbated by the sensitive nature of the ethical dilemmas under scrutiny (the need to be seen by others and ourselves to have moral virtue). I therefore discounted the research question as it focussed on student teachers' ethical decision making. I did not believe the question, as stated, would help me get close enough to the truth of how a teacher experiences the ethics of teaching.

So who is left to research? That would be me! Yes, I am the monster at the end of this book. I only have access to the decision-making processes of one person, and, for better or worse, that is muggins. My participants are those who read and listen to my stories of the ethics of teaching and in doing so juxtapose their own ethical experiences alongside them. My research question changed to, *how does a university teacher experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching?* I used autoethnography as the methodology to explore my own ethical decision making. I wanted to make the murky, awkward, hypocritical and hopeful arena of my experience of educational ethics available for scrutiny and discussion. Pelias (2016) acknowledges the importance of the autoethnographer being true to themselves in their writing. Lockford (2001) discusses how autoethnographic research has an obligation to show the dirt and grime of our lives so we recognise the humanity in ourselves and others. Through my autoethnographic case studies below, I have strived to ensure that what I write is true to the human essence of my lived

experience. Autoethnography has offered me ways of writing and representing the ethics of teaching that were unavailable through more traditional interpretive methodologies.

So, what have I learnt through this methodological deconstruction and reconstruction?

I return to the question posed earlier:

1. What theories, research paradigms and methodologies that have I used historically will continue to give structural integrity as I construct my new research study? *Critical social research has proved a resilient foundation to previous research projects. A keeper.*
2. What theories, research paradigms and methodologies have served me well but may not support my new structure? *While grounded theory served me well in the past it is for the skip, along with symbolic interactionism.*
3. What new theories, research paradigms and methodologies may I now need to consider incorporating into the foundations of my study to improve structural integrity? *The allure of autoethnography is irresistible.*

Section 2 Courtship: Getting to Know Autoethnography

Early 1987: I love Fridays. I especially look forward to the bus ride from Mt Eden Village to the bottom of Queen Street after training college. It is my one chance to be alone with Steph. We meet after class at the bus stop outside the Edmonds bakery, buy a raspberry lamington each, and spend our 15-minute trip eating, chatting and laughing. Steph helped me land a part-time job at Hannahs shoe store in lower Queen Street where we both worked late-night Fridays and Saturday mornings.

Each ride to work is a voyage of discovery. The more I learn about Stephanie, the more I am entranced. We both have the same sense of humour, enjoy the same eclectic range of music. Stephanie is the first person I know who shares my enthusiasm for both ska and progressive 70s rock, a genre blend seen as “weird and wrong” by our more musically puritanical peers.

The Ethics of Teaching and Autoethnographic Possibilities

The more I found out about autoethnography, the more I knew it was the methodology for me, a methodology that would help me discover *how a university teacher experiences and negotiates the ethics of teaching*. My methodological restoration project had demolished any ambitions I had of trying to provide a valid representation of how others viewed the ethics of teaching (Van Maanen, 2015). I now needed a methodology that would liberate me from being a distant spectator of the ethics of teaching and instead position myself as an authentic protagonist (Bray,

2019). Educational ethicists Elizabeth Campbell and Ivan Snook both argue that those interested in the ethics of teaching should attempt to capture their personal experiences. Campbell (2003) discusses the importance of educators and researchers capturing or “freezing” personal ethical incidents for “analysis, reflection and debate” (p. 134). Similarly, Snook (2003) suggests that, in writing about the ethics of teaching, it is important for scholars “to consider the more personal side of teaching and the ethics that go with it” (p. 79). Pelias (2016) argues that autoethnography provides researchers with tools to dig into the personal, discover and display “what was previously hidden and elusive” (p. 387). Autoethnography, with its emphasis on personal writing as a method of inquiry, provided me with the ideal companion to take up the challenge set by Snook and Campbell and explore my previously hidden personal experiences of negotiating the ethics of teaching as a university teacher.

Writing As a Method of Inquiry

Autoethnography emerged from a disillusionment with traditional research methods of doing and writing research where writing is seen as the product of the research process (Ellis & Adams, 2014; Holman Jones, 2016). Social science research, influenced by scientific positivism, is critiqued from a poststructuralist perspective for perpetuating dominant power relationships through presenting the artefacts of language/writing/research as universal truths that privilege the elite while marginalising the dispossessed (Richardson, 2000). Colyar (2016) recognises that autoethnography offers a more holistic view of the research process where writing is both the product of research and, importantly, a “process that supports, or perhaps constitutes, the self and the sociocultural connection” (p. 368). In my methodological turn towards the autoethnographic, I explore, through writing, how my experiences of negotiating the ethics of teaching constitute my identity as a teacher within the sociocultural context of the university. Through writing narrative diaries of my ethical dilemmas, I was at once involved in the production of research artefacts, and the process of inquiring into how a university teacher negotiates the ethics of teaching (Richardson & Pierre, 2005) or, as Tilley-Lubbs (2016) observes, as an autoethnographer I was both participant in the research and author of the study giving significance and meaning to my personal experience through writing.

Fitzpatrick and Mullen (2019) identify how writing as a method of inquiry sits within the qualitative arts-based research paradigm, where researchers are encouraged to explore affective experiences through a range of different writing genres. Through experimenting with different forms of writing, researchers are able to find new methods of analysis and interpretation that “represent complexity and critique hegemonic texts of privileged stories” (p. 74). In writing my narrative diaries, I have utilised prose, letters, poetry and scriptwriting as genres to analyse and

present the perspectives of the powerful and the powerless in my ethical stories. I have attempted to engage emotionally with my stories and my audience through writing evocative text. Pelias (2005) suggests emotionally engaging writing must be more than a mere conduit for scholarly analysis; rather, there must be a relationship between form and content. Researchers need to attend to the craft of writing so that it captures a world of beauty worth savouring, situates the author and reader in this world, leads the reader into disciplinary insights not available through more traditional research, and pays attention to necessary concrete details while avoiding unnecessary abstract verbiage (Pelias, 2005). New Zealand author Paula Morris (2019) also cautions creative non-fiction writers to avoid the traps of symbols and “grand abstractions” and instead pay care, and imaginative attention, to the details of our daily lives through vivid and precise writing. In presenting my diarised accounts of ethical dilemmas, I have worked and reworked narratives to ensure my stories are rich, crisp and evocative. I have attended to the details, the sediment at the bottom of the wine glass, with the aim of capturing both lived and imagined experience.

The reciprocity of form and content in excellent autoethnographic and creative non-fiction writing resonated with my understanding of quality drama education practice. As a drama practitioner and scholar, I had been influenced by Gavin Bolton’s (2003) thinking around the importance of the aesthetic in helping people learn through drama. Responding to theatre purists such as David Hornbrook (1998), who promotes a view of drama education that focusses primarily on the disciplinary aesthetics of the art form, Bolton (2003) argues that for learning to occur through drama, attention needs to be paid to both the aesthetic form and the learning content. Bolton highlights the importance of the drama teacher taking responsibility for the aesthetics of the drama experience, leaving students the ability to focus on the problem to be solved within the content of the drama. While students may not have their attention intentionally directed to the aesthetics of the drama, they will have a subsidiary awareness of the aesthetic dimension so long as their teacher has successfully paid attention to both form and content. Thus, to Bolton, the aesthetic and learning dimensions of drama are not mutually exclusive but rather are sustained by one another within the context of an artistically meaningful experience. As the effective drama teacher must take responsibility for the aesthetics of the learning experience for the student, so the successful autoethnographer must take responsibility for literary form for the reader. In my re-presentation of my narrative diary entries, I have paid close attention to the aesthetic quality of the genres I use, with the hope that this considered approach to form will engage readers in the theoretical insights of my work. The autoethnographic work that has had the greatest impact on my learning is the texts that allow me to move into the multi-

dimensional world of the author through writing of purpose and beauty. The recent work of Peter Bray is a case in point.

Through a deeply moving autoethnographic account of the sudden loss of his wife and two children in a car accident, Peter Bray (2019) provides insights into how writing as a method of inquiry allows him to introduce competing voices to his research, while also positioning himself as the storyteller, researcher, survivor, protagonist and critical audience. Bray describes how writing from differing vantage points allows fragments of experiential data to be revealed to the researcher, contemplated and subsequently integrated into “an outward manifestation of an inner re-alignment” (p. 217). In this way, the creation of the autoethnographic story becomes both a conduit for personal reconnection, and possible social transformation. For Bray, the personal reconnection occurred as the researcher voice of his writing provided confidence to legitimately attend to his feelings openly in a way that had been hitherto been too traumatic. The social transformation occurred as the author shared his deeply intimate story with others through the integration of personal narrative and critical theory. Bray observes how his autoethnographic intersection of critical social theory and personal writing provided a framework through which his audience began making sense of their own experience of grief and loss and in doing so were moved to act on their world in new and different ways.

J. Thomas (1993) observes how this shift towards the “critical” in ethnographic methods allows the researcher, the researched and the research audience to understand the possibility of transcending forces of domination and dehumanisation. “The act of critique implies that by thinking about and acting on the world, we are able to change both our subjective interpretations and objective conditions” (p. 18). Writing as a method of inquiry has enabled me to explore my ethical dilemmas experienced as a university teacher from a range of perspectives. The competing voices of the privileged, the powerless, and the complicit are made available to the reader within the setting of the neoliberal university. In revisiting ethical dilemmas through writing, I have been able to reconnect with feelings of shame, fear, pride and accomplishment that had hitherto remained buried. It is my hope that, in reading my stories, readers will reflect on the ethical nature of their own practice and enable a form of ethical agency in their future decision making.

As the months passed from summer to winter, our conversations on the ride to work became more cerebral. We both enjoyed English and the cinema and would entertain each other with snappy oral reviews. Stephanie was, and still is, one of the most acutely observant people I have ever met, and her art class sketches, occasionally shared with me, were testament to a rare flair

and perception. Our politics were to the left, our hearts were open, and we were critical of injustice. We would become a couple but it would take another 6 months of bus rides and many intensely critical conversations.

Critical Autoethnography and Me

Coming to understand the critical and political potential of autoethnography took our relationship to a whole new level. The realisation of the intensity of this methodology was both liberating and frightening. There were no half measures with autoethnography. If I was in, I was in for the long haul. I had long been attracted to approaches to critical thinking that exposed issues of oppression and promoted social change. Paulo Freire's (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, with its attendant notion of conscientisation, was the most memorable reading of my undergraduate study. As I became aware that autoethnography also shared my commitment to critical pedagogy, I could see a promising future, albeit a future of challenges, questions, continual reflection and constant reflexivity.

As discussed earlier, my master's research was influenced by the critical social paradigm, as I was interested in how Smyth's model of reflection could assist student teachers to be more aware of the social forces that control teaching and learning in schools (Moody, 1992). As a teacher educator, I had introduced students to the notion of the reflective practitioner, with a particular emphasis on Smyth's model of critical reflection. Smyth (2001) advocates a reflective approach to teaching that requires teachers to understand education as a political process that serves the interests of dominant groups while excluding and denying those at the margins. For Smyth, it is not sufficient for teachers to deliberate in contemplative reflection on the forces that inhibit and constrain the transformative possibilities of their work; rather, this critical thought must be transformed into militant action that alters the material conditions of their oppression. I could see the same transformative possibilities I had admired in Smyth's approach to reflection apparent in critical autoethnographic methodology, where researchers similarly seek to disrupt dominant discourses in the cause of social justice (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

Holman Jones (2016) discusses the reciprocal nature of theory and story in critical autoethnography. Theory interrogates stories set within specific sociocultural contexts and stories in turn, reveal how theory maps onto the lived experiences of those within the narrative context. Theory is not an analytical epilogue to story; rather, theory is "a language for thinking with and through...the experiences and happenings in our stories" (p. 2). In writing my narrative diary of ethical issues and dilemmas, my stories are illuminated by theories of moral philosophy

while these theories are simultaneously storied into new contextualised ways of knowing about moral philosophy. My stories are illuminated by theories of teacher identity, while these theories are simultaneously storied into new contextualised ways of knowing about teacher identity. The dance of collaborative engagement between theory and story allows the critical autoethnographer to reveal the ideological and material conditions of lived experience and, through storying, see possibilities for transformation (Holman Jones, 2016). By storying my own dilemmas through critical autoethnographic method, I have come to better understand the ethics of my teaching. As a researcher, I have been able to draw on my experiences of ethical dilemmas as a university teacher to disrupt dominant neoliberal narratives, provide voices for those silenced within these dominant narratives, and reveal the material effects of the broader ideological context on my ethical decision making, and the material effects of my ethical decision making on others. Through storying my own professional ethical quagmire, and laying bare my moral strengths, weaknesses and uncertainties, I begin to see the possibility of my personal transformation as an ethical teacher. Furthermore, in sharing stories of the dark ethical corners of my professional life, I provide my audience with novel and complex ways of understanding the ethical nature of teaching. Critical autoethnography enables me to explore areas of the ethics of teaching that would have been very difficult to access with more traditional qualitative methodologies. These “new ways of knowing” about the ethical nature of teaching open up possibilities for audiences to engage in their own personal and professional transformation through inviting critical reflection on the ethics of their own teaching practice. In this way, critical autoethnography provides both myself, the researcher, and my audience bridges that connect understandings of personal experience with an intellectual commitment to understanding the ethical nature of teaching within the neoliberal university (Holman Jones, 2016). However, the transformational potential of autoethnographic stories to connect the personal to the political can only occur when the autoethnographer is visible in the sociopolitical power structure.

When doing critical autoethnography, the researcher must position themselves in relation to their research and acknowledge their own subjectivity (Boylorn & Orbe, 2016; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Madison, 2012; Tilley-Lubbs, 2016). Boylorn and Orbe (2016) discuss how reflexivity demands the critical autoethnographer acknowledges their subjective lenses of both marginalisation and privilege. Similarly, Tilley-Lubbs (2016) discusses how the conscientisation of the researcher empowered through critical autoethnography is not a static state, but rather a way of being that acknowledges an ebb and flow between a critical awareness and praxis on power relations, and a critical awareness of personal complicity in the materialisation of the privileging dominant ideology. In a candid examination of her own academic research career,

Tilley-Lubbs exposes assumptions from her position of privilege within the dominant white culture while working in marginalised, vulnerable migrant communities. Reflexivity is achieved through critical autoethnographic poetry that evocatively locates her power, her privilege, and her whiteness in relation to her co-participants. It is through poetic form, which shows rather than tells the audience of the author's privileged position, that Tilley-Lubbs is able to exercise powerful reflexivity. When interrogating my own experiences of the ethics of university teaching, I have drawn on poetic forms of script writing and poetry to position myself as both the powerful and the disempowered, the privileged and the marginalised. I am at times the interrogator, and at times the interrogated. I am at times the enforcer, and at times the activist. Using the creative freedom afforded by the poetic form has enabled a reflexivity of *showing* rather than *telling* in my evocative and analytical autoethnographic accounts.

Section 3. A Complicated Relationship: Living with Autoethnography is not Straight Forward

Once I started living with Steph, I realised how complicated relationships could be. While we had similar goals, we had different views on how we could best reach our destination. There were also friends who thought we were taking things too seriously at such a young age. There were other attractive people, why settle down? There were some older traditional relatives who thought it was unethical we should be living together out of wedlock. This was never going to be a straightforward relationship.

Getting to Know the Autoethnography Crowd

The more I got to know autoethnography, and her many acquaintances, the more I realised there would be inevitable tensions in our relationship that would require attention. Autoethnography meant different things to different people and, if our relationship was to stand the test of time, I needed get to know the different sides of this most intriguing of methodologies. Holman Jones (2005) claims the goal for autoethnographic researchers should be to “produce analytical, accessible texts that change us and the world we live in for the better” (p. 784). While most autoethnographers would agree with the transformative intent of this goal, there is a divergence of opinions on whether emphasis should be on analytical rigour or aesthetically satisfying accessibility. Ellis, Adams, and Bochner (2011) highlight this tension within the autoethnographic research community when they observe how “autoethnography is criticised for either being too artful and not scientific, or too scientific and not sufficiently artful” (p. 283). In this written response to the debate between the “evocators” and the “analysts,” I attempt to present claims for research legitimacy from both methodological camps. I consider my own

place within this autoethnographic dichotomy through another storied response to Andrew Sparkes's (2007) article "Embodiment, Academics and the Research Culture: A Story Seeking Consideration." My story is a factional (for more on faction, see below) amalgamation of a range of responses from colleagues to my decision to move from a more traditional qualitative methodology towards autoethnography.

Lunchroom banter.

"I saw your presentation on Wednesday and I must say it was very good, Paul. Excellent use of thematic analysis to develop a hybrid taxonomy of ethical dilemmas combining past empirical research and your own pilot study. You should look at publishing this work in Teaching and Teacher Education."

I reply, "Submitted and rejected...but thanks for the feedback, Craig, I appreciate it."

"I know the Dean thought the work was an excellent example of the type of research a professional teaching fellow should be engaged in. Research that focuses on the mahi of initial teacher education and contributes directly to that work."

"That is very nice of you to say, Kristin."

The three of us sit around the long lunch table. The leatherette covering reveals my sweaty palms when I lift them from the table surface. I always get nervous discussing my research with Craig and Kristin, even though I regard them as friends. Kristin is our school's most recently hooded doctor and Craig our most recently appointed professor. Both are mixed-methods researchers who have little time for the perceived eccentricities of purely qualitative research. In their view, qualitative research should only be used to reinforce statistically significant quantitative findings. I sit at the lunch table awaiting the inquisition.

"So where are you going next with this project, Paul?" asks Craig. I consider an answer that would maintain the positive energy inherent in the conversation to date. I could discuss the 100 ethical dilemma statements that I have yet to analyse and how these could be used to broaden the aforementioned taxonomy of ethical dilemmas. I don't.

"I am looking at doing a critical autoethnography on my experiences of ethical decision making in my position as a university teacher and programme leader in the faculty." I continue to look at my hands, my tone pleads for mercy.

Kristin chokes on a half-masticated slice of apple, swallows deeply and spits, "You are what???"

"I am looking at doing a critical autoethnography on my experiences of ethical decision making in my position as a university teacher and programme leader in the faculty." I look up from my hands.

In unison, the doctor and professor raise their eyebrows and exchange a knowing smirk. I have a choice to make. I can remain in the lunchroom and be interrogated by the positivist gestapo or I can make a break for freedom and seek refuge in the solace of my office. I make the break.

“Anyway, nice to chat but I need to see a student,” I lie.

Back in my office, I realise that in my hasty retreat from the lunch room I have left my phone behind. I give it 15 minutes before I head down to retrieve my mobile, hoping that should be enough time for the doctor and professor to have thrashed out their mutual derision of my research plans and finished their respective meals. As I approach the lunchroom, I realise I have been optimistic. The professor is in full rant mode. I hover outside the lunchroom door and listen.

“His research is exactly the reason the public see us as self-absorbed, ivory-tower-dwelling pontificators. I struggle to even call it research. I mean where is the scientific method, the contribution to knowledge, the expansion of theory, the validity, the reliability...He may well write some interesting stories about his experiences making ethical decisions but why are they of any more value than a war story shared with a colleague over a pint on a Friday afternoon? Personal stories are just that, personal stories. Nothing wrong with them. I like a good story. I can tell a good story. Just don’t dress them up as research!”

“I agree. Self-indulgent academic wank! I expected more from Paul.”

I swallow hard. I take a step towards the entrance, turn on my heels and head back to my office. I will leave it another 15 minutes; my phone can wait.

Faction is described by Bruce (2019) as a literary form that straddles both fact and fiction.

Faction uses fictional literary devices to engage the reader while retaining some claims to truth (Morgan, 2013). The ethical, methodological and artistic opportunities and challenges of using faction as a form of research representation will be addressed later in this chapter. In recounting my factionalised version of an overheard conversation, I am aware that I have portrayed myself as a marginalised victim in the methodological debates that abound in university faculties of education. It is important that I admit that I have indulged in similar disparaging discussions of various colleagues’ research agendas with academic peers I identify as my methodological soul mates. In fact, I have drawn on some of these conversations for this factionalised story.

With that admission out of the way, I will now turn my attention to how autoethnographic researchers refute the accusations of self-indulgence made by my friends. I will initially outline the arguments of analytic autoethnographers before moving on to a discussion of those who reside in the evocative autoethnographic camp.

How analytic autoethnographers would refute the self-indulgent accusation.

Analytic autoethnographers such as Leon Anderson (2006) argue that, to preserve the academic integrity of autoethnography, researchers need to attend to the ethnographic and symbolic interactionist roots of this method. Anderson (2006) contends that autoethnography's credibility issue within the broader social science community is the result of autoethnography being captured by those who value the literary aesthetic over the analytical ethnographic. While Anderson applauds the pioneers of the aesthetic/emotional movement for establishing an increasingly popular and burgeoning evocative autoethnographic research community, he cautions that the value of analytic autoethnography that stems from the realist ethnographic tradition is in danger of disappearing, thus opening up autoethnographic research to charges of self-indulgence from the wider research community.

Anderson argues that "unlike evocative autoethnography, which seeks narrative fidelity only to the researcher's subjective experience, analytic autoethnography is grounded in self-experience but reaches beyond it as well" (p 386). Anderson argues the rigour of autoethnography can be defended when the following five features are inherent in the work of the researcher. Firstly, the researcher must have complete membership of the social group being researched. Secondly, sustained reflective attention needs to be paid to one's position in the web of field-based relations. Thirdly, there must be textual visibility of the self in the narratives produced. Fourthly, the researcher must reach beyond themselves to engage with others in the field. "No ethnographic work—not even autoethnography—is a warrant to generalise from an N of one" (Rosaldo, 1993, as cited in Anderson, 2006, p 386). Finally, the research must use empirical data to gain insight into some broader set of social phenomena. The data should transcend the particular towards a more generalised "theoretical development, refinement and extension" (p. 386).

I would argue the features of analytic autoethnography outlined above can be seen to have their foundations in more traditional qualitative notions of trustworthiness developed by Lincoln and Guba (1985). In rejecting quantitative notions of reliability and validity for the assessment of qualitative research, Lincoln and Guba instead proposed the idea of trustworthiness. Trustworthiness comprises four aspects—credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. To achieve credibility, Lincoln and Guba advise the researcher to have prolonged engagement in the field and triangulate with different methods, researchers and data (Flick, 2006). The notion of prolonged engagement in the field is consistent with Anderson's (2006) call for complete membership of the social group, and the importance of triangulation echoes his insistence that the autoethnographer must reach beyond themselves to engage with others in the

field. However, those from the evocative school of autoethnography are not so quick to apply fixed criteria from more traditional qualitative modes of research as a defence to their academic integrity. For the evocative autoethnographer, the criteria for judgement can only be applied in relation to the goal of the research (Le Roux, 2017).

How evocative autoethnographers would refute the self-indulgent accusation.

Evocative researchers reject any kind of adherence to the type of externally imposed criteria for evaluating autoethnographic work proposed by Anderson (2006) above. In fact, Ellis (1997) has warned that any attempt to justify autoethnography in terms of conventional sociological analysis violates the value and integrity of the methodology. For the evocator, an autoethnography can only be judged as having integrity when it evokes an emotional response in the reader through the researcher's literary command of the word and/or image (Le Roux, 2017). There is, therefore, no value in attempting to defend accusations by drawing on traditional social science criteria; rather, the criteria for judgement can only be determined in relation to the individual work under discussion.

Sparkes (2002) argues that accusations of self-indulgence can be best dealt with when a broader conception of the goals of autoethnographic research is considered. Drawing on the notion of the *heartful* autoethnography developed by Carolyn Ellis, Sparkes (2002) argues for a range of characteristics that could be used when assessing the integrity of autoethnographic research; these characteristics are always dependent on the goals of the author. These include the production of emotionally engaging texts that create the effect of reality; an encouragement of empathy; a concern with the moral, ethical and political consequences; and the "celebration of concrete experience and intimate detail" (p. 212).

My position.

At a supervision meeting on March 2 2017, I set the goal of reading six articles on autoethnography that discussed the debate regarding the relative merits and limitations of evocative and analytic approaches to this methodology. The first article I read was Andrew Sparkes's (2007) "Embodiment, Academics, and the Audit Culture: A Story Seeking Consideration." As I read, I recognised the cast of characters churning their way through the neoliberal intestines of university life. Some of them revolted me as they did their best to play the academic game with no regard to those they ignored and trampled on in their quest for publication glory. Others drew feelings of pity and empathy. I was inspired by the clean yet layered analysis of the impact of neoliberalism on the academy and beyond. The fact this piece of writing could evoke both emotion and political insight was a testament to the literary craft of the author. Sparkes' ability to re-create the mundane settings of domestic and university life,

then populate these settings with feeling human beings, was exceptional. I had read a truly *heartful* autoethnography.

With the benefit of hindsight, reading Sparkes's article first was somewhat of a mistake. The other readings, while well written and thoughtfully argued, lacked the engagement of Sparkes piece. I felt like I had enjoyed a brief reprieve from the usual structured dance of the academic publication only to be drawn back into the familiar beat ...abstract...introduction... methodology...boring...boring...boring...conclusion.

Yes, my head had been turned and I was feeling that the evocative was more me than the analytic. But the further I read, the more I realised the binary was more complex than one or the other. Le Roux (2017) was particularly useful in helping me see how I could place myself on a sliding continuum between the two polarities. At this point in my relationship with autoethnography, I would suggest I sat towards the evocative end of the continuum. I agree with Sparkes (2002) when he argues "the aim of the storyteller is not to prompt a single, closed convergent reading but to persuade readers to contribute answers to the dilemmas they pose" (p. 28). When I consider my research question '*How does a university teacher experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching?*', it is clear there will be no single answer to this question. Evocative autoethnography will allow me to put up my own case-study narratives where readers will be encouraged to contribute their own answers.

However, there is a nagging pull towards the analytic call for autoethnographic research to use "empirical data to gain insight into some broader set of social phenomena than those provided by the data themselves" (Anderson, 2006, p. 287). I therefore provide my own analysis of each of the case-study narratives in Chapters 4 and 5 using teacher identity theory and moral philosophy.

Sparkes (2002) argues that, in assessing the integrity of autoethnographic research, it is important to consider how the text encourages empathy and requires the reader to consider the moral, political and ethical consequences. Sparkes's research has motivated me to "write and think with" (Frank, 1995) his story of life in the neoliberal university and, in doing so, consider my own experiences and the moral, political and ethical consequences of my decision making. I intend for my readers to think, and maybe even write, with my stories of experiencing and negotiating the ethics of teaching in a neoliberal university. However, to help with my storytelling, I need to introduce you to a friend named John.

Section 4. An Old Friend Comes to Stay: Smyth's Model of Reflection as Autoethnographic Writing Method

A make or break for any long-term relationship is how well our partners get on with our close friends. As Stephanie and I were essentially introduced by my best friend Stephen, this was never an issue. In fact, Stephen came to contribute to our relationship in many ways, from being an occasional travelling companion on our big OE to going thirds on our first house. Stephen complemented our relationship with his humour, friendship and intelligence.

Me and John

I was first introduced to John Smyth at the turn of the century when I took up a position as a visiting teaching fellow at The Centre for Professional Inquiry at the former Auckland College of Education (ACE) now the Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Auckland. The centre taught courses underpinned by critical reflection within “The Professional Inquiry Strand” of the ACE Bachelor of Education (Teaching) degree (BEd Tchg). The model of critical reflection adopted was Smyth’s (2001) four stages of professional empowerment. I was particularly drawn to how Smyth’s approach to critical reflection positioned “teachers as intellectuals” (Smyth, 2011). Drawing on the critical pedagogy of scholars such as Apple, Freire, Giroux and McLaren, Smyth argues for a reimagining of the teacher as an intellectual, as an actor carrying out an ethical duty to judge, critique and reject practices that disempower teachers and students. To carry out this ethical duty, Smyth outlined four stages of critical reflection for teacher empowerment: describe, inform, confront and reconstruct.

The *describe* stage requires teachers to describe their practice by considering questions such as “what did I do?” These descriptions of practice should be in the teachers’ own words and create a form of text that could be subsequently analysed for its meaning. The *inform* stage requires teachers to interrogate their practice through questions such as “what does this mean?” and develop their own short-range theories or explanatory principles that could make sense of their described practice. The *confront* stage asks teachers to confront the assumptions underlying their practice through questions such as “how did I come to be like this?” It is at this stage where teachers are encouraged to interrogate their short-range theories for their legitimacy. Teachers are challenged to see their practice less as personal pedagogical choices and more the product of political, economic, social and cultural norms that may never have revealed themselves before. The final *reconstruct* stage asks teachers to consider how they might do things differently. Smyth argues that when the critical reflection outlined in the previous stages occurs, and teachers are able to locate themselves personally and professionally in history and uncover the

forces that have shaped their assumptions, they are able to begin to act on the world for radical change.

While I found enormous potential in using Smyth's model of reflection with student teachers, there were also unique challenges in using such a critical form of reflection. In my master's research, I reflected on the frustration of using Smyth's model as a form of assessment. During student teaching placements in schools, one of the assessed requirements was a Smyth reflection on a challenge students were experiencing in the practicum environment. I remember vividly the difficulty in moving students beyond a superficial analysis of the positives and negatives of their practice to a meaningful deconstruction of their teaching in terms of issues of power and control. The individualistic and accountable nature of such tasks seemed to run contrary to the collectivist, cooperative reflective stance advocated by Smyth. However, even when the notion of critical reflection fell out of favour in the ITE programmes I taught, I still drew on Smyth's model as a useful way to engage student teachers in deeper thinking about their teaching and the purpose of education.

John, I'm only writing.

In late May 2017, I returned to my old mentor for help. My doctoral writing to that point had revealed two problems that required resolution. Firstly, I needed to find an autoethnographic method of writing that provided space for an accessible and affective evocative style while also satisfying my deep-seated need to provide an analysis of my narratives that created transformative possibilities for others. Secondly, I needed to establish a theoretical framework to interrogate my autoethnographic case studies. Smyth was able assist me on both counts. The autoethnographic method I used for exploring my two ethical case studies drew on the describe, inform and confront stage of Smyth's (2001) model of critical reflection. As Smyth (2001) describes it, "teaching is a form of text to be described and then untied for the meaning it reveals" (p 191). I drew on my narrative diary of ethical issues experienced as a university teacher to develop two ethical incidents into case-study texts that reveal *how a university teacher experiences and negotiates the ethics of teaching*. As discussed below, this framework opened opportunities for my autoethnographic writing to be both evocative and analytical. To address the second problem, Smyth was able to help me by creating intellectual space within the confront stage of his model for theoretical interrogation I needed to attend to, while also sparking my interest in teacher identity theory through his writings about teachers as bricoleurs, improvisers, activists, accommodators and incorporators (Smyth, 2002, 2011). A theoretical framework for teacher identity is developed in the following chapter.

The describe stage: Smyth (2001) suggests critical reflection cannot occur unless teachers take the time to describe issues of practice in their own language. Shor (1980), cited in Smyth (2001), observes how when teachers keep a narrative journal they are able to “extraordinarily experience the ordinary” (p. 92). In developing selected texts from my narrative diary into fully developed case studies, I have taken literary liberties to present these stories as evocative fictionalised accounts of my ethical dilemmas. In doing so I have re-experienced the ordinary grind of my ethical decision making as something extraordinary, and ultimately revealing, through the artistic possibilities afforded by fiction. New Zealand author Paula Morris (2019) points to the possibilities provided by creative forms of non-fiction, such as fiction, for authors to tell their own stories from a position of authenticity by using imagination to “interrogate ourselves and articulate the world” (p. 33). Similarly, Bruce (2019) observes how fiction as a research method merges the imaginative and the factual through “(re)presenting in-depth research that is both rigorously embedded in its research context and engaging to read” (p. 57). My autoethnographic research on negotiating the ethics of teaching is embedded in events that have happened to me in my work as a university teacher. However, fiction as a method has provided me with the opportunity to imaginatively conflate, combine, converge and exaggerate events for artistic affect.

The inform stage: Smyth (2001) argues that describing the act of teaching is not in itself an act of critical reflection; rather, it is a catalyst for revealing the principles that inform practice. Therefore, the inform stage requires teachers to take an analytical step further and work out the operational theories they use in their daily practice to better understand the principles that inform their professional behaviour. Compelling teachers to critically theorise their own practice and generate their own explanatory principles about practice disrupts the usual separation of theory and practice. I use the inform stage as an intellectually playful space where my nascent understanding of the principles of moral theory is set to work in a variety of fictional backdrops. In the inform stage of my Chapter 7 case study I employ the fictional setting of an industrial control room to theorise my ethical decision making from a range of moral philosophical standpoints. In the Chapter 8 case study I use the plot device of an ethical interrogation to theorise the principles that informed my ethical choice from multiple perspectives.

The confront stage: In presenting my two case studies I have used a largely evocative approach to autoethnography to explore the describe and inform stages of Smyth’s model of critical reflection. I have described my own ethical decision making as a university teacher and then theorised this practice through operational theories of moral philosophy I have developed as both a teacher and scholar. However, taking heed of Smyth’s (2001) warning that, “theorizing and

describing practice is one thing, but being able to subject those theories to a form of interrogation and questioning that establishes something about their legitimacy and their legacy is altogether another matter” (p. 193), I turned to a more analytic form of autoethnographic writing for the confront stage of my case studies. Through the confront stage of both case studies, I have analysed my ethical decision making as a university teacher using a theoretical framework of teacher identity construction developed in the following chapter. My theoretical framework has enabled me to engage in an in-depth analysis of how the negotiation of the ethics of teaching, explored in the describe and inform stages, is an ongoing act of teacher identity construction.

Ethical Considerations

As this study has primarily focussed on my own ethical decision making, it was important to address how I have protected myself, and others implicated in the descriptions of my decision making, from harm.

Protecting myself.

Tullis (2016) cautions that while autoethnography may provide researchers with a form of cathartic self-therapy there are also dangers inherent in re-interrogating personal and professional histories. Similarly, Allen-Collinson (2016) points to the autoethnographic process being a “very painful and even potentially self-injurious act” (p. 283). In presenting my narrative case studies I have revisited some challenging personal and professional moments where I made ethically questionable decisions. In re-presenting my thoughts, words and actions through factional narratives I have needed to confront memories of shame and regret. I have been able to navigate these emotions by regularly sharing and discussing my work with my supervisors, my doctoral study group and fellow autoethnographers. These discussions have enabled me to legitimate my emotional reactions to the writing process and helped me maintain a clear sense of purpose and momentum in researching *how a university teacher experiences and negotiates the ethics of teaching*. However, there was a point in my doctoral journey where I needed to stop writing for a period of 6 months due to the impact my research was having on my mental health.

In April 2018, I became aware that, due to an academic staffing review, there was a very real possibility my professional teaching fellow position at the university could be disestablished. Having survived the emotionally bruising experience of the previous 2014 academic review, I had a clear idea of the months of angst, self-doubt and collegial turmoil that lay ahead as the review process played out. While I initially tried to keep to my doctoral writing schedule, I found working on an autoethnographic study into my own work as a university teacher, at a time

when the very future of this work was at risk, an act of academic masochism I could not stomach. In the interest of protecting myself from mental and emotional harm, I suspended my doctorate for 6 months and took up my employer's offer of three free sessions of counselling.

Protecting others.

It is inevitable that autoethnographers are going to implicate others in their research through the presentation and/or performance of their work. In discussing the importance of critical reflexivity to the autoethnographer, Hernandez and Wambura Ngunjiri (2016) point to the complexities of implicating others in our research and the ethical dilemma of whether we should inform others we are including them in our stories. Ellis (2007) observes how autoethnographers are continuously moving back and forth between examining the vulnerable self and revealing the social context of their experience. In illuminating those who populate the researcher's social environment, the potential for improving or diminishing relationships is determined by the choices the autoethnographer makes. Being sensitive to the relational issues of research is crucial to the autoethnographer and "each autoethnographic work must include careful consideration of the ethical issues around how we choose to protect the identities and vulnerabilities of those involved or implicated in our studies" (Hernandez & Wambura Ngunjiri, 2016, p. 269).

Hernandez and Wambura Ngunjiri (2016) argue that it is possible to protect the vulnerability of those implicated in our stories by staying truthful to our stories without revealing the whole truth. The idea that the manipulation of truthful events can be used for both artistic and ethical purposes is not the preserve of autoethnography. In the recent Elton John biopic, *Rocketman*, truthful events are distorted, exaggerated and merged through artful script writing, choreography and direction. In a column piece in *The Guardian*, soon after the release of the film, Elton John (2019) commented on the reaction to this factionalised masterpiece from his long-time song-writing collaborator, Bernie Taupin, who felt that the script was in no way an accurate representation of what actually happened. However, after seeing the film he could grasp the ethical and artistic choices that had been made in creating *Rocketman*. "He understood the point of it, which was to make something that was like my life: chaotic, funny, mad, horrible, brilliant and dark. It's obviously not all true, but it's the truth" (John, 2019, para. 25). Thanks Elton, I couldn't have described factionalisation better myself. And while I am at it, thanks to both Elton and Bernie for the "Ballad of Danny Bailey," to name but one slice of life so beautifully told through song.

The use of faction in presenting my case studies has enabled me to address some ethical issues that arise when using autoethnography as a methodology. Richardson (1999) observes how, in writing stories, autoethnographers are sensitised to the potential consequences and ethics of

representation brought about by writing of the lives of those in their homes and work places. By using fiction to describe characters and situations, I have been careful to ensure characters and events are not clearly identifiable; pseudonyms are used, clear identifying character markers such as age, gender, ethnicity, and institutional position, are changed, and settings are fictional. Where colleagues, friends and family members are implicated in my work I have asked them to read the relevant narratives and had their approval to include these stories in the final thesis (Hernandez & Wambura Ngunjiri, 2016).

Conclusion

Autoethnography has allowed me to examine the events of my own life using the describe, inform and confront stages of Smyth's model of critical reflection. For 2 years, I recorded ethical dilemmas I experienced as a university teacher in a narrative diary. I experimented with different genres of writing including prose, letters, poetry and scriptwriting. Tilley-Lubbs (2016) identifies that an autoethnographer performs the concurrent roles of both participant and researcher through their writing. In performing this dual role, the autoethnographer makes clear to the reader their subjective position and how this positionality influences their selection of data and decisions as to how data will be presented. In reviewing my data, I selected diary entries that represented moments where my ethical decision making could be viewed differently depending on the ethical-theoretical perspective/s of the reader. In fictionalising my selected diary entries as case studies through the describe, inform and confront stages of Smyth's model, I chose genres that would reveal power dynamics at play within dilemmatic spaces. My positionality as both the oppressor and oppressed is captured through the evocative use of plot devices, character and setting. Tilley-Lubbs (2016) discusses how, in her critical autoethnographic work, she interrogates her relationship with phenomena with a focus on how her own power and privilege situate her compared to other less-powerful actors. I have taken a similar approach by providing an evocative exposition of my ethical decision making at the describe stage, followed by an open, sometimes brutal, interrogation of my actions at the inform and confront stages. As with the work of Tilley-Lubbs, I am able to explore how the social, political and economic contexts have shaped my perspective and actions and, in doing so, am able to recognise myself as the oppressor. However, I have also drawn on the autoethnographic approaches of Boylorn and Orbe (2016) to examine how my classed positionality as a teacher within the neoliberal institution of a university has resulted in a lived experience of oppression.

The remaining chapters of my thesis are an act of critical pedagogy where my ethical decision making is re-created as lived narratives that are analysed to reveal the complexity interwoven in issues of oppression and empowerment, agency and structure, and the ethics of teaching.

Chapter Six

The Theoretical Framework

Scene One (May 2017)

I sit thundering away at my laptop keyboard. The words appear one by one. Occasionally I punctuate. Full stops feel good. They are final. They signal I am done. I feel done. As I re-read my fallen thoughts, I feel the pressure behind my eyes increasing and spreading to my temples. I am getting nowhere fast. I have committed to an autoethnographic approach to explore how a university teacher experiences and negotiates the ethics of teaching. A question...a method... but how?

Later that afternoon, I sit in a small West Auckland café nursing a flat white and relaying my paralysis to colleague and friend, Dr Esther Fitzpatrick. An hour later I emerge into the early evening light with a plan. Smyth's model of critical reflection will provide the structure for my autoethnographic tales of ethical educational dilemmas, and teacher identity will be the theoretical framework through which I can provide analysis and insight.

I return to my laptop and begin to research theories of teacher identity that will inform the construction of my theoretical framework.

A Theory of Teacher Identity

Teachers struggle hard to...see the importance or even the relevance of “accommodation” and “resistance” in their work, especially in a system which increasingly demands that schools be responsive to the needs of the economy. (Smyth, 2001, p. 188)

In his 2002 article “Unmasking Teachers’ Subjectivities in Local School Management,” John Smyth suggests a model of teacher identity construction that reflects the neoliberal managerialist discourse of the Australian education system. Smyth discusses three positionings taken up by teachers in response to managerial reforms in their schools. There are the minority who take an “activist position” and actively resist the reform agenda. Then there are those who capitulate and allow notions of “managerialism, marketization and accountability to infiltrate their work in practical ways” (p. 469). Smyth labels this the *accommodation* position of identity. Finally, there were the majority of teachers who maintain an “incorporation” positioning. These teachers make minor modifications to previous practice to bring it in line with current policy or incorporate policy but largely do not alter how they go about their work. “In other words, the most common reaction of teachers was of trying to find ways of construing the reform so that it minimised the damage of the worst excesses to their professional identities” (Smyth, 2002, p. 470). Similarly,

Day, Elliott, and Kington (2005) point to the way in which reform agendas require teachers to mobilise their “occasional” identity as “adapters” of managerial reforms so they can balance their “ideal” teaching self with what is possible given the constraints of their day-to-day work. Ironically, Day et al. (2005) argue that the constant tension teachers experience between their “core” ideal teacher identity of care and commitment to pupils and their occasional identity as adapters of neoliberal reform requirements, leads to the eventual erosion of teacher commitment, leaving policy makers with major issues with teacher retention.

In the later decades of the 20th century, the notion of a core teacher identity came under challenge as researchers began to take more seriously the biographical and personal dimensions of their research participants. MacLure (1993) argues that teacher identity should not be seen as a constant stable dimension of the self but rather a “continuing site of struggle for teachers” (p. 312). Drawing on her informal biographical interviews with 69 teachers, during the reforms of the British education system of the late 1980s and early 1990s, MacLure concludes the managerialism imposed on teachers did not result in the establishment of a new core identity but was rather experienced and responded to through diverse expressions of identity. Sachs (2001) also draws on a more fluid theory of teacher identity in her proposition that teachers in Australia have developed a duality of teacher identities in response to two educational discourses. Sach’s discourse analysis of teacher professionalism posits the dominance of neoliberal managerialism in recent Australian education policy has led to a good teacher being characterised as a professional who efficiently meets externally imposed educational goals. The proliferation of prescriptive codes of conduct, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 4, are indicative of this neoliberal vision of the professional teacher. In response to this shifting notion of professionalism, the discourse of democratic professionalism has provided a more radical view of teachers’ work which sees teachers actively engaging in collaborative, cooperative work with other teachers and stakeholders. Within this discourse, teachers contribute not only to their classrooms but also the system itself. Sachs argues the engagement with these discourses leads teachers to at times assume an “entrepreneurial identity” characterised by competitiveness, individualism, efficiency and an ability to meet the market. Alternatively, teachers may assume an activist identity characterised by two main elements. Firstly, the willingness to shed the shackles of the past allowing a transformative attitude towards the future. Secondly, the desire to overcome the illegitimate domination of some groups over others. Sachs emphasises that these identities are fluid rather than fixed and are mediated by a teacher’s exposure to and engagement with the discourses of managerial professionalism and democratic professionalism.

In exploring my own identity as a teacher and teacher educator, I propose to draw on the work of both Smyth and Sachs to develop a theory of teacher identity that comprises the notions of “teacher as conformist” (Player) and “teacher as activist” (Hero). Using this theoretical framework of teacher identity within the confront stage of Smyth’s model, I hope to reveal the ethical nature of my work as I am pulled and pushed between two seemingly incompatible identities of the “good teacher.” I acknowledge that, as a middle-class Pākehā male, these are not the only possible identities that have influenced my professional conception of what is to be a good teacher; however, they have been omnipresent in my identity development as an educator in Aotearoa over my 30-year teaching career.

Scene Two (A metaphor)

The road I live on clings to a winding ridgeline in the Waitakere Ranges west of Auckland city. To one side of the ridge there is a steep drop to the surging Manukau Harbour, on the other a more undulating graded fall to a bush-clad valley floor. The road meanders for a mile or so to a point where the ridge meets the sea. The sign reads Kauri Point Road. On both sides of the road an eclectic assortment of dwellings sits ensconced in native bush. I live half way down the road in the middle of a short straight. On foggy evenings I like to step outside my front gate to enjoy the vista of streetlights playing in the haze on my little stretch of Kauri Point Road. To the west, some 100 paces up the road, a street light marks the completion of the straight and an abrupt turn in the ridgeline. To the east, another 100 paces away, a second street light reveals the other end of this short stretch of Kauri Point Road. The streetlights throw a foggy glow onto the surrounding trees that arch and stretch over the road. The wet undulating asphalt takes on a yellow slithery sheen that leads to mystical dark caves framed by the boughs and verdure of the bush. If I venture to the east I am in Narnia, if I travel westwards, I am in Maurice Gee’s Land of O. It is mystical and delicious to stand outside my gate, on my road, throwing my gaze to the east and the west, imagining the adventures, intrigues and possibilities that lie just around the corner.

A few weeks back, workers in high-vis vests arrived in their trucks with flashing lights. They took down the old wooden eastward lamppost and hoisted up a clean concrete replacement. After they had left, and the early winter evening descended, the streetlights made their appearance. The mystical world of my imagination had been shattered. While the warm soft yellow haze of the westward world remained, to the east a different light dominated. A cold hard white light cast the east into stark relief. The efficiency of the new streetlight revealed the hard edges of the world beneath. Warmth and possibility were replaced by a chilling certainty.

The land at both ends of the straight is elevated from the vantage point of my front gate. I stand in the centre of a gentle dip in the road. If I were to alight a skateboard I would need to kick repetitively to get to the eastern lamppost. Once there, if I stood with both feet on the board, I

would start rolling westwards past my house and up the incline towards the western lamppost. Gravity would refuse permission for me to arrive beneath warm glow of the western light and pull me successively to the east, then west, then east, then west until my pendulumlike ride would finally cease outside my gate. The same ride would happen in reverse if my inclination was to strike out westwards.

As I stood outside my house mourning the loss of the eastern kingdom of my imagination I began to think about my recent reading around teacher identity theory. Sachs's (2001) argument that teachers' identities are formed and reformed as they engage with the competing discourses of managerial professionalism and democratic professionalism seemed to somehow fit with the discordant streetlights that now illuminated the road in front of my house. The harsh efficient light of the east seemed to fit with the notion of managerial professionalism while the more welcoming glow of the west resonated with an inclusive democratic version of professionalism. However, from where I stood, the illumination of both lights mixed and merged.

Lasky (2005) explains professional identity as “how teachers define themselves to themselves and to each other” (p. 901). Teacher identity formation is a dynamic and ever-evolving process that involves a complex interplay between external expectations and internal beliefs (Coldron & Smith, 1999; Convery, 1999; Lasky, 2005; Moore, Edwards, Halpin, & George, 2002; Sachs, 2001; Smyth, 2002). An important stage in the formation of teacher identity is the period of early-career development (Lasky, 2005). In her study into Canadian secondary school teachers working within a managerialist reform process, Lasky (2005) concludes that teacher identity could best be understood as an outcome of the mediation between the personal attributes and inclinations brought about by early-career teacher training and the cultural tools of policy mandates, curriculum guidelines and state standards. Lasky (2005) and Moore et al. (2002) observe how older teachers who engaged in their teacher education prior to the neoliberal reform movement felt a far greater rift between managerial and democratic notions of professionalism than did their younger counterparts. The implementation of managerial policy caused a discord between older teachers' pedagogical beliefs and their professional actions that they found difficult to reconcile.

The illumination thrown by the democratic and managerialist streetlights was experienced in very different ways for older and younger teachers. The streetlight metaphor can assist us in understanding teacher identity when it is understood as being differentiated for each actor. While I contend the democratic and managerialist streetlights are part of the streetscape of every teacher, the brightness of the lights and the way the respective illuminations merge together are perceived in different ways dependent on personal and professional history.

Coldron and Smith (1999) suggest “part of the experience of teaching is continually constructing a sustainable identity as a teacher” (p. 14). The skateboard ride aspect of my metaphor refers to the fluid nature of teacher identity. While the contrasting discourses of managerial and democratic professionalism offer their own particular attractions and rewards, the teacher ultimately has agency in the direction they will kick towards. Once they have pushed off they will become aware that although they are kicking in a particular direction the moment they stop kicking they will either need to put their foot down to stay still or be pulled by forces of resistance and compliance back to their original starting position, which is influenced by both their individual biography and the cultural and political context of their teacher development. The starting point is never fixed but shifts continually, depending on the repeated inclinations of the rider and the shifting context of their environment.

Kicking to the east is an act of conformity or “playing the game.” The east is clear, visible and easily measured. The rules of the game are established. The rule makers are to be obeyed.

Kicking to the west is an act of activism or heroism. The west is uncertain, complex and messy, yet hopeful. The rules of the game are contestable. The legitimacy and agenda of the rule makers are to be challenged.

Scene Three (July 2017)

I am walking through the blustery wind tunnels of the Epsom Campus to meet with my supervisors. I walk with the confidence of a man who has just nailed a theoretical framework of teacher identity. If I could whistle I definitely would.

On the supervision meeting agenda is my latest piece of writing “A Theory of Teacher Identity.” While both supervisors are complimentary about the writing, there is feedback that the notion of teacher identity needs to be theorised more. There is also a challenge to the binary notion of the teacher as activist/hero or teacher as conformist/player. The questions come thick and fast:

“What do you think identity is, Paul?”

“Is teacher identity limited to the binary of teacher as conformist and teacher as hero or is it more multifaceted?”

“How do you think identity is constructed, Paul?”

“What is the place of structure and agency in identity formation?”

“Have you thought about how the theory of interpellation mentioned in the Hall reading I sent you could be useful?”

I scratch my chin and respond to each of these questions with half-swallowed sentences and an expression of mild panic. The meeting concludes with an agreement that there are some key questions I need to pursue if my theoretical framework of teacher identity is going to be able to do the work I need it to, namely answer the questions:

1. *What is identity and what is teacher identity?*
 - a) *Is identity static or fluid?*
 - b) *Is there a core teacher identity or is teacher identity dualistic or multifaceted?*
2. *How is teacher identity constructed? (structure versus agency)*
 - a) *How is teacher identity imposed by societal expectations and public discourses of teaching and learning?*
 - b) *How agentic are teachers in self-determining their teacher identity?*
3. *Can the theory of interpellation be useful in exploring teacher identity construction?*

As I leave, I announce:

"I go forth to review the literature on identity and more specifically teacher identity in order to develop my own more nuanced theory of teacher identity that can be used in analysing my own autoethnographic stories at the confront stage of Smyth's model of critical reflection."

Barbara and Peter both smile and wish me all the best.

I hunch my shoulders into the prevailing westerly and return to my office on the far side of campus. I lift my gaze for no one.

Scene Four (November 2017)

It is early summer and I find myself on the shore of Long Bay at a writing retreat. It has been a busy 4 months since my July supervision meeting. I am thankful to have 4 days free to work on my promised review of teacher identity literature for my theoretical framework chapter. I feel I am prepared as I lift my gaze from my laptop screen and stare out my lodge window at the arc of golden sand that stretches into the distance. I have read widely on the area of teacher identity and feel the questions posed by my supervisors provide a promising organisational framework for my writing. I intend to structure my discussion of teacher identity by initially giving a brief historical overview of identity as a field of study generally and then the area of teacher identity theory more specifically. I will explore how teacher identity is viewed both as stable and dynamic before discussing the competing notions of a core teacher self and a multifaceted view of teacher identity. I will then explore differing views of how teacher identity is constructed and the influence of societal structures and individual agency on this process. I will conclude by considering how Althusser's theory of interpellation can provide insights into how both structure and agency are at play in teacher identity construction. It feels good to have a plan.

I have taken a break from writing and am walking along the beach beneath the retreat lodge with my good friend and colleague, Dr Melinda Webber. We are enjoying the warmth of the early evening offshore wind and discussing our day's achievements. I inform Melinda of my work on teacher identity theory that I intend to use as a key theoretical framework for analysing my autoethnographic narratives.

"Why?" asks Melinda.

"Why what?" I reply.

"Why is a theory of teacher identity of any value to you, or to anyone for that matter?"

"It's of value to me as it will inform the analytical dimension of my autoethnography."

"That's good for you Paul, but I still don't get how a theory of teacher identity has value to the wider educational community."

"Because it does." I state petulantly. We both laugh and continue our journey towards the headland of the bay in silence.

I always appreciate my friend's intellect and telling directness. Melinda deserves a better response than my pouty lipped muttering, even though it was given in jest. I am also keenly aware that the question Melinda posed on our walk needs answering before I do any more work on my theoretical framework chapter. As I open the door to my room the certainty that existed before my walk seems to stream out into the ether. More reading and thinking are required. Why exactly is a theory of teacher identity of value to the educational community?

Scene Five (December 2017)

I spy my friend lining up to buy a coffee at our campus café. I approach quietly and tap her gently on the back of her left shoulder. Melinda turns and smiles, but before she has time for a salutation, I make my announcement...

"Because an understanding of teacher identity theory will both assist the ongoing professional development of teachers throughout their careers and empower teachers to critically analyse the material conditions of their work and how particular identities serve particular interests."

"And kia ora to you too Paul." Mel replies quizzically.

"It's the answer!"

"To what?"

"The question!"

“What question?”

“The question you asked me on the beach.”

“You’re weird, bro.”

“Thanks. Can I get you a coffee? I owe you one.”

Why is a theory of teacher identity important?

A nuanced and rigorous theory of teacher identity formation can inform the professional development of teachers from their ITE and through their ongoing professional learning. Coldron and Smith (1999) observe how “the conceptualization of how persons acquire their identities as teachers has implications for the kind of support needed for professional development” (p. 711). Similarly, Beauchamp and Thomas (2009) argue for how a more complete understanding of teacher identity could enhance teacher education programmes. They point to the importance of stories in research on teacher identity and advocate the use of narrative and metaphor techniques to assist preservice teachers explore their developing identities. Rodgers and Scott (2008) also suggest that teacher education programmes should assist teachers to become the authors of their own professional identity. They point out that, for those entering the profession, the development of identity is less like a coherent set of staged developmental progressions and more like a random assortment of seemingly disparate professional experiences. It is therefore understandable why the most widely embraced ways of helping student teachers make sense of their often contradictory and confusing initial teaching experiences is through “the practice of narrative, or the telling of our stories” (Rodgers & Scott, 2008, p. 736).

An understanding of teacher identity can help teachers, researchers and policymakers recognise how teachers come to negotiate the complex social and cultural contexts they work within. Beauchamp and Thomas (2009) suggest that studying teacher identity is important in developing an understanding of teacher development in preservice teacher education and through their ongoing professional learning. They suggest a study of teacher identity can provide an analytic frame to gain insights into how teachers deal with the complexity of their role over time. A range of researchers analyse how teachers come to negotiate and re-negotiate their teacher identities in the complex context of the neoliberal, managerialist reform agenda (Coldron & Smith, 1999; Convery, 1999; Day et al., 2005; Foster, 2017; Lasky, 2005; Moore et al., 2002; Sachs, 2001; Smyth, 2002).

The complex emotional component of teachers' work that informs the development of identity (Atkinson, 2004; Barrett, 2015; Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Lasky, 2005; Søreide, 2006; Rodgers & Scott, 2008; Zembylas, 2005) is another strong theme in the literature. For example, Day et al. (2005) promote the importance of research into "commitment" as a crucial facet of teacher identity and the potential of such research to assist teachers to find sustained "enthusiasm" through their working careers. They go on to advise those engaged in any kind of systematic professional development with teachers to work closely with teachers and their individual identities to ensure professional change is successful.

The idea that theorising teacher identity can create opportunities to expose power relations and in turn transform the intellectual and emotional nature of teachers' work has been suggested by a number of scholars. Søreide (2006) has argued the multifaceted nature of teacher identity requires that those involved in the professional development of teachers avoid ascribing universal teacher identities and rather allow the opportunity for teachers to construct identities that are unique, relevant and meaningful. Søreide promotes a critical approach to professional development that empowers teachers to explore how they are positioned as subjects within the institutional contexts of their work, and, as a result of the illumination of their subject position, deconstruct and reconstruct their teacher identity. Through inquiry into how dominant discourses of accountability and professionalism inform teacher identity, teachers are empowered to understand the concept of teacher identity beyond the most obvious cultural stereotypes (Søreide, 2006). In a similar vein, Zembylas (2005) argues for the historicising of emotional control and labour in teaching and, in the process, revealing and deconstructing "the power relations that normalize the life of teachers in schools" (p. 946). Smyth (2002) argues that, in the reform context of Australian self-managing schools, a preferred identity of the teacher as entrepreneur has emerged, a teacher self-governed by "a political rationality of personal choice, individual freedom and self-fulfilment" (p. 479). He goes on to advocate for a principled activist teacher identity that moves beyond the governmentality of current managerial notions of effective teaching and educational leadership. Similarly, Sachs (2001) argues for the development of an activist teacher identity that gives rise to new ways of enacting and thinking about teachers' work. Britzman (1993), as cited in Rodgers and Scott (2008), exhorts "new and experienced teachers alike to 'resist' these normative forces, forces which are 'overburdened with the meanings of others,' and author their own identities according to their own deep convictions, investments, and desires" (p. 737). However, Breen (2014) cautions that in the authoring of their own identities, teachers need to critically reflect on their identities and acknowledge how their teacher identity could potentially influence the identity formation of the students they teach.

In summary, the study of identity provides teachers with some means by which they can justify and make sense of themselves for others. Gaining a more complete understanding of teacher identity can enhance teacher education programmes so they assist teachers to develop an awareness of, and resistance to, dominant educational discourses and the impact these can have on their students. In Chapters 7, 8 and 9 I apply my understanding of teacher identity construction to reveal, and speak back to, the dominant neoliberal discourses.

What is identity and what is teacher identity?

Having established why an understanding of teacher identity theory is important to the broader educational community, I now turn my attention to what teacher identity actually is. In beginning my exploration of theory, it seemed apposite to start my quest with Margaret Wetherell's (2010) seminal text *The SAGE Handbook of Identities* in which she traces the history of identity as a field of study. In examining sociological and psychological roots of identity studies, the author points to how identity "became the site where questions about the relationship between the individual and society would be most extensively highlighted" (p. 9). Identity studies of the 50s and 60s varied in their emphasis on the psychological and social determinants of self-experience. However, what united this research was the notion of a unified persistent self. Modernist assumptions of identity being stable, unified and universal underpinned the social group research of feminists and those interested in civil rights movements around race and sexuality. Likewise, Erikson's developmental approach to identity was underpinned by notions of universalism and an incremental growth towards a unified self-identity or what he called *self-actualisation* (Duchesne, McMaugh, Bochner, & Krause, 2013).

More recently, the idea of a unified identity has been contested by a range of social theorists who reject the linear, recursive models of psychologists like Erikson (Breen, 2014). Butler (1990) argues that a desire for a stable identity is a fantasy that can never be achieved; rather, identity needs to be seen as contingent upon the multiple social performances an individual enacts. Hall (1996) observes how these critiques of the notion of identity are not driven by a desire to produce a more positive knowledge; rather, they attempt to put the concept of identity under erasure. "Identity is such a concept—operating 'under erasure' in the interval between reversal and emergence" (p. 2). Here, then, the notion of a fixed unified identity is replaced with a more fractured view of identity as a continual state of becoming through a process of deconstruction and reconstruction. Akkerman and Meijer (2011) have identified this move towards a more dynamic and multifarious view of identity as a postmodern shift.

Scholarship in the field of teacher identity reveals that both modernist singular core notions of identity, and postmodern dynamic diversified understandings of self, inform theories of teacher

identity. In the literature, there is a recognition that certain core identities can dominate the way teachers think about and perform their work. Day et al. (2005) argue that identities formed early in a teacher's career can be difficult to modify or replace and that these foundational identities can act as filters to new knowledge. They go on to discuss a core of reasonably permanent values based on an image of the self and professional identity "which are subject to challenge by change which is socio-politically constructed" (p. 563). Similarly, Lasky (2005) observes how experienced Canadian teachers, who were trained prior to the 1990's neoliberal lurch of the Canadian education system, are often unwilling to change the human-centred teaching identity formed in the early years of their teacher education. Lasky suggests mediational tools such as managerialist policy mandates may have a limited influence on changing an individual's historical ideas of professional identity. However, Moore et al. (2002) warn that, while more experienced teachers may indeed have longstanding principles that inform their teacher identity, these principles can lead to identity crisis as teachers are forced to make pragmatic educational compromises in changing educational contexts. The experienced teacher can be torn between the more enduring elements of their teacher identity and the identity expectations of an increasingly managerialist education system.

The notion of identity being conceived of as a fluid, discursive concept rather than being characterised as a unified, coherent persistent self has underpinned much of the research into teacher identity over the last 20 years (Rodgers & Scott, 2008). Akkerman and Meijer (2011) observe how the notion of teacher identity as "the possession of a defined set of assets required for the profession" (p. 310) has been replaced by multiple subidentities that are in an ongoing process of construction dependent on social context. Zembylas (2005) points out how the recent extensive research into teacher identity draws on poststructuralist theorisations of identity. A view that teacher identity is contingent, fragile and constantly in a state of reconstruction has come to characterise much of the scholarly analysis in this field of research. Coldron and Smith (1999) discuss the dynamic nature of identity in their reflection on how teachers acquire their identities. They argue that, rather than being fixed and unitary, teacher identity is fluid and multifaceted. Throughout their careers, teachers are engaged in creating themselves as teachers. They define and redefine their teacher identity in a continual process of social legitimation to themselves and others. This notion of teacher identity being formed through relations to both the self and others is echoed by Lasky (2005) who states that "teacher professional identity is how teachers define themselves to themselves and to each other" (p. 901). Similarly, Convery (1999) discusses how teachers are involved in the construction of identity and reconstruction when they narrativise their practice for themselves and others. Teacher identity as a field of inquiry can

therefore be seen as an exploration of the ongoing recursive dialogue between the self and others in a diversity of social contexts.

It is important to acknowledge that the postmodern shift from a unified persistent self to a multifarious discontinuous identity has been critiqued in the literature. In proposing a dialogical approach to conceptualising teacher identity, Akkerman and Meijer (2011) argue the dichotomy between modernist and postmodern conceptions of teacher identity can be unhelpful. A dialogic approach to teacher identity attempts to provide a model of identity that allows for both multiple identities and a unified core identity. A dialogic approach also balances a discontinuous view of identity where notions of self are under constant deconstruction and reconstruction with a view of identity as a historically continuous narrative. From a dialogical perspective, teachers, as individuals, are shaped by their social context but also act as transcendent agents that shape the social spaces they negotiate. While there are undoubtedly multiple subidentities, or I-positions, that make up a teacher's identity, Akkerman and Meijer (2011) argue there must be some form of unified and continuous self that reconciles tensions between the continually emerging and conflicting I-positions. The authors conclude that stability of identity is maintained through narratives where multiple discordant experiences are synthesised into a singular narrative structure allowing a consistent and coherent sense of self. Rodgers and Scott (2008) have captured elements of the dialogic theory of identity formation in their observation that "if our identities are stories, then our selves might be the storytellers" (p. 738).

How is identity and teacher identity constructed? (Agency versus structure).

Central to any discussion of teacher identity construction is the place of structure and agency in this process. Coldron and Smith (1999) argue that the process of identity construction is formed through a combination of inherited social structures and the choices people actively make in the social spaces they exist in. Drawing on Bourdieu's theory of habitus, teacher life-history research and their 40 years of cumulative experience as teachers in the English and Welsh education systems, the authors advance a philosophical case for viewing identity construction as a balance between the influence of structure and agency. The social determination aspect of their thinking on identity is influenced by the social theory of Bourdieu (1984) and Foucault (1981) who assert that personal identity and action are habituated by the operation of power in society that is controlled by particular social groups. On the other hand, the personal agency facet of their thesis is based on the life-history strand of educational research. Life-history researchers have sought to examine the life cycle of teachers, to illuminate how teachers' sense of self shifts through time, and have shown the ability of teachers to be creative and moral decision makers in the uniquely personal act of teaching (Goodson, 1991; Sikes, 1985; Woods, 1987). Coldron and

Smith (1999) suggest that there are patterned sets of practices or traditions that are available for teachers to choose or reject. These traditions, or structures, inform a range of possibilities that teachers actively locate themselves in relation to; these possibilities provide teachers with resources and discourses to draw on as they try to make sense of questions of practice. Hence in the construction of a teacher's identity, there is the influence of structure (patterned sets of practices or traditions) and agency (the active location of the teacher in relation to these traditions). Social structures influence location by providing the traditions, practices and discourses of teaching that offer some, but not other, possible choices.

Coldron and Smith discuss how education policies that dominated England and Wales in the latter half of the 20th century, such as the postwar tripartite school system and, more latterly, national standards for teacher training, have shaped four influential social traditions or discourses in teaching: the craft tradition (the teacher as craftsperson), the moral tradition (the teacher as moral agent), the artistic tradition (the teacher as artist), and the scientific tradition (the teacher as scientist). The teacher as craftsperson identity is formed as teachers learn to apply their skills through making decisions over possible learning experiences and teaching approaches that lead to predetermined ends. The teacher as moral agent identity is formed as teachers make moral judgements and in doing so actively locate themselves in relation to other possible moral decisions they could have made. The teacher as artist identity is formed by the way teachers work with and respond to the socially given resources of the world of teaching practice by generating additional resources through an aesthetic response to professional experience. The teacher as scientist identity is formed as teachers engage with educational research in a scientific manner through engaging in critical analysis of the methods and results of others' work and also through conducting their own investigations. These traditions make available certain kinds of resources to teachers that help frame their identity development. Coldron and Smith clarify that these are not the only "traditions" of teaching that shape identity development but they have been prominent in debates about the nature of teaching in the United Kingdom.

A sociocultural approach to exploring teacher identity also acknowledges the influence of both structure and agency in identity construction. A sociocultural approach to identity is premised on a Vygotskian view of human development where learning is seen to occur first of all on the social plane (interpersonally) and then psychologically (interpersonally; Ormrod, 2016). How individuals develop, including how they construct identity, is shaped by their social environment and the cultural tools that result from the social and cultural evolution of this environment (Vygotsky, 1962). Vygotsky argues that each culture has a set of physical and mental tools

“through which culture is expressed and passed on” (Duchesne et al., 2013, p. 85). From a sociocultural perspective, individuals always have agency in their social environment, but possibilities for action are mediated by the cultural tools at hand (Lasky, 2005).

Using this notion of “mediated agency,” Lasky (2005) explores how large-scale educational reforms in Ontario, Canada, impacted on teacher identity and particularly the way in which vulnerability was experienced by participants. Lasky surveyed 59 teachers in one secondary school on their experiences of large-scale reforms and the impact these had on collegiality, school leadership and material support. Surveys were followed up with in-depth semi-structured interviews with four volunteer teachers from the same school. An analysis of data revealed two ways in which vulnerability was experienced in relation to teacher identity. Firstly, vulnerability was experienced as an emotional openness to others where sharing emotional pain and embarrassment was considered crucial by participating teachers to establishing learning-focussed relationships of trust with learners. As Murphy and Alexander (2007) observe, teacher vulnerability is crucial if students are to feel safe to critically challenge authority with reasoned arguments. Secondly, vulnerability was experienced as a sense of powerlessness and fear in the face of external educational requirements of the large-scale reforms. Through this second experience of vulnerability, participants were forced into making pedagogical decisions that often contradicted their fundamental values and beliefs about teaching. The externally driven reform mandates interacted with the teacher identity of participants and impacted on their sense of agency and willingness to be professionally vulnerable with their students. Participants revealed that they simultaneously experienced the open/willing aspect of professional vulnerability and the protective/inefficacious component. The mediational system of the recent reform context and the mediational system of early professional influences on teacher identity resulted in teachers negotiating conflicts between compliance requirements within the reform discourse and their core values and beliefs about teaching.

A wide range of authors have sought to refine our understanding regarding the range of discourses that shape teacher identity construction. As discussed earlier, the increased interest in teacher identity that flowed from the neoliberal reform agenda of the last 3 decades of the 20th century saw managerialist and democratic discourses rise in prominence in the teacher identity literature alongside the associated identities of “teacher as entrepreneur” and “teacher as activist” (Day et al., 2005; Foster, 2017; Lasky, 2005; Moore et al., 2002; Sachs, 2001; Smyth, 2002). Coldron and Smith (1999) offer a more discursive view of teacher identity construction than the entrepreneur activist duality when they identify the multiple traditions of teaching that inform identity construction. Similarly, Søreide (2006) points to multiple competing narrative

discourses that teachers oscillate between as they construct and reconstruct their teacher identity. Using interviews with four Norwegian elementary teachers, Søreide carried out a discourse analysis that revealed how participants used “narrative resources to construct and negotiate several possible teacher identities” (p. 527). These identity constructions include “the caring and kind teacher,” “the creative and innovative teacher,” “the professional teacher,” and “the typical teacher.” When participants identified as the caring and kind teacher, they emphasised the importance of creating a safe social environment for children. The creative and innovative teacher is highlighted when the teachers discussed their enjoyment of drawing on their own interests and passions to improve their teaching competencies. The professional teacher was characterised when participants stressed the separation of their working life from their personal life. While there are few explicit references to the typical teacher made by the teachers in the study, implicit throughout all interviews was the idea of a teacher as a person who is responsible, well organised and a bit boring. Beijaard, Verloop, and Vermunt (2000) describe how teacher identity comprises three subidentities: the teacher as subject matter expert, the teacher as didactical expert, and the teacher as pedagogical expert. The subject matter identity emphasises a commitment to subject knowledge and skills. The didactical expert highlights a deep understanding of teaching and learning processes. The pedagogical expert accentuates the support of students’ social wellbeing. The authors used a questionnaire to probe the perceptions of 80 experienced Dutch secondary school teachers regarding their perceptions of professional identity and how these perceptions had changed since their period as beginning teachers. They found teachers viewed themselves as a combination of these subidentities with specific identities taking precedence in particular contexts and at certain biographical moments in their professional journey.

While the teacher identity literature has been helpful in illuminating the types of discourses that shape teacher identity, it is Althusser’s (2006) theory of interpellation that provides a unique insight into how and why teachers gravitate towards different identities at particular biographical moments.

Can the theory of interpellation be useful in exploring teacher identity construction?

The concept of interpellation has been useful in explaining how teacher identity is constructed (Atkinson, 2004; Watson, 2007). Interpellation is a theory of ideology developed by the Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser. For Althusser (2006), an individual becomes a subject of ideology when they recognise themselves as being summoned or hailed by ideology. Althusser provides an example of a police officer calling “Hey you!” and an individual recognising that it is indeed them being hailed. When an individual recognises the hail, they become a subject of ideology. In

recognising the hail is intended for them, there is a recognition that they have always been there as a unique subject, a subject of an ideology. There is an “obviousness” to the hail. Much like in Gramsci’s notion of hegemony, the ideology of the ruling class becomes obvious and common sense and incorporates individuals into the power structure. It is through this process that Althusser argues “ideology interpellates individuals as subjects” (p. 103).

Snir (2015) discusses how the theory of interpellation can be utilised in social science. Snir has suggested “to be interpellated is to identify with a particular idea or identity” (p. 5). Snir argues that when we recognise we are being hailed we accept the social identity being offered to us whether that be old, young, gay, athletic, Black, etc. Interpellation functions through the process of individuals acknowledging the significance of some ideology in which they live and, through this recognition, become subject to the ideology. Therefore, the subject does not exist until the hail of ideology is recognised, and ideology can only exist when it has constituted individuals as subjects. Althusser (2006) explains this double constitution:

I say: the category of the subject is constitutive of all ideology, but at the same time and immediately I add that *the category of the subject is only constitutive of all ideology insofar as all ideology has the function (which defines it) of “constituting” concrete individuals as subjects.* (p. 160).

The example of the police officer hailing and an individual recognising that it is them being hailed is an example of the ideological state apparatus of law and crime interpellating the individual as subject. Other examples of apparatuses are education, media and religion (Althusser, 2006). Snir (2015) argues that interpellation as a process encompasses all human interactions, as “we are always already in ideology, we generate systems of ideologies ourselves, always already implicated as subjects of and subjects (re) producing interpellation” (p. 6).

Atkinson (2004) also applies the theory of interpellation to how student teachers form their identities. He argues that the pervasive educational discourse of the reflective, reflexive and critical practitioner relies on the existence of an individual who is able to be neutral, objective and rational when analysing their practice. Atkinson argues that the notion of student teachers as subjects occupying “positions of transcendence or autonomy” (p. 386) is imaginary. Because the reflective practitioner can only be a subject to the discourses of reflective practice, “the subject does not exist independently or prior to them” (p. 386). Atkinson suggests that, while reflective discourses are important for student teachers to reflect on their experiences to become better teachers, the reflective discourse is itself interpellatory in that it constrains the subject to its own normative framework and maintains a specific teacher identity. In conclusion Atkinson states:

Thus, the element of transcendence presupposed by reflective (reflexive or critical) practice and its attendant notion of a prior consciousness or subjectivity able to reflect is replaced by the notion that reflective practice produces subjects and that such practice is always already ideological; the student teacher does not exist prior to reflection; he is interpellated as a student teacher through reflective practice and policed by its particular ideological framing. (p. 393)

Atkinson is able to demonstrate that even the emancipatory motivations of the discourse of the critically reflective teacher do not immunise such a discourse from being interpellatory. Thus interpellation is a hail heard from the left and the right, from above and below.

A revised theory of teacher identity construction.

Like a magpie, I have pilfered the literature to develop the following theoretical framework of teacher identity. Carter (2014) has discussed the possibility of an eclectic or “magpie” approach to the use of theory in higher education. Rather than being definitive, I see this theoretical framework as part of an ongoing dialogical exercise that will continue to open up lines of enquiry for myself and others (Carter, 2014). For now, and in the work that follows, my theory on the process of teacher identity construction combines three key areas of research. I draw on teacher life-history research (Coldron & Smith, 1999), elements of sociocultural theory (Lasky, 2005) and the theory of interpellation (Althusser, 2006) to produce a theoretical framework for understanding teacher identity that addresses debates over structure and agency. Here are the theories I draw on, in brief.

Coldron and Smith’s (1999) central argument is that teacher identity is formed as teachers actively locate themselves in social space in relation to competing discourses or “traditions of teaching.” Drawing on life-history research, the authors suggest four broad traditions of teaching that educators are continually locating themselves within, between and against. The artistic, moral, craftsperson and scientific traditions create discursive notions of teaching that enable teachers to justify their practice to themselves and others at different biographical moments.

Lasky (2005) proposes the process of teacher identity can best be understood through a sociocultural lens whereby teachers are continually in the process of constructing their identities through the use of cultural tools that come in the form of policy mandates, curricula, codes of ethics and so on. Lasky argues that while teachers have agency in how they respond to the demands of teaching, their sense of identity is always mediated through these cultural tools.

French philosopher Louis Althusser (2006) uses the term *interpellation* to describe the process through which ideology comes to cast the individual as subject. Althusser proposes that ideology

only exists when individuals recognise they are being hailed by the ideological apparatuses of the state. It is in the recognition of the “hailing” that individuals become subjects as, in recognising the hail, it was as if they were always there as a subject.

In responding to my supervisor’s question: “How do you believe identity is constructed?”, I hybridise key elements of each aforementioned theory. The notion of interpellation is useful in understanding the way in which varying discourses hail individual teachers to take up particular positions as subjects. The notion of how the recognition of the hail creates the individual as subject, a subject that has always been there waiting for a summons, resonates both personally and professionally. I think back to my days teaching in New Zealand in the 1990s and hearing the hail of teacher accountability and responding to the call with endless checklists of learning intentions. Each tick against a learning intention further inscribed my identity as auditor and an adder of value. However, this structural deterministic account of teacher identity is problematic. I was indeed a subject of those neoliberal calls but surely I had agency in my response?

Lasky (2005) has been helpful here in developing my understanding of how the dominance of particular discourses mediates the agency of teachers through providing particular cultural tools and expectations for teaching. It is through the cultural tools made available by these discourses that individuals are both subject to ideology but also able exercise their agency. There is choice in how an individual teacher works with the cultural tools at their disposal within particular educational discourses; however, the cultural tools themselves mediate that agency and the construction of what it means to be a teacher. Harking again to my teaching in the 1990s, I can now name as cultural tools the curricula, school schemes, Education Review Office reports and student portfolios that mediated my agency. When I actively located myself in opposition to the neoliberal *teacher as entrepreneur* discourse (Sachs, 2001), by surreptitiously falsifying assessment results to allow my students to learn deeply without the ever-present pall of summative assessment hanging in the classroom air, I was constrained in my response to use the cultural tools of a neoliberal discourse. In part, my identity as “teacher as activist” (Moore et al., 2002; Sachs, 2001; Smyth, 2002) was always being mediated by the cultural tools of the dominant discourse of managerialism.

Scene Six (Sometime in the imaginary future)

I am having a break from my summer of writing at the beautiful Cheltenham beach. I swim out to where I can just touch the sandy sea floor with the tips of my toes. Another bather swims towards me, head bobbing with each sweep of her breast stroke. I recognise the sparkling eyes and warm smile immediately.

“Kia ora, Barbara.”

“Kia ora, Paul. Lovely to see you. I have a question for you.”

“Shoot!”

“How do you believe identity is constructed?”

“Through processes of interpellation and active social location, mediated by the cultural tools of available discourses.”

I take a deep breath and dive down to the cool sandy bottom of the Waitematā and wait for a response.

Scene Seven (An extended metaphor)

I stand on the summit of Rangitoto and admire the panoramic 360-degree view. No better spot to observe the lands of the tangata whenua of Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland). To the south west I see the golden thread of shoreline that ribbons along the seaside suburbs of St Heliers, Kohimarama, and Mission Bay. Bastion Point makes its green prominence known and the golden thread tapers off. The land of the Ngāti Whātua-o-Ōrākei iwi spreads southwards and my gaze traces an imaginary path from Maungarei (Mt Wellington) to Maungawhau (Mt Eden) and finally to Te Ahi ka roa a Raka (Mt Albert). Beyond Mt Albert, the western edge of the city’s suburban outskirts are protected by the ancient volcanic remnants of the imposing Waitakere Ranges, home of the Te Kawerau A-Maki iwi.

As I look down upon my home city I am reminded of a recent achievement of a friend of mine. Shaun, an endurance athlete, set himself the task of running up every scoria cone and around every explosion crater in Auckland’s volcanic field in one weekend without using a car. This was no small feat given the size of Auckland, there being 56 volcanoes to knock off, with two of these sitting in the Waitematā harbour. He did it! He knocked the bastard off!

Reflecting on Shaun’s achievement, my eyes drift westwards to the Waitakere Ranges and my mind returns to my streetlight metaphor for the construction of teacher identity. The limitations of this metaphor were drawn to my attention in the July 2017 supervision meeting. While it was acknowledged the streetlights did illuminate the pull and push of the democratic and managerialist professional identities, it was suggested by my supervisors that the metaphor could not sustain the multiplicity of identity positions that teachers take depending on the cultural and social context of their work. Now, as I scan my city’s volcanoes, another potential metaphor comes to mind.

The volcanoes of Auckland are the multiple identity positions available for teachers to inhabit; these identities include teacher as entrepreneur, as activist, as craftsperson, as moral agent, as scientist, as artist, as caring nurturer, as creative innovator, as subject matter expert, as didactical

teaching and learning process expert, as pedagogical relationship expert, to name but a few. The endurance runner navigating the Auckland's volcanic fields is the teacher. The volcanic field provides the endurance runner with a range of maunga (mountains) to climb and basins to traverse. The viability and attraction of these volcanic features is mediated by the space the runner finds for themselves within the volcanic field and the trail they have already taken. Importantly, the runner's choices are, to a certain extent, determined by the history of the magma chamber that sits beneath Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland) and the historical scars it has left on the skin of Papatūānuku (Mother Earth). Like the distance runner in the volcanic field choosing a maunga to ascend, teachers have some agency in the identities they ascribe to. However, these choices are mediated by where they find themselves in the field of teacher identity, the historical moment they exist in and the ideological landscape they find themselves traversing.

In the following two chapters, I interrogate my own ethical decision making through the previously discussed theoretical framework of teacher identity construction, in an attempt to uncover how, as a university teacher, *I experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching*. In analysing my own stories of ethical dilemmas, I am cognisant of Chang's (2008) reminder that when we tell our stories we tell the stories of others. My use of fiction, using pseudonyms and changing identifying character markers such as age, gender, ethnicity, institutional position and setting, ensures characters and events are not clearly identifiable. In instances where I have not been able to protect the identity of those implicated in my stories, such as family members and close friends, I have asked them to read the relevant case studies and had their approval to include these stories in the final thesis (Hernandez & Wambura Ngunjiri, 2016).

Chapter Seven

I was Wondering if it Could be Possible for Me to Do My Next Practicum at...? The Compassion Versus Regulations Dilemma

Introduction

In this chapter, I describe an amalgamation of incidents that occurred across a period of 4 years during my time as leader of the Graduate Diploma of Teaching (Primary) programme. I take literary liberty in unpicking the ethical seams of my lived experiences so they become loose enough to retrieve individual biographic threads. These threads have been reconstituted as the warp and weft of four factionalised autoethnographic accounts of my ethical decision making. These stories exemplify how I negotiate the ethics of university teaching as I attempt to reconcile the tension between compassion/flexibility and university regulation in my role as programme leader. The structure of the chapter follows the first three stages of Smyth's model of critical reflection; the fourth and final reconstruct stage will be returned to in the conclusion chapter of the thesis.

Through the initial, *describe*, stage, each story is presented as an individual dramatic "act" providing an evocative text available for reflective deliberation. Morgan (2013) discusses how fiction is based on real events that are dramatised through literary techniques that give insights into the unknown thoughts and motivations of protagonists. Each act is a factionalised mix of conversations, emails, and my own professional/personal responses to each incident. In the second, *inform*, stage, I step away from the action of the describe phase and begin to theorise my ethical decision making through an imagined scene in an ethical control room. The industrial control room metaphor provides a platform to explore my ethical decision making from the vantage point of different ethical perspectives including: the Kantian notion of universal moral laws, the utilitarian concern with consequences, a feminist ethic of care orientation and the case for the ethical egotist (Campbell, 2003; Clark, 2005; Rachels & Rachels, 2015; Snook, 2003). At this stage, I consider questions such as: how can I equitably balance different interests? What are the outcomes for those involved? What universal rules are at stake here? What is the right thing to do? What should the good teacher/programme leader do? (Rachels & Rachels, 2015). The third, *confront*, stage of the chapter steps further away from the action to locate my ethical decision making in the broader cultural, social and political context of my work as a university teacher. At this stage, I put my theoretical framework of teacher identity to work in analysing how my ethical decision making is an act of identity construction played out in an ongoing dilemmatic space that requires decisions that balance compassion/flexibility and regulation.

Describe: In Which I Lay Out the “Facts” of My Ethical Dilemma in Four Acts

The practicum setting.

The Graduate Diploma of Teaching (Primary) programme is underpinned by a partnership school-based approach to ITE. In this 1-year programme, students complete face-to-face curriculum and professional studies courses at the Epsom Campus of the University of Auckland. For their practicum placements in schools, the students are required to complete three school placements from a choice of 30 partnership schools throughout the Auckland region. An agreement is drawn up between the university and each partnership school. This agreement obligates the university to only use partnership schools for practicum placements, while each school is obliged to provide between four and six associate teachers for the three practicum blocks. Students are advised at interview of this arrangement for practicum placements. While students have some ability to choose within the partnership schools, they are informed when interviewed for the programme that schools outside the partnership consortium are not an option. Nevertheless, each year, students request to be placed at non-partnership schools for a range of reasons. As programme leader I needed to decide whether stick to programme regulations when fielding such requests or exercise compassion and flexibility.

Act One: Hayden

March 2016.

Hayden is a student teacher in the Graduate Diploma of Teaching (Primary) programme at the University of Auckland. He is sitting at the dinner table with his wife and three daughters in the well-heeled suburb of South Harbour. The three girls ask to be excused and drift back to their devices before the 8.00 p.m. curfew is imposed.

“You could at least ask, Hayden. You know you have a job lined up at Fieldavon next year, so why not do your final practicum there so you can get to know your colleagues and the way the school works?”

“I’ve told you, Deb, I can’t do a practicum in schools that are not on the list. Fieldavon Intermediate is not on the list.”

“Well it seems bloody stupid you can’t do a practicum in a school you know you are going to teach at next year. The programme is meant to be preparing you to teach, why not prepare you to teach in the school you will actually be teaching in next year. It’s common sense. If law students

can do internships in firms they intend to work for in the future, then why can't the same logic be applied to teachers?"

Hayden takes a sip of his cab sav and gently swirls the glass, his eyes fixing on the settling sediment. "You do have a point. I could ask Paul. He can only say no." One last gulp of the wine, dregs and all. "I'll flick him an email now and set up a meeting."

Wed 10/9/2015 10:11 a.m.

Hayden Bridges {haydo@memail.co.nz}

To: Paul Heyward

Dear Paul

I hope you are well. I was wondering if it could be possible for me to do my next practicum at Fieldavon Intermediate. I know it is not a partnership school, so this is technically a non-starter, but I know the DP there and he really wants me to apply for a job at Fieldavon next year. If I can do my last practicum there, I will get the chance to get a good understanding of the school culture and organisation which could only be of benefit for me as I start my first teaching position.

I look forward to your response.

Kind regards,

Hayden

This was the first time I had received a request for a student to be placed outside of the partnership school consortium. I had observed Hayden on his second practicum and was impressed with his organisation, warmth and purpose. He would be an excellent "catch" for any school. As a mature student, Hayden, who had experience running a successful business, had arrived at the Faculty of Education after loving his experience coaching his daughter's hockey team. The fact he had a job offer so early in the course was not a surprise. Why not bend the rules on this one? I had no doubt Hayden would pass the practicum so why not make his transition to his beginning teacher position as smooth as possible? Why apply a bureaucratic obstacle to a perfectly legitimate idea? As I went to type that completing a practicum at Fieldavon Intermediate would be no problem I found myself suddenly deferring my decision to another colleague even though, as programme leader, I had every right to make this decision independently.

Wed 10/9/2015 5.01 p.m.

Paul Heyward {p.heyward@unimail.co.nz}

To: Hayden Bridges

Dear Hayden

While this seems like a reasonable request, I need to check with my administrator to see if this is possible. I'll get back to you.

Kind regards

Paul

Well done me. I had successfully moved any danger of accusation of bureaucratic inflexibility to the door of my administrator! Or so I thought. If a positive outcome could not be achieved for Hayden, I would look like a fellow victim of the sticklers who had done his best to subvert the system. However, in a meeting with him, the administrator's reply put the ball squarely back in my court:

"It is up to you if you let Hayden go to Fieldavon Intermediate. You are the programme leader. However, just be aware if you let Hayden do this you will get many other requests of the same nature. Students will talk and they hate feeling disadvantaged in any way whatsoever to their peers. The whole partnership model could fall apart."

The administrator then leaned back in his chair and carried on...

"The beauty of the partnership model is we have guaranteed associate teachers for each student. Once we move outside partnership schools, we start taking placements away from the other primary programmes and this creates inequity between programmes. It also creates a major headache in finding enough associates for all students across all programmes."

He then leaned towards me, I could almost see an imaginary finger wagging in my face:

"You also need to consider how ethical is it for Hayden to go into a practicum at a school where he has a relationship with senior management. What if he bombs? How will the school be able to make an objective decision on his performance given this relationship? Anyway Paul, as I said, it is up to you whether you place Hayden at Fieldavon."

And so, I wrote an email to Hayden.

Wed 11/9/2015 3.56 p.m.

Paul Heyward {p.heyward@unimail.co.nz}

To: Hayden Bridges

Dear Hayden

I have discussed your request to be placed at Fieldavon Intermediate for your final practicum with the practicum administrator. Regrettably I have to inform you this will not be possible.

Kind regards

Paul

Act Two: Sally

August 2016.

Sally knew the outcome the moment she entered the oncologist's office. She had been supporting her mother through her cancer treatment for just over a year now and had become familiar with Dr Cindy Jackson's engaging smile and warm eyes. Today, however, Cindy struggled to make eye contact and her smile only briefly flickered before a tired resignation spread across her face. Sally wondered for a moment how often Cindy had to deliver news of finality rather than hope in her working week. Her sympathy for the doctor was suddenly overwhelmed by the impending loss of her rock, her life force, her mother.

"Here take some of these" said Cindy pushing a box of tissues across her desk. "I am afraid the news is not as promising as we had hoped for. The tumour has grown back. Surgery is not an option I am afraid. Treatment from this point will only be palliative. There is the possibility of ..."

The doctor's verdict was cut short. "How long?" Sally's Mum asked firmly.

"Well, we aren't able to give a precise timeframe as there are a range of..."

"How long?"

"You'll be very lucky to see Christmas. I am so sorry."

Sally felt guilty on the drive home. She was meant to be supporting her Mum but here she was a passenger in her own car crying into the last of the doctor's tissues.

"Don't worry, I have a supply" Cindy had said, handing her the box as they left her surgery.

Her Mum looked resolutely ahead as she drove out of the gates of Dunstan Hospital and headed home.

“Now while I only have 6 months ahead of me you have your entire life to think about. You are not going to mope around Dunstan for the rest of the year getting under my feet. Tomorrow we are putting you back on a flight to Auckland. You are going to finish your diploma and become a teacher. It has been your dream since you were a girl. If it wasn't for my ambitions for you to get a real profession in the law you would be teaching now. Word of advice, Sally. When you have your own kids let them furrow their own field, not yours.”

As the plane taxied away from the terminal Sally felt her guilt begin to return. She had not protested when her mother had ordered her back to Auckland to complete the final semester of her Graduate Diploma in Teaching. In truth, she had felt relieved. Relieved to be leaving her home town that now seemed thrown under a permanent shadow. Relieved to be leaving the forced cheerfulness of family gatherings where talk of times past was all that could be mustered by way of conversation. As relief transformed to guilt, Sally pressed her face against the cabin window. Looking out she saw a heavy white frost coating the paddocks that bordered the runway. There will be no frost in Auckland, she thought, as the engines began to roar.

“Hi Mum how you are? That's good. Yeah uni is going well. Look I have been thinking about what you said about me staying in Auckland and finishing my diploma. I only have another 6 weeks of lectures left before the holidays, then after that we have our final 5-week practicum. I was thinking of asking whether I could be placed in a school in Dunstan. Yes, officially we can only do our pracs in the partnership schools which are all in Auckland but I was thinking of asking the programme leader if he would give some kind of dispensation given the, umm, situation. I just wanted to make sure you'd be cool with that. I would be too busy with practicum to get under your feet but we'd be able to spend some time together. What do you think?”

The next day in my office:

Sally: “Hi Paul. Thanks so much for seeing me. I know you must be super busy. Oh, by the way, the girl at reception asked me to give you this.” Sally passes me an envelope. “It just arrived this morning and as I was seeing you, she asked me to drop it off.”

Paul: “Thanks Sally. Please take a seat” I take the envelope from Sally and place it unopened on my keyboard. I take a seat opposite Sally at the small round meeting table.

Sally: “I feel really embarrassed asking you this Paul. I am not the kind of student who asks for special privileges. I like to go with the flow but something is happening in my life that makes things pretty tough being here in Auckland. My family are in Dunstan in the South Island and I have just found out my mother has terminal cancer. We don’t think she will make Christmas, so I would really like to be close to her. I am committed to staying in Auckland to complete the programme but was wondering if I could return to Dunstan to complete my final practicum?”

I look into Sally’s eyes and see a fear and confusion I am sadly too familiar with. It was 20 years ago this week that my own mother died after a short and shocking battle with cancer. I was a University of Auckland student at the time, completing my BA. My mother had been diagnosed at the beginning of Semester 1 and was gone half way through Semester 2. Those few months were a blur of specialist visits, oncology wards and broken sleep on hospital stretchers. University study became a refuge of normality so I totally understood Sally’s wish to continue with the programme. I also knew how important it was for Sally to spend as much time as possible with her family. On compassionate grounds I was going to do everything in my power to ensure Sally could complete her final practicum in her home town close to whānau.

As Sally closed the door, I moved back to my desk by the window and took a moment to look out at the bare maple tree struggling in the watery winter sunlight. My mind drifted back through time to the cold winter months in 1995, the last months of my Mum’s life. As tears begin to make me blink, I noticed the envelope on my keyboard. Pleased to be distracted from my nostalgic melancholy I slipped my forefinger under the seal of the envelope and ripped it open. Inside was a letter from an anonymous student.

Dear Mr Heyward

Please treat the following as a formal letter of complaint regarding the ongoing discrimination that I feel is occurring in the Graduate Diploma of Teaching (Primary) programme.

You have repeatedly told us that we can only complete practicums at one of the schools on the partnership school list. This is also reiterated on page 22 of the practicum booklet where it states that we must complete all our practicums within partnership consortium schools. I can totally accept these parameters when they are applied fairly to all students. However, this is clearly NOT the case!!! It has come to my attention that at least three students in the current cohort have been able to negotiate their own practicum placements outside of the official consortium of schools and it would seem all these students are Maoris and Islanders. I am in no way a racist but it seems totally unfair that some students are getting an advantage in the programme because of race.

I have paid good money for completing this programme and am upset that I am getting an inferior product compared to my peers who are lucky enough to have the right skin colour. In getting to select their own school, the lucky few are getting in unfair advantage over the rest of us as they are able to choose a school that they will feel comfortable in and that they are likely to succeed in. The rest of us do not have this luxury and this is both unfair and discriminatory. I would like to see that this would be rectified and that everybody in the cohort is starting practicum three on a level playing field.

Yours in anticipation

Anon

Act Three: Meghan

September 2017.

Kim has just dropped her two children off at their daycare in the semi-rural town of West Hinterland. As she walks back to her car, she notices her neighbour Meghan behind the wheel of her late nineties people mover. She is slumped forward, head in hands, shoulders rocking back and forth in a rhythmic sob.

Kim hesitates before knocking lightly on the passenger window. Meghan raises her head, looks at Kim with tear-washed eyes and attempts a neighbourly smile. The smile quickly crumples as the next wave of tears crashes. Kim opens the door and slides alongside her long-time neighbour and friend and embraces her in both arms.

“Ohh, Meghan, come here, it’s alright babes, it’s alright.”

Meghan buries her head deep into the embrace and continues to sob.

“Just let it out. Just let it out.”

Suddenly Meghan sits up and wiping her face with the sleeves of her cardigan. Pushing back her shoulders and straightening her posture, she checks her face in the rear-vision mirror.

“Oh God, look at me. I’m so sorry, Kim. I didn’t mean to break down. I just, I just, it’s got all too much. Really, I am sorry. I shouldn’t be sitting here blubbering. What a mess I am.”

“Don’t be stupid. We all have our moments in this crazy fucked-up world. You need a coffee and chat. Let’s go back to mine.”

“I can’t. I am meant to be at uni by 8.30.”

“And I’m meant to be at work in 10 minutes. But fuck work and fuck uni!”

The two women sit on the back deck of Kim's brick and tile unit. The morning sun glares through watery grey clouds. Meghan's black shades hide her tired eyes.

"Another coffee?" offers Kim lifting the quarter-full plunger.

"No, I'm right thanks Kimmy."

"So, what's going on Meghan?"

"What do you think? Same old, same old. Asshole's gone and left me high and dry again. He knew that I needed him to take the kids for 5 weeks over October and November so I can finish my final practicum for uni. He agreed to it last year before I enrolled. So, what's he gone and done? Taken a 3-month contract in Aussie starting in September. Prick!"

"Well, tell the prick to pull his bloody head in and look after his kids as agreed."

"He reckons by taking the contract he is looking after the kids. The Aussie mines are lucrative and he will earn five times what he gets at the mill. How much will come our way and how much will be pissed up against the walls of Kalgoorlie's finest is anyone's guess. In the meantime, I need to work out how I am going to get three kids to and from their daycare, primary and intermediate while needing to complete a practicum where the closest possible placement is a 50-minute drive away. They warn us that the final practicum is really demanding. We need to do 3 weeks of full responsibility that involves planning, teaching and assessing the whole classroom programme. There is no way I am going to pass if I have to have full responsibility for a class of 30 while having full responsibility for my three ratbags. I found practicum two hard enough and that's when I had Mum staying and helping out. But now, with Dad's stroke, I can't ask her."

"OK Meghan, here's the plan for your final practicum. If you can get the kids to school, I can pick them up in the afternoon. I will need to borrow your seven-seater. You can take my Corolla. I'll sort after school sports, homework and cook them dinner so you can stay at your practicum school as long as you like. When you get home, all you will need to do is eat the dinner I will have made and kiss the kids goodnight. In the weekends they can hang at my place. Sorted babe."

"Oh, Kimmy, I can't expect you to do all that!"

"Would you do the same for me if our positions were reversed?"

"Of course..."

"Well that's sorted then."

A tear sneaks beneath the black rim of Meghan's sunglasses. She leans towards Kim and gives her a long, silent, grateful hug.

"The only issue is, the earliest I can drop Olly off is 7.45. The closest prac school available to me is a 50-minute drive on a good day and at least an hour at peak times, so I won't be able to get to school until 8.45. We have been told a minimum expectation is that we are at school by at least 8.30 but we really should be there by 8."

"I would offer to do the morning drop off but you know I work mornings and I don't have the leave to take 5 weeks off."

"No Kimmy you are doing more than enough, I need to think of another solution."

"Why can't you do a practicum at one of the schools in the local area? I can think of at least six primary schools within a 15-minute drive."

"They are not on the list. The uni has some kind of partnership with 30 schools around the Auckland area. We can only do practicums at these schools. Unfortunately, the only school in West Hinterland on the list is the intermediate Ollie goes to and we are not allowed to do practicums at schools where family members attend or are employed in case there is a conflict of interest."

"Jesus Christ, all I hear about that university is the rules you must abide by. Surely the point of going there is to learn to teach, not follow their silly bugger rules. Why don't you ask if they can bend the rules in your case? Surely they would understand that circumstances have moved beyond your control."

"I could ask the programme leader, Paul. I know he has three kids so he may be sympathetic. I will try to see him tomorrow."

The next day, in my office:

Meghan: "Sorry I'm late, the traffic was a nightmare. I live all the way out in West Hinterland so I got caught in traffic. In fact, West Hinterland is what I want to talk about. I am finding it really stressful dealing with the traffic every morning. I need to drop my kids off at school in West Hinterland and then get here for classes at 8.30. I had arranged for my ex-partner to do drop-offs but he has unexpectedly gone to Australia for work. It is going to be even worse on practicum as we need to be at our schools by 8.00. I really need to be placed in a school in the West Hinterland

area or I don't think I can cope. I know there are no partnership schools there but I know of a student from last year's Grad Dip programme that did her last practicum out that way so it has been done before. Please???"

Paul: "I totally understand your frustrations with Auckland traffic; however, you were informed at the interview and at the beginning of the course that you could only do practicums in our partnership schools. I am afraid there is nothing I can do."

Meghan: "But last year a student from the programme did her final practicum in a school in West Hinterland."

Paul: "That maybe the case but at that point I was not programme leader. You understand if I let one student move outside the partnership school model then I will need to consider requests from all other students. The whole partnership model could fall apart."

I stand up as Meghan trudges from my office. It is early evening. Meghan will be battling rush hour before getting home to prepare the evening meal. I catch my reflection in my office window as I return to my chair. I stare at my translucent image and wonder if I am being the person I want to be.

Act Four: Cassy

August 2018.

Six members of the Herd family huddle in the hallway of their suburban bungalow, ears pressed against the bedroom door of the youngest of the Herd clan. Mother Herd had just taken a call from the chair of the Olympic selection panel asking to speak to Cassy. On being handed the phone and informed of the caller Cassy immediately rushed to her room so she could hear the news alone. On the hallway walls there are numerous framed photographs of triumphant family members posing upon bicycles with trophies held aloft. The Herds are a well-known clan in cycling circles. Father Herd was a former North Island time-trial champion, while his four children hold eight separate age-group titles between them. However, there has never been an Olympian in the family. The huddle silently listens for any sign of confirmation or rejection. Without warning, the door handle turns and the eavesdroppers step back as one. The door swings open to reveal Cassy standing stock still, deadpan face looking straight ahead. "I'm going to Brazil. I can't believe it! I am actually going to bloody Brazil!" The huddle joyfully reforms, this time with Cassy in the middle, and the celebrations begin.

The next morning, I get a phone call:

Paul: “Kia ora, Paul Heyward speaking.”

Cassy: “Hi Paul. It’s Cassy here. Guess what?”

Paul: “What?”

Cassy: “I have just been selected to represent New Zealand in cycling for the 2020 Olympics. It is such an honour. The only problem is training starts in earnest during my final practicum placement. I can still attend practicum as training occurs outside school hours. The only problem is the main international velodrome in New Zealand is in Danniville. I can train here in Auckland but I will be training on my own in inferior facilities. If I could do my practicum in Danniville I could train with the team in a quality international cycling complex.”

I am impressed. An international athlete in our programme. Not only that, I have a chance to assist this young athlete to potentially become an Olympic champion. I bask for a moment in anticipated reflected glory. I must help this practicum to happen! It is the patriotic thing to do. But how am I going to sell this to the administrators? It will be a major imposition to have to sort a practicum placement that is not only outside of the partnership school consortium but also outside of Auckland.

Paul: “Congratulations on your selection to the national team Cassy. You must be thrilled. Now, as you know, all practicums need to be completed within our pool of 30 partnership schools. However, in these exceptional circumstances we can try to make an exception. I am not promising anything, but I suggest we give it a go. What I want you to do is gather together the names and contact numbers of five schools in Danniville. Send these to me and I will give them to our practicum administrator. If she can set up a practicum in one of these five schools it’s a goer; however, if she gets through the list with no bites, we cut our losses and go with a partnership school. I am happy to do the visit to Danniville so we just need to find the school.”

Inform: In Which I Theorise my Ethical Decision Making

The industrial control room.

In a large industrial chemical plant sits a man in a control room. From this room, the man monitors power flows, gas levels and chemical stability. Out in the plant, other workers go about their business testing semi-conductors, checking chemical balances and maintaining operating equipment. Any mistakes by workers are guarded against with a rigorous series of safety checks and back-up systems. Large amounts of chemicals and gas combined with massive currents of

electricity make this a volatile and extremely hazardous place of work. Should the workers fail to maintain back-up systems, or complete safety checks, then gas leaks, chemical spills and fire are a certainty. The workers are always working with the knowledge that not following protocols could cost them more than their job.

The man in the control room has no such fears for his safety. Should the worst happen, the control room is hermetically sealed with its own air supply sourced from well beyond the confines of the plant. His job, while complex and requiring high levels of technical knowledge, is also relatively straightforward. Should he see unusual variations in power flows, gas levels or chemical stability, his job is to alert the appropriate workers to complete safety checks or, if required, trigger back-up systems. Under no circumstances is he to break the control room seal and intervene directly.

The man in the control room used to work out in the steely caustic air of the chemical plant. Many of his friends still do. He understands the difficulties they face. He has encountered many of these problems himself in his previous roles as joiner, supervisor and health and safety officer. The seal can be broken without detection, so he helps when he can. He helps when he knows he shouldn't.

The multinational talking heads have made it clear to the man in the control room the process that would be followed if an accident were to occur. The first step would be to investigate whether the relevant workers had maintained back-up systems and followed safety check procedures. Should fault not be found with the workers, the focus would shift to the controller and the plant itself. As long as the controller had communicated any variations in the normal operation of the plant to the workers he would be in the clear. As long as the seal had not been broken, he had nothing to worry about as the fault would lie with human error or unforeseen catastrophic plant failure.

The description above is drawn from many conversations I have had over a beer with my electrical engineer friend, Rob. Our conversations often turn to the stresses we experience in dealing with people and institutional regulations in our respective workplaces. The idea that regulations can provide university teachers a sort of hermetically sealed control space, similar to the electrical engineer's control room, was one I wanted to explore. I use the metaphor of an ethical control room to theorise the decisions I made for Hayden, Sally, Meghan and Cassy, from a range of ethical perspectives.

Smyth (2001) points to the inform stage of his framework for critical reflection as being a space where educators can begin to theorise their described practice; where they can attempt to scrutinise their practice for the tacit theories that have informed their practical decision making.

The inform stage requires teachers to seek possible contradictions in their practice and actively consider multiple perspectives. In theorising my previously described programme leadership practice through the lens of moral philosophy, I will reveal the contradictions of my decision making and the various ways my actions could be intellectualised from different ethical standpoints.

The control room metaphor seems useful in theorising my ethical decision making in each of the cases described above. When I applied rules systematically, and treated student requests with impartiality, I was protecting myself from charges of favouritism. I made decisions in a morally secure, hermetically sealed ethical control room. However, when I made decisions that took into account the individual backstories of students, my decisions can be seen to be arbitrary. The hermetic seal, made up of the ethical compounds of rules and duties, was ruptured as I ventured out of the control room and emotionally engaged in the lives of my students.

When I reflect on my 4 years of programme leadership to date, I have often enjoyed the comfort of the control room. The control room allows me to make decisions that are aimed at ensuring fairness and equal treatment for all. When a student is distressed at my decision making, I can point to the rules and regulations of the university that have determined the outcome, rather than at any hard heartedness on my behalf. Such an approach to decision making is certainly endorsed by the university. During a recent professional development workshop on conducting difficult conversations, programme leaders were advised to begin these meetings by reiterating to students that the outcome of such conversations will not jump outside university policy and regulations. The conversations must always be conducted from the control room.

There have been occasions where I have left the control room. My motives have largely been based on a sense of empathy. How I would like to be treated if the tables were turned? How would I want people I cared deeply about to be treated in such a situation? Outside of the control room there is space for rules to renegotiated, duties to be ignored. However, outside of the control room you lose control.

When the complaint letter arrived, I needed to account for leaving the control room. According to the anonymous complainant, I was giving preferential treatment to Māori and Pacifica students and in doing so was discriminating against the rest of the cohort. In discussions with my colleagues, I was able to defend the charges of discrimination based on ethnicity. I pointed out that each of the students who had received some flexibility afforded to them in their practicum placement had extenuating circumstances that required me to demonstrate compassion and

professional judgement. The fact all these students were either Māori or Pacifica had nothing to do with my decision making. My colleagues agreed with my reasoning and empathised with the complexities I was negotiating. I had effectively dealt with the charge laid against me, but life outside the control room seemed suddenly fraught, arbitrary and dangerous.

The ethical control room.

When I try to imagine a control room for a programme leader, I see a dimly lit, perfectly square, windowless office with a solitary door. In the middle of the room is a black high-backed swivel chair. There are no other items of furniture or decoration except for the four television monitors mounted high in each corner. With a swivel of the chair and press of the remote control, the programme leader can access each monitor. The monitors provide the programme leader with a means of communication with their students and their friends and whānau.

Each monitor also provides the programme leader with access to an ethical advisor and each advisor bases their advice on very different views of moral philosophy. The ethical egotist is a disinterested young woman, with the pallid complexion of a junkie, and the scornful eyes of an unfed pet cat. She appears on Screen 1. The Kantian universalist is an old man with a long grey beard, small round spectacles and an expression of permanent disappointment. He appears on Screen 2. The advisor concerned with the feminist ethic of care is a serene Samoan woman in her early sixties with gentle and intelligent eyes. She appears on Screen 3. The utilitarian advisor is a young Pākehā man with a well-groomed beard and a craft-beer tee shirt. He has the air of smug confidence that comes with successfully balancing freedom and responsibility. He appears on Screen 4.

Hayden appears on screen one gazing down at me. He makes his request. I listen. I think. I turn to Screen 2, point and press the remote. The old man appears. He urges me to think about the principle at stake here. There is an agreement with schools in the programme. They agree to provide associate teachers and we agree to place students in their schools, giving them access to potential recruits for beginning teacher positions. I expect the schools to be honest in upholding their end of the bargain by providing quality associate teachers, and I should uphold my end of the bargain.

Screen 3 flickers into life. It is Hayden's wife. She reminds me that the programme is ultimately about preparing students to be teachers, and letting Hayden teach in the school he will actually teach in next year would be most beneficial for Hayden, the student. I swivel to Screen 4 where a young man argues that letting Hayden complete his practicum at the school he has a relationship with will ultimately lead to the greatest happiness for the most people. Hayden will be happy, his

wife will be happy, the school which has promised future employment will be happy and, potentially, the children he teaches next year will be happy as they will have a teacher who is familiar with school organisation.

The practicum administrator suddenly appears behind the young man to remind me that should other students and schools find out I had applied the rules differently in Hayden's case there could be a good deal more unhappy people than happy ones. "Do you really want to leave the control room for this guy?" she asks. The young man turns to the practicum administrator and calmly states "As you said there would only be unhappy schools and students if they found out. They don't have to find out. Paul could ask Hayden to use his discretion." "Well I'm just saying. Be it on your head, Paul," the practicum administrator warns as the screen fades to black.

The old man has more advice. "I noticed in your dealings with Hayden you were able to use the practicum administrator as a decoy to your own decision making. Hayden will have the impression that you were willing to offer dispensation but were thwarted by an inflexible administrator. You know very well this is not the case. You have the final decision regarding practicum placements but decided not to place Hayden outside of the partnership school consortium for fear of creating a precedent that would lead to an avalanche of similar requests. Fair enough, as far as I am concerned, but it was your decision not that of the practicum administrator, as you implied. You are using the practicum administrator to make yourself look good in front of the student. You want the student to see you as a compassionate leader who does his best for his students but is victim to policies beyond his control, a victim to university bureaucracy. The worst thing is the practicum administrator had no idea you were manipulating her in this way. You used another rational human agent as an unwitting means to your own ends. This I find to be morally and ethically reprehensible."

I point the remote to Screen 1 for some respite from this onslaught. The young woman appears and directly addresses Screen 2. "Hey why don't you lighten up on the guy, old man? Paul is only looking after his own self-interest here and there is no shame in that. In truth, the only person in the world we can truly understand is ourself so we need to always act in a way that is most advantageous for the one person we understand. If we don't respect our own individuality then we are morally bankrupt. It is highly likely that Paul has good reasons for keeping up a positive relationship with Hayden, and maintaining this relationship will most likely pay off for him and Hayden."

Meghan appears on Screen 1 gazing down at me. She makes her request. I listen. I think. I turn to Screen 2, point and press the remote. The old man appears. "I think you are doing the right thing

here Paul. You have a duty to your partnership schools and other student teachers to truthfully apply the rules regarding practicum placement in a fair and impartial manner.”

Meghan’s friend Kim suddenly appears on Screen 2 and brushes past the old man so her face fills the monitor. Kim is angry and threatening as she glares down at me. “Fuck duty! Fuck rules! Fuck impartiality! This is about a human being. This is about my friend that I deeply care about and so should you. You sit there in your ivory tower lecturing your student teachers on the importance of establishing relationships with children in classrooms, yet you treat your own students as bums on seats that need to fit your system come what may. Meghan is at her wits end with everything going on in her life. She explained this to you but all you could do was point to some poxy rule in a poxy programme handbook. Where is your compassion man?”

The older woman appears on Screen 3. “I wouldn’t go too hard on him, Kim. Paul is only trying to be honest with everyone, including Meghan.”

“So, honesty is more important than compassion. Tell that to Meghan’s kids who are going to have to go without seeing their mother for 5 weeks so she can stay close to town in order to complete her final practicum. Poor little buggers have been through enough lately. Their Dad has fucked off to Aussie. Their Poppa is at death’s door. I really don’t see any losers if Meghan can do her final practicum in West Hinterland. Her kids will be happy, Meghan will be happy and, I can tell you, her student colleagues will also be happy for her because they know what shit she has been going through lately. They understand. They have compassion.” Kim pauses for breath and a long drag on her cigarette. She exhales straight into the camera filling Screen 2 with white smoke. The old man coughs. Kim closes her rant dismissively, “But I suppose as long as the precious school partnership agreement stays intact that is all that bloody matters, eh?”

The woman on Screen 3 agrees “It does seem that certain principles and duties are being given precedence over showing compassion. However, it is Paul’s prerogative as an active moral agent to decide whether demonstrating the virtues of honesty and loyalty towards other actors in this situation is more important than showing the virtue of compassion. It would seem, in demonstrating compassion in this situation, the greatest good would occur to the most people, as student colleagues are likely to be understanding of any dispensation awarded to Meghan. Yet there have been promises made to partnership schools. A deal is a deal and Paul would be demonstrating integrity by upholding his end of the deal.”

Sally appears on Screen 1 gazing down at me. She makes her request. I listen. I think. The old woman appears on Screen 3 and looks down. A gentle smile emanates from the monitor. “I know this is tough for you Paul. You have been in the same position as Sally in the past and received

the compassion and support of your university lecturers. You really need to think what decision will help you to become your ideal moral self in this situation. How would you like others to treat you or your loved ones in the circumstances poor Sally finds herself in?”

Screen 2 flickers into life and the old man appears. “This is not about how others have treated you or how your decision makes you feel, it is about what is the right thing to do. Is it the right thing to do to treat one person more favourably than others? Is it the right thing to do to renege on an agreement undertaken in good faith?”

I hear the light click of the control room door unlocking. No one enters but I feel a cool draught.

Cassy appears on Screen 1 gazing down at me. She makes her request. I listen. I think. I know what the old man will say. He is going to tell me that I compromised the honesty and integrity of the programme by acting impartially and, in doing so, I have been dishonest to our partnership schools. I try Screen 4, hoping for some advice that confirms my decision. To my disappointment, the old man has swapped screens and now leers down at me. “I am not even going to lecture you on duties, principles and impartiality. You know that you have undermined the integrity of your programme by being impartial and dishonest.”

“Well, thanks for not lecturing me on that then, old man.”

“Silence! I will, however, lecture you on the vulgarity of being an ethical egotist. What makes Cassy’s request so unique as to warrant the abandonment of the foundational principles of the programme? Shall I tell you? It is pure and simply your ego. Yes, that’s right, your ego. What chance do the principles of honesty, and loyalty towards your partner schools, have in the face of your self-aggrandisement? I would understand your decision more if had you acquiesced to poor Meghan’s request. In my view, a far more deserving case to throw away the integrity of the programme on. But to undermine all the goodwill of schools that has been built up over years by programme leaders that have gone before you, so you have the chance to crow about having helped an athlete to Olympic glory, is morally very disheartening.”

The young man appears on Screen 4 and reminds the old man of the virtues of personal space before gently pushing him out of shot. He looks at me and rolls his eyes in sympathy. “Look mate, don’t listen to old grumpy, you have done the right thing here. Think about how much pleasure you help bring to the world by assisting Cassy to perform at her very best at the Olympics. Her family are over the moon and four million Kiwis are going to experience the excitement of cheering her on to an Olympic medal. You, in part, have made the chance of Olympic glory more possible. Most people would applaud your decision. To be totally honest, mate, I think you need

to step out of your little room, get away from the old man and get with the real world. I have left the door unlocked. See you on the other side.”

I turn the handle of the control room door and exit. The wind is blowing outside.

Confront: In Which I Interrogate and Analyse the Assumptions That Informed My Ethical Decision Making.

A theory of teacher identity formation.

The four acts described above occurred across a period of 4 years during my time as programme leader. In describing my accounts of ethical decision making through individual scenes, I have been able to graft elements of specific “lived” conversations and interactions onto factionalised accounts of student requests for care and flexibility regarding practicum placements. These rich descriptions map out an evolving ever-present dilemmatic space (Honig, 1996) through which I negotiate what it is to be an “ethical” teacher. I now turn to an analysis of how the competing discourses that blow through this ethical space impact on my evolving teacher identity, as I manage external expectations and internal beliefs (Coldron & Smith, 1999; Convery, 2009; Lasky, 2005; Moore et al., 2002; Sachs, 2001; Smyth, 2002).

Grant (2005) discusses how the discourses we respond to offer particular subjectivities that serve to legitimate our behaviours as educators. “The discourses that hail us as their subjects offer us subjectivities that “feel right,” which satisfy and please us” (p. 345). Grant analysed how doctoral supervisors and their students responded to the calls of a range distinct supervisory discourses and, in doing so, performed “preferred” academic identities. Similarly, McDowell, Batnitzky, and Dyer (2007) explore how hotel workers respond to a range of managerial discourses of the preferred employee. Workers maintain a satisfying performance of being an appropriate employee by responding to managerial calls for deference and well-managed emotions. In narrativising my response to student practicum-placement requests, I have performed an act of teacher identity construction and reconstruction. In analysing these performances, I consider how different ideological discourses or traditions of teaching interpellate me to preferred teacher identities. In particular, I interrogate how my ethical decisions are mediated material responses to competing discourses of the *caring compassionate teacher* and the *neoliberal managerial teacher*. In limiting my analysis to these two discourses, I wish to acknowledge that there are many other discourses influencing my identity formation that have not been analysed here. For example, the scientific evidence-based discourse (Coldron & Smith, 1999) clearly blows through the dilemmatic space, a space created by the tension between demonstrating flexibility/compassion and applying regulations when making practicum-

placement decisions. Research suggests that strong reciprocal partnerships between ITE providers and schools, similar to the relationship between the University of Auckland and consortium schools, can deepen understanding of teaching and learning for both parties and, in turn, lead to rich student-teacher practicum experiences (Ell, Grudnoff, Haigh, & Hill, 2018).

In the following analysis, I explore how I negotiate competing discourses of the *caring compassionate teacher* and the *neoliberal managerial teacher* and, in doing so, locate my practice in the broader moral, cultural, social and political context of my work as a university teacher (Smyth, 2001).

Negotiating the identity of the caring compassionate teacher.

There is a specific moment in the scenes recalled above where my idealised teacher identity of a compassionate and caring human being comes to the fore. When I arranged an out of town placement for Sally so she could be close to her dying mother I was motivated by a deep sense of care and compassion. I was performing the identity of a teacher who was willing to protect his student from the cold administrative regulations and policies of the university. I could have chosen to refuse Sally's request and apply principles of fairness, as I had done for other students, but, in her case, I chose to locate myself as the caring teacher and, in doing so, eschewed my identity as an impartial managerial teacher administering university policy.

Socially locating myself within the caring teacher tradition. When describing the process of location within social space, Coldron and Smith (1999) observe the various fields of professional choice that are available to teachers. These choices are dependent on the relational context of teachers' work and "by choosing some and rejecting other possibilities in various professional fields of choice, a teacher affirms affiliations and makes distinctions that constitute an important part of his or her professional identity" (p. 713). The activity of social location requires teachers to continually evaluate whether or not they will follow external demands of others; in doing so they should ask themselves questions such as "Should I, can I, be like that or this?" (p. 719). In considering this question in relation to Sally's practicum-placement request, I am compelled to consider an idea central to Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, namely "what is it to be a good person?" or, in my case, "what is it to be a good teacher?" when deciding how to deal with such requests (Rachels & Rachels, 2015). Those from a feminist ethics of care perspective would warn me about fixating on the application of moral principles when deciding how to deal with Sally's request and, instead, ask me to consider whom I should be as an ethical person in this unique lived teacher-student relationship (Noddings, 1993). When faced with Sally's request, the virtue of compassion figured prominently in how I wanted to "be" as a teacher. So why did

the virtue of compassion or care figure so prominently in my decision making in this specific case? Why do I want to identify as the caring and compassionate teacher?

When I think back to why I entered teaching as an 18-year-old, I recall friends and relatives advising me of my suitability for teaching due to my naturally kind and caring disposition. It seemed, from the outset of my career, that being a caring person was a prerequisite for being a teacher. Educational ethicists have also identified the strong tradition of the virtuous, caring and compassionate teacher in education (Campbell, 2003; Luckowski, 1997; Sockett, 1993; Starratt, 1994). According to Campbell (2003), the application of a particular virtue is dependent on specific professional contexts, although the ethical virtue itself is universal. In the case of teaching, the virtue of compassion is both a required general virtue for anyone entering the profession, and a professional virtue to be applied in the unique context of schools (Campbell, 2003). A cold and uncaring person who enters teaching is not going to be able to learn and apply the “professional virtue” of compassion if it is something they are unable or unwilling to do in their personal life. For Campbell, it is a given that core virtues such as compassion and care are universally understood to be good things for people to exhibit in their general lives, and therefore vital for teachers to display in their professional lives. Similarly, Nucci (2001) asserts the existence of a basic core of morality important to all human beings. Drawing on a cross-cultural study of children and adolescents, Nucci identifies a universal set of moral principles that stem from issues of human welfare, compassion, fairness and justice. Nucci identifies the universal and transcendent virtue of compassion as something we ought to possess and as something all individuals should exhibit in their interactions with other human beings. It would seem my desire to identify as a compassionate teacher has its roots in a shared, core human moral duty to exercise compassion whenever possible.

Life-history researchers are also able to provide valuable insights into why the tradition of the caring and compassionate teacher is so important to professional identity construction. Teacher life-history research shifts the traditional educational research emphasis on “the teacher-as-practice to the teacher-as-person as the starting point for educational research” (Goodson, 1991, p. 41). In exploring the teacher as a “person” rather than as a “practitioner,” life-history researchers reveal the importance of virtues driving the work of teachers. For example, Gudmundsdottir’s (1990) life-history study of four experienced and expert high school teachers reveals how all participants were driven by a deep care of both their students and their subject-specialisation. Similarly, Søreide’s (2006) interviews with five women “about their jobs and everyday lives as teachers in Norwegian public elementary schools” (p. 527) demonstrates an important identity construction for participants was “the caring and kind teacher.” Teachers in

the study discussed the emotional relationships they had with their pupils and their determination to care for their students as they would care for their own children.

Life-history research also shows the enduring influence that teachers from childhood can have on the construction of the “caring teacher” identity. Goodson (1991) discusses how many life-history teacher narratives feature the research subject reflecting on the care shown to them by an inspirational teacher from their own schooling experience, and this virtue of care becoming formative in the subject’s conception of what it is to be a good teacher. In contrast, Woods’s (1993) life-history study of an English primary school headteacher, demonstrates how negative personal schooling experiences can lead to the development of a personal pedagogy grounded in caring teacher–student relationships, in defiant rejection of adverse personal experience. Convery (1999) points to how life-history research often presents a narrative of the caring teacher battling a hostile system and, in doing so, championing the cause of their oppressed and dispossessed students. In the case of Woods’s (1993) headteacher, his care for students was motivated by his own oppression within the schooling system as a child.

The importance of the tradition of the caring and compassionate teacher permeates both the philosophising of educational ethicists and the research of teacher life historians. In considering my own life history, I am able to isolate a critical incident that I believe is formative in how I have located my identity as a caring and compassionate university teacher.

The year was 1995 and I was in my last year of a Bachelor of Arts degree at the University of Auckland. I had returned to university after 5 years of teaching and travelling to complete a degree that I started while simultaneously studying for my Diploma of Teaching at the Auckland College of Education (ACE) in the late 1980s. While nervous about returning to study, I thoroughly enjoyed the experience of being a committed and enthusiastic student. I have to admit, as a school leaver at the ACE my diligence towards my studies wavered as the tantalising promise of late teenage freedom pervaded my daily decision making. As a more mature 20-something, with a better grasp of consequences, I reengaged in study with an enthusiasm my 19-year-old self would have found disturbingly nerdy. The effort I put into my study paid off with high grades, letters of congratulations, invitations to consider studying at master’s level and, ultimately, a senior prize from the Department of Education.

In April 1995, my Mum was diagnosed with ovarian cancer. On July 31 1995 my Mum passed away aged 48. My close family unit was devastated. Throughout my Mum’s cancer treatment, I found solace in my studies. While I wanted to spend as much time as I could with her in those

final months, my Mum implored me to continue with my studies. Although I felt guilty when I turned my attention away from my family, and towards assignments and readings, I welcomed the change of head space. Emotions of despair, fear and deep concern were temporarily quelled as I engaged my mind and immersed myself in the academic process of critical analysis. Surprisingly, my grades held up well through the first semester of 1995. My Mum was thrilled.

Following Mum's death, my ability to offset anguish and despair through study was a strategy I no longer had the energy to muster. For a month after the funeral I struggled to see the point of getting out of bed, let alone the sociology of community or history of education. I stopped attending classes, ignored assignments, and ceased contact with lecturers and fellow students. As university had been my bastion of normality during my Mum's illness, I decided not to inform anyone there of my personal circumstances, a decision made out of personal preservation rather than stoicism. However, in early September 1995, I found myself completely isolated from the university and on the precipice of wasting all the hard work I had put into gaining a degree. My Mum would have been devastated.

While I was isolated from the university, I was fortunate enough to have the support of my partner, family and close friends, who all encouraged me to return to my studies. I had no idea whether this would be possible after missing over half of Semester 2, but I was willing to find out. By the time I returned to university, I had missed out on handing in numerous assignments across five courses. The official time for the lodging of extension requests had passed. I had no idea what my prospects were as I sat in the hallway waiting to meet the head of the Department of Political Studies. The door opened and I was ushered into the cramped office. I explained my situation and immediately received a commitment from the head to support me in whatever way possible to successfully complete my studies. New due dates for assignments were arranged and offers of university support offered. The compassion, care and warmth shown by the head of the Department of Political studies was replicated in the Departments of Sociology and Education.

The compassion shown by my university lecturers at this very difficult time in my life provides some insights into why I chose to reject the managerial/entrepreneurial teacher identity and locate myself in the tradition of the caring and compassionate teacher when dealing with Sally's case. However, in dealing with Hayden and Meghan's requests, the kind, caring teacher identity dissolved as the interpellation of neoliberal managerialism called.

The interpellation of neoliberal ideology disrupts my identity as a compassionate caring teacher. The process of interpellation plays out differently in different contexts but it always

involves the recruitment of individuals to subject positions in ideologies that perpetuate and reproduce patterns of domination and subordination (Hay, 1995; McDowell et al., 2007). Hay (1995) and McDowell et al. (2007) demonstrate the discursive mechanics of interpellation in their respective studies into media-inspired moral panics and the identity construction of migrant hotel workers. Hay turns his attention to the moral panic that ensued following the murder of toddler James Bulger in Liverpool in 1993. He explains how individuals were interpellated as subjects *through* the moral panic and *to* the moral panic via the press coverage of the “Bulger affair.” The press shaped a narrative of innocent victims, terrified parents, juvenile delinquents and broken homes that hailed individuals to identify with the narrative *through* moments of resonance, taking up subject positions as “victims” that then materialised into changes in behaviour and relationships. In this process, blame was shifted to the “other,” the solo mother, the black teenager from a broken home, and the reproduction of dominant racist and sexist ideologies was secured. McDowell et al. (2007) explore the process of interpellation in relation to migrant workers in a large London hotel. They describe how workers are interpellated to take up subject positions that reproduce stereotypical notions of gender, race and class. The fantasised or idealised version of hotel workers, constructed by hotel managers and clients, creates a dual interpellation where employees have to conform not only to managers’ personifications of idealised service, but also to the often-sexualised imaginations of the fantasising consumer.

Both studies point to the material effects of interpellation. Once an individual is subject to an ideology, they then base their material interactions in the world from that subject position, and thus the interpellated becomes the interpellator, further securing their identity. In the case of Hay’s example, the identity of concerned parent who is a potential victim of juvenile delinquents from broken homes is secured as the worried parent continues to blame the poor and dispossessed for their fear. The participants in McDowell et al.’s. (2007) study embody their identity as sexualised, attentive and deferential workers through “performances of class, gender, and ethnicity...constructed through material inequalities, structural changes, neoliberal institutions and policies, and new patterns of migration” (p. 21). In both these examples, the interpellation is materialised in ongoing relationships and interactions. Thus, ideology exists only in the subject’s continued recognition of the hail.

When I declined the placement request of Meghan, I was primarily concerned with the question “what is the right thing to do in these types of cases?” rather than “what is it to be a good teacher in such circumstances?” Prominent in my mind during the decision-making process was the aforementioned letter of complaint I had received about my perceived favouritism when placing

Māori and Pacifica students. My flexibility and compassion in placing students outside of the partnership consortium was certainly considered “the wrong thing to do” by a certain student who felt they were being disadvantaged and discriminated against. Hay (1995) discusses how individuals are interpellated as subjects when points of resonance within the hailing discourse are secured in moments of recognition and identification. The letter of complaint revealed the notion of education as a commodity and that the complainant was getting an inferior product compared to some of their peers. The letter of complaint drew attention to competition between students in the educational marketplace and to the fact that certain students were getting an unfair advantage. The letter of complaint was testimony to the rights of the individual consumer of a university education. The letter of complaint secured in me a moment of recognition that I had not fulfilled obligations to the complainant as university education provider. I was interpellated to a neoliberal discourse in which education is configured as a commodity and, in recognising this managerialist hail, I lost part of my compassionate and caring “self.”

Negotiating the identity of the managerialist neoliberal teacher.

The partnership model. When considering the requests made by Hayden and Meghan, I was cognisant of the integrity of the partnership model between the university and schools. There was a written contract with the partnership schools to be honoured. The words of the practicum administrator continued to haunt me. “It’s up to you but the whole partnership model could fall apart.” The consortium of 30 partnership schools has served the University of Auckland well in the competitive ITE education marketplace. When schools sign up to the consortium, they agree to provide consistent quality supervision of students when on practicum. A school coordinator is appointed to oversee the supervision of associate teachers. The quality of professional supervision within partnership schools enhances the reputation of the university as a quality ITE provider and ensures the recruitment of future students to the programme. The partnership model has also served schools well in an increasingly competitive labour market where the recruitment and retention of teachers is becoming a major challenge for schools. The constant flow of potential beginning teacher candidates through the doors of partnership schools offers a “try before you buy” opportunity not afforded to schools outside of such a consortium. The symbiotic relationship between the university and consortium schools secures the reputation of both partners in their respective educational marketplaces. For the schools, their relationship with the University of Auckland gives access to high-performing beginning teachers while the university secures quality practicum placements for beginning teachers. However, the relationship is predicated on a commercial monogamy that requires each partner to be faithful to the contract. Should principals or school coordinators get the sense that the university is placing students at schools outside of the consortium, they could justifiably withdraw their goodwill in placing

University of Auckland students for future practicums. The whole partnership model could fall apart!

My dual interpellation “through” the discourse of neoliberalism. In the McDowell et al. (2007) study into migrant hotel workers, the authors identify the dual interpellation that informs the construction of identity in the workplace as both clients and managers construct idealised versions of hotel employees that become internalised by the workers themselves. A form of dual interpellation informed my identity construction as I responded to both the hail of my students, towards ideals of fairness and impartiality as programme leader, and the hail of the partnership school consortium, towards ideals of contractual loyalty as a good institutional partner. I internalised the importance of being a fair programme leader who diligently follows process to ensure all students are provided with consistent information and equal opportunities. I also internalised my role as a loyal commercial partner who upholds his contractual agreements with partnership schools. Olssen and Peters (2005) observe how neoliberal institutions are characterised by contractualism whereby partners to a contract have identifiable roles to which they are held to account. In my role as programme leader, I was accountable to both students and the consortium. To this end I experienced a dual interpellation to the discourse of neoliberalism. On the one hand, I was being interpellated by the students as a provider of a purchased service, on the other, I was being hailed by the consortium and university to preserve our place in the ITE market by honouring an agreed partnership contract. In both instances I recognised myself in the identity constructions offered and as such became subject through the discourse of neoliberal managerialism. The internalisation of these dual identities also caused changes in how I subsequently acted towards others. Hay (1995) suggests that it is at this point “the ideological effect has become material” (p. 208) and I have become subject to the discourse of neoliberal managerialism.

My dual interpellation “to” the discourse of neoliberalism. Hay (1995) discusses how the moment of identity recognition occurs when “we inject our own subjectivities into the empty scenarios constructed within a mediated discourse” (p. 208). I was able to insert myself into the narrative structure of the neoliberal discourse of ITE. I recognised my role as provider of an educational service to clients. I needed to ensure clients perceived they were getting the same service as other clients. These clients operate in a free educational marketplace and their customer experience is important to the ongoing reputation of the programme. In protecting strategic relationships between the university and the consortium, I positioned myself as the entrepreneurial teacher ensuring the programme’s capacity to keep schools from drifting to other providers. In recognising the market ramifications of placing **students outside of the** partnership

consortium, and injecting myself into the narrative structure of the ITE marketplace, I became subject *through* the discourse of neoliberalism. Importantly, the resonance I experienced with the neoliberal discourse, in these moments of recognition, translated to “material practices and forms of behaviour” and thus I simultaneously became subject *to* this discourse in my day-to-day relationships. This subjectivity materialised in the lack of compassion I demonstrated when considering Meghan’s request for a placement close to home, and my lack of flexibility in considering placing Hayden in the school of his future employment. The ideological effects of neoliberal discourses on higher education were materially reinforced through my rejection of requests to exercise compassion and flexibility (Hay, 1995). I was living through the effects of what Ball (2005) has termed the little-neoliberalism of our daily lives that is realised “in the mundane rhythms of our email traffic, our form filling, our peer reviewing, and re-modulates the ways in which we relate to one another as neoliberal subjects, individual, responsible, striving, competitive, enterprising” (p. 258).

Neoliberalism and higher education. The global impact of neoliberal ideology on the provision of higher education, including ITE, is materialised in students perceiving their education as a service they have procured for their own individual benefit (Ball, 2015; Baltodano, 2012; Grant, 2005; Lockford, 2017; Olssen & Peters, 2005; Zeichner, 2010). Olssen and Peters (2005) suggest a central supposition to neoliberal higher education discourse is a view of students as self-interested individuals who are best placed to judge their needs in the educational and broader market place. Grant (2005) argues that neoliberalism has cast the student as a consumer who has “the power of the purchaser and expects value for money” (p. 343). In her satirical letter to a fictitious prospective liberal arts student, Lockford (2017) congratulates the student for wanting to realise her entrepreneurial desires to become her own product and maximise her profitability, before sarcastically commending the student for her bravery in choosing to exercise her economic agency in a liberal arts institution.

As the individual commodification of education has gained dominance, traditional notions of higher education serving a public good are replaced with a view of universities being the providers of recognised qualifications that will enable individual consumers to compete in national and international market places (Baltodano, 2012). Global rankings of universities secure qualification elitism and high demands from individual consumers (Ball, 2015). Such an individualistic perception of the benefits of university education relegates the public education ethos of higher education to the position of a quaint historical relic, with no place in a competitive modern neoliberal economy. Olssen and Peters (2005) argue that the traditional

academic culture that saw universities as the critic and conscience of society “has been replaced with an institutional stress on performativity” (p. 313).

The cultural tools of the higher education marketplace that mediated my identity construction.

The anonymous complainant, who was concerned about a perceived lack of fairness in the allocation of practicum placements, had been interpellated through and to this neoliberal discourse of higher education. Inherent throughout the complaint letter were the concerns of an individual higher education consumer who felt their position in the labour market was being undermined by the favouritism shown towards other consumers by their university teacher. The complainant was convinced their ability to compete for potential jobs had been adversely affected, as Māori and Pacifica students had been given greater discretion in their practicum placements. The complainant accused me of both a negligent disregard of the policies around practicum placement and overt discrimination. Lasky (2005) discusses how the cultural tools available within educational discourses come to mediate the decisions teachers make and the identities they construct. The complaint letter was a symbolic cultural tool of a neoliberal higher education discourse that hailed me to consider more carefully future requests for special consideration when placing students on practicum. The official complaint letter was a cultural tool located within a neoliberal discourse that mediated my decision making when it came to considering Meghan’s request. In responding to her request, my interpellation to the neoliberal discourse was materialised through declining to move outside of my control room and exercise compassion.

As discussed above, individualism has come to characterise the neoliberal discourse around higher education; however, this individualism is not only reflected in the behaviour of individual students but also in how individual higher education institutions relate to each other. Ball (2015) observes how broad collective academic interests once shared by higher education institutions have been replaced by competitive relationships between isolated and distinct corporate bodies. While competitive individualism of students is a crucial tenet to the operation of the higher education market, the operation of the market is only truly realised when there is genuine competition between institutions to attract students. In the case of ITE in New Zealand, there was little in the way of competition between institutions until the 1990s (Kane et al., 2005). The pre-1990s era of ITE saw teachers training colleges, latterly to be known as colleges of education, set up to provide teachers for defined geographical areas, for the public good. There was little by way of competition between these institutions as they had, in the neoliberal lexicon, a captured market. By the mid-2000s most of the colleges of education had been amalgamated

into the universities and were actively competing for students between themselves and other private providers who had come into the market (Alcorn, 1999).

The importance of the practicum in ITE saw providers clamour to establish relationships with schools to ensure quality placements and secure their reputation for quality ITE provision. In the case of the University of Auckland, Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Primary) programme, a consortium of partnership schools was established. An agreement was established between the schools and university that ensured quality associate teachers would be available for practicum supervision in exchange for a small monetary reward and exclusive access to these students when on practicum courses. The agreement between the schools and the university became a way of sustaining the quality of the programme and recruiting potential students. As with the official complaint letter, the partnership schools' agreement was a neoliberal cultural tool that mediated my decision making when it came to considering both the requests of Hayden and Meghan. In responding to these requests, my interpellation to a neoliberal discourse was materialised when I declined to move outside of my control room and exercise flexibility and compassion, and instead decided to fulfil my contractual obligations from the safety of the swivel chair.

The answer is blowin' in the wind.

In this case study, I have explored an ongoing ethical dilemma where I needed to balance demonstrating compassion and flexibility, when considering specific practicum-placement requests, with the application of university regulations. Honig (1996) would challenge viewing this dilemma as an isolated unitary situation that can somehow be resolved. Honig contends dilemmas are not external events to the subject that can be dealt with through the application of procedural ethical problem solving, so the subject can return to a place, or home, of ethical neutrality. Rather, the winds of ethical dilemmas are internal to the subject and can never stop blowing as the sociopolitical context that dilemmas emerge from are always present in what Honig has coined as the "dilemmatic space." These dilemmatic winds continue to shape who we are and who we want to become.

In analysing my own lived experience of ethical decision making in dilemmatic space, I have become critically conscious of my own fluid teacher identity. I have historically identified as a caring and compassionate teacher with a genuine concern for student wellbeing and a commitment to egalitarian teacher-student relationships. However, I increasingly feel a degree of circumspection and suspicion when I am approached by a student who asks "I know this is not allowed but I was wondering if it could be possible for me to do my next practicum at...?"

And, as I pause to answer, I feel the winds blow.

Chapter Eight

I'm Afraid It's Time for You to Leave: The English Language

Dilemma

Introduction

In this chapter, I describe an incident that occurred reasonably early in my tenure as leader of Graduate Diploma of Teaching (Primary) programme. As with Chapter 7, the structure of the chapter follows the first three stages of Smyth's model of critical reflection.

Through the initial, *describe*, stage I present a series of factionalised meetings I have with James, a student I failed on practicum due to his poor command of spoken English. I also describe my factionalised dealings with the faculty bursar. In the second, *inform*, stage I begin to theorise my ethical decision making through an imagined scene of my interrogation at the hands of the Ethics in Education Enhancement Unit (EEEU). The interrogation provides opportunities to explore my ethical decision making from a range of different ethical perspectives. In the third, *confront*, stage of the chapter, I locate my ethical decision making in the broader cultural, social and political context of my work as a university teacher. As in Chapter 7, I make use of my theoretical framework of teacher identity to analyse how my ethical decision making is an ongoing act of identity construction.

Describe: In Which I Lay Out the "Facts" of My Ethical Dilemma

Meetings with James.

The call comes in towards the end of Week 2 of a 5-week practicum for training teachers. It is late on a Thursday afternoon and I am sitting in my office finishing off the last emails before I head home. An associate teacher (AT) is having real problems communicating with her student teacher, James. Her main concern is James does not actually understand much of what *she* says and the children don't understand much of what *he* says. James's first language is Korean, while the children's language of instruction in this classroom is English. As head of the practicum course I agree to observe James the next day, 10 days before my scheduled assessment observation.

As I hang up the phone, there is a knock at my partially open office door. I swivel on my chair and see an anxious middle-aged Asian gentleman standing in the doorway. James would be in his late forties, has intelligent eyes and is clearly agitated about something. I have a fairly good idea what. James explains to me that he feels his AT has unrealistic expectations

of him and he is concerned he may fail the practicum. I nod and tell him I will be observing and meeting with him and his AT the next day where we can clarify expectations. James leaves. I have two sides of the story, but I could only fully understand one.

The next day I turn up at the school. I am to observe James teach for 30 minutes followed by a triadic discussion where James, the AT and I will have the opportunity to attest to what extent we each believe the practicum learning outcomes are being achieved. James teaches, I observe. The one phrase that I clearly understand from James is “Do you understand?” He asks this in desperation at the end of each of his long, heavily accented and broken teaching monologues. The children never reply.

The triadic sees both the AT and me searching for positives in James’s practice.

“Good to see you getting down on the level of the children when working in groups.”

“You are very respectful of the children.”

I cut to the chase.

“James, I am afraid I did not understand much of what you said in that lesson. And I suspect if I didn’t understand it the children didn’t either.”

Agitated James replies “Yes they did. I will find and bring here. They tell you. They know!”

I pause.

“That won’t be necessary James, but what we do need to do is clearly identify the learning outcomes that are in danger of being failed in this practicum and identify steps you can take to take to get back on the road to success.”

As I said these words, they felt hollow and meaningless. James was not going to pass the practicum. His inability to communicate lucidly in English made it as likely he would pass the practicum as Donald Trump putting out the recycling. However, there was a process to follow with students in danger of failing a practicum and, as programme leader, I felt bound by this process. Dutifully I went through the key learning outcomes and identified clear actions that would need to be demonstrated over the next week before my second observation visit. As each action was outlined, the AT nodded gravely while James looked bewildered. A lamb to the slaughter. Although, in the short term, this lamb had a reprieve, it would not be for long; however, for the children and the AT, I thought their reprieve would have to wait.

The second call comes in the day after my observation. The caller ID immediately tells me all is not well with James. I look hastily at the increasing backlog of unopened emails on the screen in front of me. Reluctantly, I take the call from Glenwood School. James is trying but the children are still confused; the AT is becoming increasingly stressed. The deputy principal has done some relieving in the room and has seen James in action. She is disgusted the University of Auckland could be accepting fees from someone so clearly out of their depth due to a lack of English language. My next observation of James is not scheduled for another 5 days. The school want this done now. I hastily rearrange my already packed visiting schedule and head to the school. The emails will have to wait.

I enter the classroom and James is working with a small group of four on some maths work. He should be in full control but it is clear he has no awareness of any children beyond the group he is working with. The AT ensures the remainder of the class get on with their learning. I sit down on a small wooden chair, knees around ears, belly protruding and begin my observation of James. On his action plan, we have agreed he needs to develop strategies to keep all children involved in the group learning. James has clearly worked on this and now *physically* turns the heads of children who look away from the activity at hand. “Now listen to me,” he implores. Things don’t improve. A lesson of desperation and bewilderment for all concerned.

The triadic discussion should be a dialogue format that is followed after an observation visit of a student on practicum. The discussion is facilitated by the visiting lecturer who ensures both the student teacher and the AT have a chance to comment on how they felt the observed lesson went before the visiting lecturer provides their insights. The discussion then follows the same format, focussing on how each practicum learning outcome has been achieved over the student’s time in the school. The triadic discussion is used to provide transparency for all parties while giving student teachers a degree of professional agency regarding practicum assessment decisions.

Following my observation, I briefly meet with the school practicum coordinator. I explain to her I am going to dispense with the formal triadic discussion when I meet with James and his AT. There is no point, as I am going to fail James and see no need in dragging the process out any longer than necessary. Furthermore, I explain that, for the benefit of all involved, I am going to withdraw James from the school with immediate effect. The school coordinator is in full agreement with my proposed action.

James and his AT walk into the cramped office we meet in following his lesson. There are no windows that can be opened and the air is warm and heavy.

Firmly and kindly I begin.

“James, after observing your teaching this morning and looking over Jane’s (AT) report I am not satisfied you are going to meet the learning outcomes of this practicum. I have decided it best for all concerned we finish your practicum today. I think you need some time to gather yourself, farewell the children and then leave the school.”

James has the look of a condemned man. Jane quickly disguises her expression of relief to one of sadness.

“Does this mean I will not become a teacher?”

“I think it best you take some time to gather your things and say goodbye to the children. We can meet tomorrow to discuss your future in the programme. I am sorry things have not worked out for you here James, and I understand you will be feeling deeply disappointed.”

As I leave the school, I feel heartless, mean and insubstantial. I have just told a man senior to me in years and eminently more intelligent, given his Doctorate in Engineering and Masters in Theology, to effectively sling his hook. A man of compassion and patience, qualities so important to teaching, has been discarded on the educational wayside.

Meeting with the bursar.

The bursar is not happy with my request. I have asked that we give James a full refund on his fees as he never had a chance to succeed in the programme given his challenges with the English language. I feel the principle of natural justice is at stake here. However, the bursar is concerned about process and precedent. There is a process for selecting students for the programme. English deficiencies should have been picked up in the process. Unless it can be shown we did not follow process, there will be no refund. The precedent of a refund is not one the bursar wants set. The university cannot afford to refund every student that fails a course. This is not a floodgate that warrants any tampering with.

My response to the bursar is polite yet clear. Reputational damage has been done to the Graduate Diploma of Teaching Primary programme. I would like to regain some respect from the school by assuring them that it was our mistake James was given a place in the programme and we are going to make good with James by giving him a full fee refund. I decide to go

digging to see exactly how James was offered a place in the programme given he was clearly unsuitable due to his poor communication in English.

I gather together all the admission documentation from student services and begin my hunt for a breach in process. All qualifications meet required entry criteria, although I privately question the rigour of James' New Zealand-awarded Masters of Theology. I turn to his interview score and comments. James has scored 36 out of 50 in the interview process. This score is on the cusp of being able to be accepted into the programme. It seems at first James was rejected, but a last-minute increase in quota for the programme saw James offered a place along with a number of other candidates on the cusp. No breach of process to date, but I certainly think the process needs to be tightened up regarding students on the cusp. The programme leader should definitely have some input into whether these potentially vulnerable students are admitted to the programme. But that will have to wait until later. For now, I am interested if any comments were made about James' performance at the interview. Both panellists have made comments. Both panellists make mention of the candidate's politeness and enthusiasm for teaching. Both panellists comment they found it difficult to understand the candidate during the interview. Both candidates write in capitals **"POOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE. UNSUITABLE FOR THE PROGRAMME."** I feel like a successful air-crash investigator. I now understand what brought the fully laden jumbo jet crashing to earth half way through a seemingly routine flight, and it wasn't pilot error! The ground crew did not do their checks thoroughly enough and went off numerical scores rather than interview panel comments.

I inform the bursar the results of my forensic investigation. Arrangements are made between accounts and admissions. A refund is offered and James' resignation from the programme accepted. While I had won a small victory for James, the whole experience had left me deeply unsettled. I needed to theorise the ethical principles that had informed my practice as a university visiting lecturer. I needed to somehow interrogate my ethical decision making.

Inform: In Which I Theorise My Ethical Decision Making

Setting the scene: *The EEEU is housed in the upper two floors of a commercial building in Auckland Central. Many years ago, the space had been used as the base for the Arts Education Advisory Collective. Paul meets his union brief in the lobby. Seena is a Lebanese Muslim woman in her early 30s with keen eyes and Arabic poetry trailing down the inside of her left forearm. Paul has worked with Seena before and trusts her intellect and judgement.*

The lift doors opens and reveals a wide view of the inner-city Auckland skyline, a tangerine orange reception counter and an airy open-plan office configuration. Before the pair have a chance to announce their arrival to the receptionist, a deep, confident voice calls “Paul, Seena we have been expecting you. Nice to see you both. Please follow me.” Neil Ruddock’s pace is quick and direct as he leads the pair away from the open-plan office and down a windowless corridor into Interview Room 1. Waiting to greet them is the EEEU legal counsel Pearl Sargent. A smile from her tight thin lips flickers their arrival is noted. Paul and Seena take their seats opposite Pearl and Neil. An oval glass table separates the two parties. Neil pulls his mobile from his trouser pocket, swipes and presses then positions the mobile gently in the middle of the cold glass tabletop.

NEIL: Interview commenced at 2.45pm Monday July 17 2017. Present EEEU Development Mentor Neil Ruddock, EEEU Legal Counsel Pearl Sargent, University Educators Union Advisor Seena Darwish and Associate Director of the Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Primary) programme Paul Heyward. All participants have formally consented to having the interview recorded.

As you know, we are interested in finding out more about a decision you made to terminate the placement of James Park during his second practicum at Glenwood School in May 2012. We have received information that you did not follow the “student of concern” process in full before you made this decision.

PAUL: I remember the case well. Thankfully, I was notified by the AT early in the practicum that James was at risk of failing. I made it a priority to observe James teach and then work alongside James and his AT to develop an action plan to address the identified areas of concern. An action plan was drawn up and signed off by both the AT and James. The concerns and corrective actions were made transparent to all parties involved. On my second observation it was clear that the concerns had not been addressed and the AT and school-based coordinator agreed with me that James could not meet the second practicum learning outcomes. Therefore, James was failed. I am comfortable that I followed the student of concern process as outlined in the relevant practicum and programme handbooks.

PEARL: I wouldn’t sit so comfortably, Paul. It clearly states in your documentation that all practicum assessments need to be made “after” a triadic assessment process where you, the AT and the student teacher all have a chance to attest to how or how not each learning outcome has been addressed. Your decision to dispense with the triadic discussion was a clear breach of process.

PAUL: I think I need to clarify the context the decision was made within. James had been incorrectly admitted into the programme due to an administrative error. His inability to clearly speak English made it impossible for him to communicate with either the children in his class or the staff. The circumstance I found myself in was highly stressful for all concerned. James was stressed as he could not understand the requirements of the practicum, the students he was teaching, or the feedback he was getting from his AT. The children were stressed as they had no idea what they were being asked to do by James. The AT was stressed as the learning environment of her classroom was disintegrating in front of her eyes. The school-based practicum coordinator was stressed as she was getting pressure from the principal to remove James from the school for the sake of the children and to allay the concerns of stressed parents. In the interests of natural justice, I thought it best he be removed without some kind of grand inquisition into the blindingly obvious. I believe my decision to remove James without going through the triadic process was an ethical one.

PEARL (Chuckles): Natural justice! You clearly don't know the meaning of the term. Natural justice protects individuals against the arbitrary use of power. Natural justice provides individuals a chance to hear the charges of their accusers and prepare a rebuttal. Far from acting in the interests of "natural justice," your capricious decision making flies in the very face of the principles of natural justice.

PAUL (Murmurs): Maybe I meant social justice.

SEENA: I would like to request the interview be suspended so Paul and I can confer. Paul come with me.

NEIL: Interview suspended at 2.53 p.m.

Paul follows Seena down the corridor and into a spare interview room. Seena closes the door behind them.

PAUL: Christ I feel like the surviving pilot of an unexplained crash that killed hundreds who has been hauled in front of an accident investigation panel.

SEENA: A slight over dramatisation there, Paul. Now breathe...good...here, have some water...now do you mind if I make a few observations?

PAUL: Go ahead. That's why you are here.

SEENA: The way you responded in there was very interesting. When you spoke confidently about pulling James from the practicum for the wellbeing of the children, James himself and the staff of

Glenwood School, I could see you identifying yourself as “teacher as activist.” Smyth (2002) has described the activist teacher as one who resists actions and requirements that perpetuate acts of violence and domination of disempowered groups. However, I was interested that in defending your socially just decision making you were drawn into the language of compliance. You argued that your actions conformed to the processes outlined in the official practicum documentation and that you were therefore justified in your decision making. There is an interesting fluidity in your identification as a teacher here. On the one hand, you are the socially just hero flying into the school to save the day, while on the other you are the efficient administrator of official processes, never putting a bureaucratic foot wrong. Lasky (2005) can be informative in helping us understand the fluid nature of your teacher identity. Lasky’s sociocultural study explored how a small group of Canadian secondary teachers struggled with the onset of managerialism at a state and local level. Lasky argues mediational tools such as policy mandates, curriculum guidelines and state standards provide a “mediating system that affects teacher identity, while also creating conditions for the ways teachers can teach in schools” (p. 900). Your need to justify your decision making with reference to official practicum documents demonstrates how the dominant managerial discourse of your neoliberal work place has a mediating effect on your teaching identity. Even though you reach towards an activist identity, that Lasky would argue was informed by early influences in your career, your agency is limited by the sociocultural tools at hand. These practicum and programme handbooks you refer to are carefully crafted documents that ensure that the requirements of institutional accountability and the client (student)-provider (university) relationship are clearly defined. Any attempt by you to use teacher agency is mediated by these cultural tools and affects your teaching identity. As Lasky observes “A person’s sense of agency and his or her ability to act cannot be separated from the effects that mediational systems have on shaping him or her” (p. 902).

When you go back in there, remember that, although you can’t escape the ideological conditions that led to your English language dilemma, you do have the agency to call out the way in which these conditions impact on your ethical decision making and the consequence of this decision.

Paul and Seena return to Interview Room 1 and take their seats

NEIL: Interview recommenced at 3.03 p.m.

PAUL: Just for the sake of clarification, when I said natural justice before I meant social justice... Look, I made some tough calls. The university, in their clamber to stay competitive in a shrinking ITE marketplace, put undue pressure on student administration to boost numbers to reach student enrolment targets. James being wrongfully offered a place in the programme was a direct result of

this pressure. Once James was in the programme, he was offered all the support possible to succeed in the programme including an individualised English language support programme. However, it quickly became apparent to myself and the staff at Glenwood School that the spoken English required of James in the complex and dynamic world of the classroom was beyond his capability given the time restraints of a 5-week practicum within a 1-year programme. I made the call to dispense with the triadic for the wellbeing of all concerned. If I had continued the triadic process I would have continued to disempower and dehumanise James even further. I would be, in the words of Giroux (2004), inflicting material and symbolic violence against James. I made the socially just call to resist such “violence” and to make good by James in pursuing a full refund of his fees. If I failed to take these decisions it would have fallen to others to eventually fail James. It would have fallen to other faculty and school colleagues to embrace James in the twisted neoliberal dance of performance accountability. For the wellbeing of all concerned, and the integrity of the programme, I stand by my decision to fail James without completing the triadic assessment process.

SEENA (Leaning in and whispering to Paul through slightly gritted teeth): That was a fascinating rant Paul. Again, I can see you oscillating in how you are identifying as teacher. You are playing the role of social justice warrior most convincingly. Nice use of Smyth by the way. However, you end your rant by making reference to the integrity of the programme. You seem to be signalling an external integrity that ensures your programme maintains a certain position in the educational market pla...

NEIL (Interrupting Seena): I find it interesting that you see your decision as being in the best interests of all those concerned. You are essentially taking a utilitarian approach to your ethical decision making by usurping the principle of natural justice embedded in the triadic assessment process, for what you feel will be a decision that leads to the best outcomes for the most people.

PAUL: Exactly! The short-term negative consequence for James, of failing the practicum and exiting the programme, are outweighed by the harm his further involvement in the programme could have had on the children, and colleagues he would go on to work with in other school settings.

NEIL: What about James?

PAUL: The short-term damage to James’s sense of self is indeed regrettable but I contend that to drag out the process of failing would have been far more psychologically harmful in the long term.

PEARL: (Excitedly pointing her finger). Do you? Do you really? Do you really think you did James a favour by asking him to leave the school immediately? That there was no psychological harm done as he made his hurried goodbyes to a group of children he felt an emotional bond with? Further, was there no psychological harm as he searched for an answer to a question from a fellow student teacher as to why he was leaving school early? No psychological harm as he sat in the bus shelter outside the school gates waiting for the mid-morning cross-town bus? (Pausing and lowering her voice). And there was no psychological harm as he tried to explain to his wife and children why he would be staying at home for the foreseeable future?

PEARL: (Slowly standing, arms extending over the table, palms pressing onto the cold glass). I put it to you that you weren't worried about the emotional harm you would be sparing James when you pulled him from the practicum like a baby molar from a 5-year-old's mouth. Removing James from the school was an act of convenience as you struggled to manage your time and keep on top of your workload as a stressed programme leader. Furthermore, your faux concern for the staff and children at Glenwood School, and any future colleagues he might go on to work with, is merely a smokescreen for your real fear about the reputation of the programme you lead. It was embarrassing for the university to have placed a student so clearly out of their depth in a high-stakes practicum when they were a full third of the way into their programme. Your quick fix extraction of James from practicum was nothing but a lame attempt at reputational damage limitation. Your ethical social warrior act might impress your students, but I see right through it.

(Smiling, Pearl sits down, leans back in her chair and folds her arms). Neil was correct when he observed that the nature of your decision making was more concerned with consequences than principles. However, in my view, it was the consequences to your reputation that really focussed your thinking. In the words of John Clark (2005), you are what is known as an ethical egotist!

SEENA: OK, OK, I think we need to request another break.

NEIL: Interview suspended at 3.09 p.m.

Paul and Seena depart to the empty interview room.

PAUL: God I feel hot. I need some air. Can we get out of here?

SEENA: No problem, Paul. If you are feeling under duress, I can ask for the interview to be stopped. It is your call.

PAUL (Gulping for air). But they will just come for me again.

SEENA: They are always going to be coming for us, Paul.

Paul and Seena sit in a small corner bar. Perching on bar stools, they both arrange themselves for modesty and comfort. The bartender brings two drinks to the table. Paul takes a much-needed gulp from his cold Pilsener, while Seena stirs the ice in her soda and lime with intent.

SEENA: That was rough in there, Paul, but you stood your ground. You should feel proud. I could see you bravely holding to your teacher as activist identity. Smyth (2011) has argued that the neoliberal agenda is perpetuating an identity of the preferred teacher as one who is “dutiful, compliant, market responsive and uncritical of the circumstances and conditions around her” (p. 29). You were far from dutiful, compliant and market responsive. You kicked ass. You were teacher as activist, my friend!

PAUL: I hardly think so. That Pearl bitch called me out. Maybe I just acted out of pure self-interest? Maybe I was just being a good little neoliberal corporate citizen? Maybe my decision was really made to protect the reputation of my programme and by extension the long-term interests of the university? Maybe I was being what Sachs (2001) refers to as “teacher as entrepreneur?” Maybe I was more interested in presenting myself as a leader who has the ability to use regulations to act in an efficient manner to uphold the integrity of the programme in the educational market place?

SEENA: Maybe you were playing both teacher as entrepreneur and teacher as activist. Sachs (2001) certainly sees a fluidity between these identities. As I mentioned to you earlier, when you use the cultural tools of documentation of accountability and the rationale of reputational protection to argue your case, you are teacher as entrepreneur. But then I see you being willing to draw attention to the contextual factors that created the conditions for the emergence of the situation James found himself in. You also acted in what you believed were his best interests. When you failed James, you could have followed university process, had the triadic discussion, had the follow-up review meeting, had the exit interview, and had James sent on his way, his bank account seriously depleted. By going beyond the role of mere technician efficiently carrying out processes imposed by others, you were fulfilling a role Smyth (2011) describes as teacher as intellectual.

PAUL: Are you just saying that to make me feel better?

SEENA: Yes. Really you are a spineless neoliberal rent boy. Jokes! You’re alright for a white Shore boy.

PAUL: (Draining his glass with a flourish). Well that’s me. Thanks for today.

SEENA: No problem, that’s what I am here for.

PAUL: Before you go, do you mind telling me what is inscribed on your arm?

SEENA. It is a poem by my favourite poet, Mahmoud Darwish:

I am from there, I am from here,

But I am not there, and I am not here,

I have two names, which meet and part.

And I have two languages,

I forget which of them I dream in.

As Paul leaves the bar, he wonders what language James dreams in.

Confront: In Which I Interrogate and Analyse the Assumptions That Informed My Ethical Decision Making

I find myself at the daunting confront stage of my autoethnographic case study. At this point, I apply the theoretical framework of teacher identity construction, established in Chapter 6, to analyse my English language dilemma. It is my intention for this analysis to reveal something of my own experience of identity formation while illuminating how a university teacher negotiates the ethics of teaching. I use the Ehrich et al.'s. (2011) five-stage model of approaching ethical dilemmas to analyse my case study. The step-by-step process developed by the authors allows for individual teachers to illuminate the dilemmatic nature of critical incidents they experience in their daily work. In utilising the Ehrich et al. (2011) model, I provide insights into how my response to this ethical dilemma demonstrates my active location in relation to various teaching discourses (Coldron & Smith, 1999) as well as in relation to wider social formations. I explore how I was interpellated to the hail of dominant managerial discourses (Althusser, 2006) and I will identify how the cultural tools at my disposal in dealing with this dilemma mediated my active decision making (Lasky, 2005).

The model of ethical decision making developed by Ehrich et al. (2011) was designed with the hope of minimising the impact of ethical dilemmas. While the authors warn “there are no easy steps to remedy ethical dilemmas” (p. 182), they do suggest their five-stage model is useful in helping teachers discharge their duties fairly. Furthermore, they advocate for their model to be used alongside problem-based scenarios in teacher education programmes thereby helping student teachers to prepare to deal with the ethical dilemmas they will confront in their future practice.

Stage 1: The critical incident.

The first stage of the model involves the identification of a critical incident. In the case of the English language dilemma, I became aware of a student teacher placed in a partnership school who could not clearly communicate using the language of instruction in his practicum classroom and was therefore unable to meet the practicum learning outcomes. I deemed this to be a critical incident as the situation was causing distress for the student teacher, children in the practicum school, and other teachers, and had the potential for grave consequences.

Stage 2: Critical reflection from multiple perspectives.

The second stage requires the teacher to view their critical incident through a range of different lenses including those of professional ethics, organisational culture, institutional context and the wider socioeconomic political environment. I work through each lens, one at a time.

The lens of professional ethics. When considering my critical incident through the lens of professional ethics, the ECANZ *Code of Professional Responsibility and Standards for the Teaching Profession* (2017b), explored in Chapter 4, seems appropriate as reference point. The code requires teachers to consider their commitments to the teaching profession, learners, families and whānau, and wider society, when making ethical decisions. Prominent in my thinking, when making the decision to remove James from the classroom, was the wellbeing of the children in the class James was teaching. It was clear from my observation that the children were not learning when James was teaching, as they could not understand him. In my opinion, there was no evidence that that this state of affairs could be addressed within the timeframe of the practicum. The *Code* advises that in demonstrating their commitment to learners, teachers should strive to protect their wellbeing and safety, which is what I was doing when I decided to remove James from his practicum placement. Of course, Pearl from the EEEU would argue this commitment was far from my mind when I made the decision to remove James. Instead, Pearl would most likely argue that I was more concerned about minimising reputational damage to the programme I lead than protecting learners. If I had the opportunity to defend this accusation, I would point to the commitment to the teaching profession outlined in the *Code* where it is stated that public trust in the teaching profession can only be maintained when teachers demonstrate a commitment to providing high-quality and effective teaching. By compelling James to leave the programme, I would argue I was upholding my commitment to high-quality and effective teachers graduating from the programme.

Coldron and Smith (1999) observe how teachers find a sense of agency when assessing how to respond to circumstances they find themselves in. They outline a plurality of traditions that occupy the social space of teaching and argue that teachers locate themselves in relation to these

traditions. I would suggest, in responding to the English language dilemma as I did, I was locating myself within the “moral” tradition of teaching. Coldron and Smith discuss how, within this moral tradition, teachers will often need to decide whether to support their teaching institution’s habitual practices and structures or to critique and oppose them. In the case of the English language dilemma, I decided to openly oppose my university’s practice of completing a second observation visit after a “student of concern” process had been initiated. I believed removing James immediately, and forgoing the second observation, demonstrated my professional commitment to both learners and the teaching profession. My location within the moral tradition of teaching was reinforced when I challenged my university’s standard practice of denying students a fee refund if they had failed to withdraw within 2 weeks of their programme start date. My determination to search through the James’ admission records for signs of administrative oversight ensured I was able to prove he was admitted to the programme by mistake. In utilising the university admission system to successfully gain James a refund, I was able to position myself as an activist teacher within Coldron and Smith’s moral tradition (Coldron & Smith, 1999; Sachs, 2001).

The lens of organisational culture. Ehrich et al. (2011) argue that, if a critical incident is going to be illuminated as an ethical dilemma, the incident needs to be viewed through the lens of institutional culture. They suggest teachers explore how the culture of their institution impacts on the decisions made regarding a critical incident. Within the university enrolment system, there are clear bureaucratic processes for admitting students into ITE and social work programmes. A culture of trust exists between programme leaders and administrative staff that decisions made by interview panels will be accurately communicated to both successful and unsuccessful applicants. If there is any ambiguity in the interview panel reports regarding an applicant’s acceptance to the programme, administrative staff will consult with the programme leader before communicating interview decisions. In the case of James’ interview report, there was definite ambiguity as the panel chair had ticked the interview pass box but, in the comments section, had written “Poor English. Not suitable for programme.” Administrative staff had brought to my attention a number of similarly unclear reports since I started in my role as programme leader. For some reason, in James’s case, I was not informed. In conversations with colleagues, I was made aware of the stress administrative staff were under as they simultaneously dealt with the induction of a number of new inexperienced staff and a university-wide review of administrative units.

Lasky (2005) discusses how a teacher’s early-career influences and the social context of their workplace mediates the development of professional identity. Using a sociocultural approach,

Lasky argues that to understand teacher identity development we must understand the cultural tools that shape ways of acting in specific social contexts. When I reflect on my historical relationships with administrative staff, both in the context of primary and intermediate schools I have worked in and the university, I believe I have formed the identity of a *good sort*. By that I mean I try to be collegial and cooperative rather than being removed and dictatorial. If I trace my early-career influences on this particular construction of identity, my thoughts return, first, to how I saw my father treated in his job as a commercial cleaner.

A story with my father.

When I was a student teacher, my part-time job was working as a cleaner for my father. I worked alone on straightforward small business jobs, but for some of the large and lucrative law firm contracts I worked evenings alongside Dad ensuring kitchens, offices and bathrooms were spick and span for the next day's commercial activities. We would usually begin our work at 6.00 p.m. when we would come across the occasional lawyer working late. I observed these professionals' social exchanges with my father with a detached sociological interest. I came to categorise three types of interactions. Firstly, there was the complete dismissive interaction where the lawyer would acknowledge my Dad's presence with a slight nod of the head as his bin was emptied and furniture dusted. Secondly, there was the irritated interaction. This was signalled by the slamming of an office door as the droning of the vacuum cleaner approached the annoyed inhabitant's cubicle threshold: this was an office that would not require cleaning tonight thank you very much. Some people are working! Finally, there was the convivial interaction where my Dad would be greeted as Kev, bawdy jokes and fishing stories were exchanged and inquiries into my family's wellbeing were made. These were people whom my Dad called "good sorts."

When I started my first teaching job, I was keen to make a good impression so I went into the school in mid-January to set up my classroom. The only person there to impress was Gene, the contract cleaner. Apart from the obvious occupational similarity, Gene reminded me of my Dad. He was hardworking, affable and generous to a fault. (Over the course of the next 10 years, I taught Gene's two children, exchanged regular opinions on the woeful Warriors, discussed the various merits of the Tellus commercial backpack vacuum cleaner, and we became firm friends.) As the first year of my teaching career drifted by, I became keenly aware that the smooth running of the school was very much dependent on the hard work of non-teaching general staff like contract cleaners, administrative personnel, caretakers and teacher aides. I also became mindful of how hierarchal a school could be. Some of my senior teaching colleagues made it very obvious to me that, as a beginning teacher, I did not have the right to have an opinion on matters educational until at least my third year. Invariably these same colleagues treated general staff as inferiors. Memories of evenings cleaning the offices of the dismissive and irritated were formative

in ensuring I would never be indifferent or rude to a colleague regardless of their employment status. I was going to be a good sort. I carried this identity into my work as a university teacher.

In beginning my role as programme leader, the biggest change I found from my previous academic teaching role was the number of relationships I now had with administrative staff. I continued to strive to be a good sort but, on occasion, this identity was threatened when I needed to query administrators on mistakes that had been made that were having a direct bearing on the smooth running of the programme, such the mistaken admission of James. When I pointed out the error on James's interview panel report to the enrolment administrator, I felt a clear shift in identity. I was no longer the collegial good sort, rather I was compelled towards an entrepreneurial identity of accountability and efficiency. I was leading a programme that needed to keep its market share, therefore, as programme leader, I needed to ensure our internal mechanisms were robust and responsive (Sachs, 2001). Lasky (2005) points out that how individuals choose to act is always mediated by the technology, numeracy systems, media, language, art, literature and other symbolic tools of their culture. In this way, an individual may have some agency in their decision making and resulting identity construction but these choices are always "mediated by the interaction between the individual (attributes and inclinations), and the tools and structures of the social setting" (p. 900). In the social setting of the university, the cultural tool of the admissions system facilitated the functioning of my search for admission data on James. At the same time, from a sociocultural perspective, it also altered my thinking about, and relationship to, my social context and ultimately led me to identify as teacher as entrepreneur, as I asked administrative staff to provide safeguards against future enrolment oversights:

As programme leader I expect to be informed of any potential candidates who have even slightly ambiguous interview panel reports. I am the one who has to deal with the fallout when we get these enrolments wrong and we look foolish in our school community....by the way, I am a good sort really.

In reflecting on my ethical decision making through an organisational lens, I examined the interpersonal relationships that occur as a result of university organisational practices. Reflection through an institutional lens requires consideration of the foundational commercial and academic imperatives of the university.

The lens of the institutional context. The Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Primary) programme has an over 20-year institutional relationship with partnership schools in the Auckland area. Many schools have had an association with the university for much of this time, and, as such, the

programme has built up a strong reputation for developing quality graduates. Many alumni go on to work in partnership schools and many have risen to roles of senior management within these schools. When I took over the programme leadership role, I was keenly aware of the hard work my predecessors had put into building a culture of trust with partnership schools and I was intent on honouring their legacy. I was also cognisant that, when many of the partnerships had been established, my university was the only institution in the city offering a 1-year primary teaching programme for graduates. That monopoly had subsequently evaporated as a number of other players had entered the market. I felt trust and reputation needed to be safeguarded for reasons of both legacy and the retention of school partners in an increasingly competitive ITE marketplace.

Following my abrupt removal of James from the school, there was no doubt I needed to move into reputational damage control. Pearl was right there. The school coordinator had made me aware of parental complaints from the parents of James' practicum class. There was also incredulity among the staff that the university would allow a student teacher with such little command of English to be allowed to go on a practicum that had a period of full classroom responsibility. At the time, I went straight to the principal's office, where I apologised for placing her staff and children in such an unacceptable position; I assured her that I would be doing everything I could to ensure James received a full refund since he was essentially in the programme on false pretences that were beyond his control.

My apology, though genuine, was greeted with what I can only describe as a look of disdain. As I left the principal's office, I felt a feeling I had never experienced as a teacher. I tried to pin the emotion down but it was elusive. There was a sting of shame at the dismissive attitude of the principal, but that was only fleeting. To suggest disappointment would only be partially accurate; it seemed more profound than disappointment. As I opened my car door and glanced back at the school, I realised that I would not be returning to this school for some time, nor would any of my university colleagues or students. Regret! It was regret, damn it! Regret at losing the school's partnership with the programme, regret at losing the sale, regret at not closing the deal, regret at losing the account, regret at losing market share. When I recognised my regret, I recognised my failure, and when I recognised my failure, I was interpellated as a subject to the neoliberal ideology of the market. Law (2000) discusses how we are interpellated when "it becomes instantly obvious to us that *we are* that way and *we know* that way" (p. 14). In my moment of regret, I was identifying as Sach's teacher as entrepreneur. Sach's (2001) observes how the market is an increasingly important factor in how teachers construct their professional identity. The collective ethos that had sustained my most satisfying work as an educator was replaced with a hollow feeling of loss. The competition for enrolments in ITE relied on our

reputation and our trusting partnerships. I felt I had slipped in the race. I was a failed entrepreneur. Others were ready to pounce. I knew who I was and I knew I had failed.

The lens of the wider socioeconomic political environment. Ehrich et al. (2011) suggest if we are to truly understand the dilemmatic nature of a critical incident, we must examine the incident through the broader global, socioeconomic and political context. My anxiety at losing a school from the programme needs to be set against the backdrop of the dramatic reduction in students wanting to enter the teaching profession. In New Zealand, the number of enrolments in ITE fell 39% between 2011 and 2016 (Ministry of Education, 2017). The global situation is also bleak, with a worldwide teacher shortage being acknowledged by UNESCO (2016) who foresee a shortfall of 68.8 million teachers by 2030 if current recruitment and retention trends continue. In the New Zealand context, the teaching crisis has been exacerbated by low teacher salaries and high house prices (Collins, 2018). All of these factors have contributed to an increasingly competitive ITE market place and heightened my concern that the fallout from placing a student so clearly out of their depth in a well-established partnership school could impact negatively on the reputation of the programme in the wider Auckland educational community.

The user-pays aspect of New Zealand tertiary education also elevated the gravity of my decision to remove James from Glenwood School. The early 1990s, saw university students having to pay substantially higher tuition fees than historically had been the case (Abbott, 2006). James had already paid over \$5,000 for his Semester 1 courses and, as discussed earlier, he was not eligible for a fee refund given the length of time he had been enrolled.

When I met with Seena at the EEEU, she pointed out how I oscillated in my teacher identity between the socially just activist, defending the marginalised student, and the efficient manager of institutional processes, scared to put a bureaucratic foot wrong and fretting over institutional reputation. In viewing this critical incident through the macro lens of the socioeconomic and political environment, it is possible to see how I was at once interpellated to the discourse of managerialism while desperately trying socially locate myself within the moral tradition of teaching (Althusser, 2006; Coldron & Smith, 1999).

Stage 3: Confronting personal values, theoretical ethical orientation and professional socialisation.

In the third part of their model, Ehrich et al. (2011) suggest that the individual should consider how their *personal values*, *theoretical ethical orientation* and *professional socialisation* contribute to how a critical incident is shaped as a dilemma. It is in the deliberation of how the various perspectives on a critical incident (see Stage 2) intersect with individual values and

beliefs where the true dilemmatic nature of a challenging situation is revealed. The authors advise individuals to examine the sources of their values such as religion, professional experience and personal conscience. Scholars in the field of teacher life-history research also point to the value of exploring the ways that teachers' personal and professional priorities influence their professional decision making (Gudmundsdottir, 1990; Goodson, 1991; Woods, 1993). Goodson (1991) observes that life experiences and background are key to how a teacher defines their sense of identity and orientates their position in the world of practice. An ethical decision-making model that requires teachers to take time to reflect on the values developed through their lived histories, and how these historical beliefs impact on their decision making, complements a life-history approach to research.

My values. A life-history approach is useful in understanding how I experienced the English language critical incident as a dilemma. The value of generosity and an inherent fear of doing the thing wrong are part of my family history.

A story with my mother

I never attended church as a child but Catholicism was very influential in how my own value system developed. My mother was a lapsed Catholic who had attended a convent school in Fiji until she was 10 years old, when she moved to New Zealand with her mother and father. As my grandmother was particularly fond of the colonial social life on offer in postwar Fiji, and my grandfather spent extended periods of time working overseas, my mother was largely raised by the Catholic sisters and her nanny. My mother's nanny, Anna, was a beautiful, graceful, and warm young Fijian woman who was my Mum's primary caregiver in her formative years. From the age of 1 to 10, my Mum was largely in the convent or being raised by Anna and the women of the local village.

There was always a tear in Mum's eye when she told me about Anna's warmth, grace and love. Over 20 years later, the sting of separation was still fresh. Mum also divulged her disdain of the convent nuns and how their cruelty and vindictiveness had turned her away from the church. Twenty years later, the sting of the ruler across knuckles was still fresh.

When I look back at my childhood, I can see the seminal influences from my Mum's own upbringing inherent in the values she instilled in my sister and me. Anna was big hearted and generous and welcomed my mother into her extended Fijian family. Her Melanesian spirit of generosity and inclusiveness was very influential on my mother who was both an only child, and somewhat isolated from her own nuclear family. Growing up, our house was a magnet for neighbourhood waifs and strays, and a refuge for family and friends in need of a bed or cup of

tea. I grew up knowing Anna, though I never met her, through the legacy of her manaakitanga. The value of generosity has settled in my bones.

Despite my mother's resentment of the unnecessary violence inflicted on her by the convent nuns, her parenting style was heavily influenced by her Catholic upbringing. The first rule in our house was the golden rule, do unto others as you would have them do unto you. The second rule was to remember that all people are created equal and that people are all essentially good. The final rule was to always try to be good as there are consequences for wickedness. I grew up knowing something of Catholicism though I never went to church. A fear of God had settled in my bones, as had the guilt of disappointing her.

When I reflect on my experience with James, I can see how these formative values play out in differing ways. I felt a lot of guilt in removing James from his placement so abruptly. Is this how I would like to have been treated if our positions were reversed? The moment I uttered the words "I am afraid it's time for you to leave," I knew I had made an irreversible decision of huge consequences for James. Confusion and panic spread across his face as the realisation of the significance of my words flooded his thoughts. When James asked, "Does this mean I will not become a teacher?", he already knew the answer. I felt guilty and mean.

My faith in the underlying goodness of people also played into my decision to act quickly. My conversations with both the AT and school coordinator demonstrated a deep empathy and respect for James as a person. They too were conflicted in wanting to remove James from their school. They saw a gentleness and intelligence and James, even as they also saw the chaos his teaching was causing in the classroom and the detrimental effect this was having on the wellbeing of children. Their desire to relieve James of his practicum duties was borne out of genuine concern rather than malevolence towards this struggling student teacher.

A deferred Catholic guilt courtesy of my maternal lineage saw me scrambling to minimise the negative consequences of a decision that would be viewed as cruel and extreme to the casual observer. My impromptu meeting with the school principal, and my frantic attempts to get a full fee rebate for James, were borne out of a desire make some sort of amends for this distressing situation. I wanted to make things right. I wanted to demonstrate a generosity of spirit. I wanted to be a good person.

My theoretical ethical orientation. In understanding how professional socialisation influences how teachers view critical incidents, Ehrich et al. (2011) advise individuals to reflect on how traditions in ethical theory have informed their historical decision making as professionals. The

authors point to how Kantian moral rules, utilitarian concerns for consequences and an ethic of care can have a bearing on how teachers respond to critical incidents in professional settings. In the case of the English language dilemma, I was primarily concerned with the consequences of my decision. I rejected the rule that all students involved in the student of concern process should be given the chance to prove their progress through a second observation. I ignored this categorical imperative and removed James immediately without giving him recourse to a second chance, as I believed it was in the best interests of the children, the school staff, and James himself to terminate his practicum with immediate effect. In this regard, I was drawing on the ethics of classical utilitarianism as I judged removing James would result in the “greatest overall balance of happiness over unhappiness” (Rachels & Rachels, 2015, p. 111).

At the same time, and in retrospect, I do not doubt I caused great unhappiness to James in my decision making and that, as this incident progressed, I disregarded my ethics of care in regard to his wellbeing. Rachels and Rachels (2015) suggest individuals who demonstrate an ethics of care put a primacy on personal relationships and value intuition over institutional rules. In my role as programme leader and visiting lecturer, I had developed a personal relationship with James through the semester and I knew how devastated he was at having his practicum ended prematurely. However, in the immediate aftermath, I made no attempt to check on James’ personal wellbeing. I did not offer him a lift home. I did not phone him later in the day to check he how he was coping. I had no time for such acts of caring. I was in damage control.

My professional socialisation. So how might my professional socialisation have influenced my apparent utilitarian orientation to dealing with the English language dilemma? In answering this question, I am not proposing that I have totally eschewed a commitment to an ethics of care or to principled base approaches to my ethical deliberations; rather, in this particular case, consequences of actions took precedence in my decision making. I suggest my experience and socialisation as a classroom teacher in the New Zealand primary school sector provide some explanation to this ethical inclination. My time as a classroom teacher through the 1980s and 1990s mostly involved the teaching of large groups of children between the ages of 6 and 12. The smallest class I ever taught had a roll of 27 students and the largest had 42. Daily ethical decisions needed to be made regarding how to best meet the needs of such numbers. A recurrent dilemma I experienced was how to fairly distribute my teacher time among the class. A principled approach might have been to ensure every student had equal individualised one-on-one time with the teacher every day. However, I often took an approach that ensured that the students who were most likely to struggle with their learning tasks in particular lessons gained the most one-on-one teacher time, while those students who were able to pick up on new

concepts quickly relied on less teacher interaction and more on support from capable peers and supplementary instructional material. While a Kantian ethicist may argue that I was ignoring the categorical imperative that every child had a right to equal education, I would counter that, in ensuring that less-academically able students received more teacher time, they would be more likely to see the relevance of the learning task to their own experience of the world, and have a greater expectation of success (Biggs & Moore, 1993). The enhanced level of motivation these children would experience from having increased teacher assistance would ensure that when they did get on with independent tasks, they were more engaged and capable of sustaining periods of independent learning. The increased commitment that these learners had towards their independent learning tasks ensured potential behavioural disruptions were minimised. Without the distraction of bored students acting out, a calm learning environment was established and, when I did work with more advanced learners, quality teaching and learning could take place. From a utilitarian perspective, when I evaluate my decision to devote more teacher time to struggling learners, I can be satisfied that it ensured the majority of the class were happy, as behavioural issues, which can cause widespread classroom upset, were minimised. I can acknowledge that some of the more academically gifted children may not have been as intellectually challenged as would have been desirable, but the unhappiness this brought to this relatively small contingent is compensated by the general wellbeing of the majority (Miller, 2010).

Ehrich et al. (2011) observe, of the ethical decision-making process: “Each of these individuals will bring their own personal ethics—whether that be an emphasis on consequences, reference to rules, or a focus on relationships and character—to identifying and resolving the dilemma at hand” (p. 182). On reflecting on the English language dilemma, I can observe a stronger consequential drive than an ethics of care to my decision making.

Stage 4: The decision.

In this fourth stage of the Ehrich et al. (2011) model, the teacher revises the various factors considered in the first three stages and makes a decision. In my case, this was to remove James from practicum.

Stage 5: The implications.

In the final stage of their ethical decision-making model, Ehrich et al. (2011) ask teachers to consider the implications of their decision. Through the inform stage of this chapter, I have used the fictional EEEU unit as setting to explore the implications of withdrawing James from practicum. The interrogation of Paul by Neil Ruddock and Pearl Sargent provides a critical

assessment of the implications of this decision on James, while Paul's attempts to justify his decision illuminate the consequences of his decision on the AT, children and school community.

Conclusion

So, I found myself at the end of the daunting confront stage. I had a tidy little introduction, then applied my tidy little theoretical framework to my tidy little dilemma, so I was done and dusted with the confront section, right? Wrong! The whole point of the confront stage is to reveal the assumptions that underpin practice. While my analysis of the English language dilemma has laid bare some of the assumptions I made as a university teacher and the broader contextual factors that led to my decision making, my approach to analysis in this chapter reveals hidden assumptions about the very nature of ethical dilemmas. In choosing to use Ehrlich et al.'s model, I made a series of assumptions about the nature of ethical dilemmas that have been challenged by Fransson and Grannäs (2013) and their work on the dilemmatic space. My first assumption was to view the dilemma as something that existed within me as an individual subject. The second assumption was to see the dilemma as a discrete and isolated incident that could be, to some extent, resolved using a "solution-oriented" logic. My third and final assumption was to see the competing forces of the dilemma interacting in isolation with the context of my dilemma rather than being a complex set of interconnected elements. Fransson and Grannäs (2013) would suggest the assumptions I have made about ethical dilemmas being internal, idiosyncratic, discrete and manageable, can be overcome when it is acknowledged, "ethical dilemmas emerge in a space between individuals and the context in which they find themselves" (p. 7). In concluding this thesis, I draw on the *reconstruct* stage of Smyth's (2001) model of critical reflection to link the processes of my ethical decision making to the political and social dilemmatic space within which they occur. In doing so, I "transcend self-blame" (Smyth, 2001, p. 195) in how I have experienced the ethical complexities of my work and take an active reflective stance in identifying the social injustices that have contributed to the ethical nature of my university teaching.

Chapter Nine

The Conclusion: Reconstructing Myself as an Educational Ethicist

An educational ethicist sits alone in a corner booth of a bar. In front of him sit two pints. One is full, one is three quarters empty. He checks his watch. A second educational ethicist enters and spots his friend in the corner. He makes his way to the booth, sits down, and places on the table a bound thesis entitled, "Blowin' about the Tops: How a University Teacher Experiences and Negotiates the Ethics of Teaching." He slides the thesis across the polished oak surface.

"You should find the answer in there. I would start with the conclusion if I were you. Now is that my pint? I think I deserve a beer!"

It is Hard to Say Goodbye

When I enrolled in the Doctor of Education programme, I had a reasonably clear idea of what I wanted to write about in my thesis. After many years of dutifully introducing student teachers to the NZTC *Code of Ethics for Registered Teachers*, I wanted to know how the code was used in the process of teachers' ethical decision making. Following 2 years of regular Ed Doc cohort meetings, a literature review, a small-scale pilot study and research proposal, I had a research purpose and refined research question. The purpose of the doctorate was to explore how New Zealand teachers make ethical decisions, and the place a code plays in this process, and the more specific research question was *how do student teachers resolve ethical dilemmas in their practice and what place does the New Zealand Teachers Council Code of Ethics play in this process?*

The certainty that filled me following my Ed Doc confirmation seminar of November 2014 was short lived. While I had successfully jumped through the hoop of the Ed Doc portfolio, and thought I had lined up a series of other hoops to continue to jump through to get my doctorate, my supervisors had other ideas. "Trained dogs can jump through hoops, Paul. You're better than that." A writing malaise took hold and an ontological crisis swirled within. How was I going to get close to the truth of how teachers make ethical decisions when I could only rely upon my interpretations of participants' filtered responses to my proposed semi-structured interview and focus group questions?

An Epiphany Over a Putt

A crisis meeting with my main supervisor, Professor Saville Kushner, was arranged on a late-summer Saturday afternoon in December 2015. The venue was Chamberlain Park Public Golf Course. As I concentrated above a reasonably straightforward five-footer, with a slight break to

the left, Saville interrupted my downswing. “You need to get into the places where ethical decisions are actually made on a daily basis. Sit in the staffrooms, immerse yourself in school life, listen, talk, become part of the setting of the ethics of teaching.” With Saville’s advice flooding my neurons, the task at hand was temporarily forgotten as unexpected synaptic bursts saw me apply far too much force for the short putt I was facing. The ball curled past the hole, picked up speed across the closely cropped grass before dropping gently into the hungry mouth of a green side bunker.

“Thanks, Sav!”

“Sorry Paul, didn’t mean to put you off.”

“No, I mean it. Thanks. While I may not have the extended time needed to sit in the research-rich setting of school staffrooms researching how teachers make ethical decisions, I can sit and be with myself as I experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching.”

“Put away the putter, Paul. You’ll need a sand wedge where you’re going,” advised Saville.

Fear and Loathing in the State Library of Victoria

So here I sit in the La Trobe Reading Room of the State Library of Victoria. I look up to the magnificent domed ceiling. The balconies above me are lined with ancient leather-bound books, arranged carefully by spine colour and volume. The green shade of a banker’s lamp illuminates my desk. I am here for inspiration. However, the leather-bound tomes that surround me seem heavy and oppressive. They contain the distilled knowledge and wisdom of thousands of scholars who have gone before. How can a former primary school teacher, the son of working-class cleaners, dare to think he can join this academy? In the final throes of my doctorate, I still feel like an intellectual imposter.

It was exactly a year ago I sat in this same hallowed hall. I was searching for inspiration then too. This intellectual ghost chamber channelled my first case study and solidified the structure of my doctoral thesis. This place had worked its magic on me before, so why not again? However, the circumstances I find myself in on this cold Melbourne afternoon are quite different from a year ago. Then I had job security. Today I am looking into the abyss. My job at the university is under threat. The staff of my faculty have been informed they have been failing their fiscal responsibility to the rest of the university. There need to be cuts to academic staff and, as it stands, I am “in scope.” For the second time in 4 years, I am among faculty who will need to fight to retain their job. For the second time in 4 years, I am afraid of being exposed as the working-class imposter.

No longer a primary school teacher, and possibly no longer an academic, I feel lost and adrift. I am living and feeling the erasure of identity (Hall, 1996).

Yet the pain of ego must be set aside. The point of this moment in time is to write. I have been fortunate enough to secure 2 days of writing time towards my doctorate in the glorious city of Melbourne. I feel both gratitude and anxiety at the thought of the 2 days of intellectual space I have been afforded. I feel grateful, as I know the real leaps in progress I have made in my doctorate over the last 5-and-a-half years have come when I have been able to retreat from the world for sustained periods. I feel anxiety, as this is the first time I have returned to my writing since finding out I might lose my job. There has been emotional damage done.

As an autoethnographer I find myself wanting to turn my back on my lived experience. Since my methodological turn towards autoethnography, my own experiences as a university teacher have become my raw data. Now these experiences seem too raw. The idea of returning to an analysis of my ethical decision making in a job I may no longer have seems a particularly masochistic intellectual exercise. Unpicking my contorted and disintegrating teacher identity seems a most unhealthy pursuit. However, I have made a commitment to my supervisors, my family and myself, to this work. Over the course of this doctorate, I have often found myself in moments of intellectual doubt. When I have expressed this hesitation to my supervisors, they have consistently advised me to write myself out of uncertainty. So here I sit in the La Trobe Reading Room of the State Library of Victoria, writing.

The Reconstruct Stage

It seems somehow fitting that the one book I brought along with me to the State Library of Victoria is John Smyth's 2001 publication *Critical Politics of Teachers Work: An Australian Perspective*. As discussed in Chapter 5, I have a long history with this esteemed Victorian academic's work and I have made use of the describe, inform and confront stages of his model of critical reflection in presenting my case studies. I have deliberately refrained from using the reconstruct stage until the conclusion of this study, as I believe there is a certain synergy between the features of a thesis conclusion and the thinking Smyth promotes in the reconstruct stage of his model of critical reflection. In arguing for the intellectualisation of the work of teachers, Smyth (2001) advocates that teachers actively analyse how their practice reflects and sustains dominant ideologies. However, for Smyth, it is not enough to simply reveal the conditions that allow the reproduction of social inequality, "one must begin to act on the world in a way that amounts to changing it" (p. 194). In identifying actions that contribute to such change, Smyth discusses how teachers should be encouraged to share intellectual accounts of

their own teaching and the unique context of this work. By locating themselves personally and professionally in their professional histories, teachers are able to reveal the forces that have informed their practice and then act to change for the better. As Anderson (2006) observes of the autoethnographer's mission, there is an ethical responsibility "to be involved in the construction of meaning and values in the social worlds they investigate. As fully fledged members, they cannot always sit observantly on the sidelines" (p. 384). In this thesis, I have attempted to locate myself in the hurly burly of dilemmatic space and in doing so reveal the forces that have come to bear on my own ethical decision making. It is my hope that in reconstructing my lived experiences as a teacher I will illuminate for others how the daily ethical decisions we make are not the result of random arbitrary events but are rather a reflection of the broader cultural, social and economic context of our work. The impact of how we negotiate in the dilemmatic space of teachers' work has a profound impact of our professional identity. In providing insights into how I experience the ethics of university teaching using the autoethnographic method, I present an original contribution to understanding the ethical nature of teaching and the formation of teacher identity.

A contribution: How does a university teacher experience and negotiate the ethics of teaching?

This thesis provides a unique insight into how a teacher goes about the complex act of ethical decision making when confronted by ethical dilemmas, while also contributing new understandings of how teacher identity is constructed. I have found that experiencing and negotiating the ethics of teaching is an act of identity construction and reconstruction. I have come to understand the ethical dilemmas of my practice are not situations where I, as an individual subject, am ever able to achieve ethical closure in how I deal with them. I have found agreement with Bonnie Honig (1996) when she suggests, "dilemmas are actually the eventful eruptions of a turbulence that is always already there" (p. 259). Like Louis Althusser, Honig views the dilemmatic winds of ideology as constant. It is within this ideological landscape that individuals are hailed to certain subject identities (Althusser, 2006). The inevitable tensions brought to bear as I respond to hails within a neoliberal university are always present in a dilemmatic space that both constitutes my identity as a teacher and forms the terrain of my existence. By exploring this terrain close up, this thesis adds to both the literature on how teachers make ethical decisions and the literature on teacher identity formation.

Through this thesis, I have provided insights into how I have been hailed by a myriad of teacher identities as I have experienced and negotiated the ethics of teaching. I have shown through an eclectic synthesis of Honig's notion of dilemmatic space, and Althusser's theory of

interpellation, how the ethical dilemmas I have experienced as a university teacher have been determined by institutional, cultural and ideological structures. However, while ideological winds do indeed shape the landscape of my dilemmatic space, I have also found, through sociocultural identity theory (Lasky, 2005) and teacher life-history research (Coldron & Smith, 1999), that, as a university teacher, I have some agency over my identity construction. Across the dilemmatic landscape there exist “identity shelters” that have been shaped, forged and mediated by the restless winds of ideology. Through this thesis, I have shown how I have had some agency in choosing the teaching traditions that have enabled me to reconcile my identity as a teacher and educational ethicist. I have had agency in deciding the identity shelters that will offer temporary respite from the ever-blowing dilemmatic winds as I have struggled to make ethical decisions as a university teacher. In concluding this thesis, I reiterate my rejection of viewing ethical dilemmas as discrete, isolated and external incidents requiring binary choices and closure (Honig, 1996). I have found through my case studies that there has been no closure in the dilemmas I have faced as a university programme leader. These dilemmas still exist within me and in the dilemmatic spaces between me and other actors who live with the consequences of my decisions.

The contribution I have made to the knowledge domains of educational ethics and teacher identity theory through this thesis has ensured I have followed Smyth’s call to act on the world through my writing. The implications of this reflective act are now discussed.

Methodological implications.

This thesis contributes methodologically to the field of autoethnographic research and has implications for how autoethnography can balance the evocative and analytical. My journey into the world of autoethnographic scholarship has provided rich opportunities for discussions with like-minded academics and an exciting new canon of literature to explore. Through my reading, writing and scholarly discussions, I have become aware of an inherent tension in autoethnographic research between “the evocative” and “the analytical,” a tension I explore more comprehensively in Chapter 5. My innovative use of Smyth’s (2001) model of critical reflection as a method of autoethnographic inquiry ensured my writing is accessible and emotionally engaging, while also providing the analytical leverage needed for my work to have transformative possibilities beyond the text. Chapter 5 details the way that I developed this methodologically distinctive approach to autoethnographic inquiry that is both engagingly evocative and deeply analytical and will prove useful for other autoethnographic scholars.

Practice implications.

When considering the potential implications of this research to teaching practice, I focus on the impact this research could make to the practice of university teaching, more broadly, and ITE, specifically. Educational ethicist Elizabeth Campbell (2003) calls for a renewed professionalism in teaching where practitioners are encouraged to share their stories of the ethical dilemmas they face in teaching and discuss the ethical virtues and principles at play in their practice. In sharing their stories, teachers develop a “heightened alertness to the nuances of practice and policy seen through the lens of more widely shared ethical knowledge” (p. 21). Similarly, educational philosopher Ivan Snook (2003) promotes teachers to “wrestle with the ethical issues that underlie their work” (p. 63). By wrestling with my own experiences of the ethics of teaching, through this thesis, I hope that other university teachers may be encouraged to not only think about their practice through an ethical lens, but also to engage in the kind of ethical dialogue of practice described by Campbell. I believe such ethical discussion and debate is essential for university teachers who continually have to face dilemmas of practice imposed by the ideology of the neoliberal university. ITE educators will also find significance in the findings of this study. The empirical study reported in Chapter 3 provides a unique understanding of the ethical dilemmas commonly experienced by students on practicum, while Chapters, 6, 7, 8 and 9 provide insights into the ongoing process of teacher identity construction from preservice teaching onwards. I hope these empirical and theoretical insights will help ITE educators, both in their work mentoring student teachers on practicum and in their university-based course teaching and design.

A temporary landing place.

As established in Chapter 5, I am the monster at the end of this book. I am a monster who has transformed into an educational ethicist. I am an educational ethicist who has had a good look around the ethics of teaching and realised how much still needs to be explored.

By turning towards the autoethnographical, I have by necessity forgone applying my theoretical framework of teacher identity to anyone but me. There are definitely duo-ethnographic and ethnographic possibilities for exploring the construction of teacher identity through my hybridised theoretical framework. This further research could focus on how the experience of ethical dilemmas is at the heart of teacher identity formation.

It was a tearful goodbye when I gave up pursuing how teachers make use of ethical codes in their decision making. My review of the literature had established a clear gap in the research. Given the prescriptive policy shift, discussed in Chapter 4, towards a prescriptive code of professional responsibility in the ECANZ *Our Code, Our Standards* (2017b) publication, it

seems timely to look more seriously into New Zealand teachers' perceptions of their code and its usefulness in supporting ethical decision making. A pertinent research question could be: *Our code? Our standards? Really?*

Blowin' about the tops: Closure of a sort.

Honig (1996) argues that when individuals are open to the notion of dilemmatic space, opportunities are provided to interrogate, and possibly transcend, the ideological constructs of gender, ethnicity, and class perpetuated by the isolated and external conception of dilemmas. This thesis is a record of my ethical identity development in the mountain ranges of dilemmatic space. While ideological winds have shaped the bluffs and valleys of my teaching landscape, I have chosen a sheltered spot, behind a ridgeline, from where I have deconstructed and reconstructed how I am becoming an educational ethicist in this written account of experiencing and negotiating the ethics of teaching. Beyond the ridgeline, I hear the winds blowin' about the tops.

References

- Abbott, M. (2006). Competition and reform of the New Zealand tertiary education sector. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21(03), 367–387.
- Akkerman, S. F., & Meijer, P. C. (2011). A dialogical approach to conceptualizing teacher identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(2), 308–319.
- Alcorn, N. (1999). *To the fullest extent of his powers: C.E. Beeby's life in education*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Allan, S. (2010). *News culture* (3rd ed., Issues in cultural and media studies). Maidenhead, England: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
- Allen, J. M., & Peach, D. (2007). Exploring connections between the in-field and on-campus components of a preservice teacher education program: A student perspective. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 8(1), 23–36.
- Allen-Collinson, J. (2016). Autoethnography as the engagement of self/other, self/culture, self/politics, selves/futures. In S. Holman Jones, S. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 281–299). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Althusser, L. (2006). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation). *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*, 9(1), 86–98.
- Anderson, L., & Glass-Coffin, B. (2016). I learn by going. In S. Holman Jones, S. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 57–84). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Anderson, L. (2006). Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 373–395.
- Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers. Issues of our time*. London, England: Norton.
- Atkinson, D. (2004). Theorising how student teachers form their identities in initial teacher education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(3), 379–394.
- Ball, S. J. (2015). Living the neo-liberal university. *European Journal of Education*, 50(3), 258–261.

- Baltodano, M. (2012). Neoliberalism and the demise of public education: The corporatization of schools of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 25(4), 487–507.
- Banks, S. (2003). From oaths to rulebooks: A critical examination of codes of ethics for the social professions. *European Journal of Social Work*, 6(2), 133–144.
- Barrett, S. E. (2015). The impact of religious beliefs on professional ethics: A case study of a new teacher. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 38(3), n3.
- Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009). Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39(2), 175–189.
- Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). Components of a good practicum placement: Student teacher perceptions. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 81–98.
- Beijaard, D., Verloop, N., & Vermunt, J. D. (2000). Teachers' perceptions of professional identity: An exploratory study from a personal knowledge perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(7), 749–764.
- Biggs, J., & Moore, P. (1993). *The process of learning* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Bolton, G. M. (2003). *Dorothy Heathcote's story: Biography of a remarkable drama teacher*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.
- Bommer, M., Gratto, C., Gravander, J., & Tuttle, M. (1987). A behavioral model of ethical and unethical decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 6(4), 265–280.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Boylorn, R. M., & Orbe, M. P. (Eds.). (2014). *Critical autoethnography: Intersecting cultural identities in everyday life*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Bray, P. (2019). Grief, loss and critical autoethnography: The father's tale. In S. Farquhar & E. Fitzpatrick (Eds.), *Innovations in narrative and metaphor* (pp. 203–219). Singapore: Springer.

- Breen, M. C. (2014). Teacher identity and intersubjective experience. In P.M. Jenlink (Ed.), *Teacher identity and the struggle for recognition* (pp. 27–36). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Education.
- Bruce, T. (2019). The case for faction as a potent method for integrating fact and fiction in research. In S. Farquhar & E. Fitzpatrick (Eds.), *Innovations in narrative and metaphor* (pp. 57–72). Singapore: Springer.
- Buchmann, M. (1986). Role over person: Morality and authenticity in teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 87(4), 527–543.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Buzzelli, C., & Johnston, B. (2001). Authority, power, and morality in classroom discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(8), 873–884.
- Campbell, E. (1996). Ethical implications of collegial loyalty as one view of teacher professionalism. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 2(2), 191–208.
- Campbell, E. (1997). Administrators decisions and teachers' ethical dilemmas: Implications for moral agency. *Leading and Managing*, 3(4), 245–257.
- Campbell, E. (2000). Professional ethics in teaching: Towards the development of a code of practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(2), 203–221.
doi:10.1080/03057640050075198
- Campbell, E. (2001). Let right be done: Trying to put ethical standards into practice. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 16(5) 395–411.
- Campbell, E. (2003). *The ethical teacher*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.
- Campbell, E. (2013). Judgment in teaching. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(2), 181–188.
doi:10.1111/curi.12008
- Carter, S. (2014). The methodology of magpies. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 37(2), 125–136.
- Cash, J. (1954). Hey porter [Recorded by Johnny Cash and the Tennessee Two]. On *Cry! Cry! Cry!* [Vinyl]. Memphis, TN: Sun Record Company.
- Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

- Cherubini, L. (2008). The complexities of ethical decision making: A study of prospective teachers' learning. *Journal of Applied Research on Learning*, 2(1), 1–15.
- Chomsky, N., Mitchell, P. R., & Schoeffel, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Understanding power: The indispensable Chomsky*. New York, NY: The News Press.
- Clark, J. (2005). The ethics of teaching. In P. Adams, K. Vossler., & C. Scrivens (Eds.), *Teachers' work in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 90–110). Southbank, Australia: Thomson/Dunmore Press.
- Clarke, M., & Moore, A. (2013). Professional standards, teacher identities and an ethics of singularity. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 43(4), 487–500.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Learning to teach against the (new) grain. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52, 3–4.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). Studying teacher education: What we know and what we need to know. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(4), 301–307.
- Coldron, J., & Smith, R. (1999). Active location in teachers' construction of their professional identities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(6), 711–726.
doi:10.1080/002202799182954
- Collins, S. (2018, August 7). High school teachers ask for \$100 pw rental housing allowance in Auckland, Tauranga, Queenstown. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/>
- Colyar, J. (2016). Reflections on writing and autoethnography. In S. Holman Jones, S. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 363–384). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Convery, A. (1999). Listening to teachers' stories: Are we sitting too comfortably? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 12(2), 131–146.
doi:10.1080/095183999236213
- Cook, P. (2013). Hey! Teacher! Leave them kids alone! The image of the teacher in rock music. In R. McLuskey & S.J McKinney (Eds.), *How the teacher is presented in literature, history, religion and the arts: Cross-cultural analyses of stereotype* (pp. 325–337). Lewiston, NY: Mellen.

- Day, C., Elliot, B., & Kington, A. (2005). Reform, standards and teacher identity: Challenges of sustaining commitment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(5), 563–577.
- Denzin, N. K. (2001). *Interpretive interactionism* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1–43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Retrieved from http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/17670_Chapter1.pdf.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Donmoyer, R. (2006). Take my paradigm... please! The legacy of Kuhn's construct in educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(1), 11–34.
- Dresscher, E. (2007). *Professional ethics in teaching and professional teachers' organisations: An inquiry into the background of Education International's declaration on professional ethics*. Retrieved from: [http://old.ei-ie.org/ethics/file/\(2007\)%20Professional%20Ethics%20in%20Teaching%20and%20Professional%20Teachers%20Organisations%20by%20Eduard%20Dresscher.pdf](http://old.ei-ie.org/ethics/file/(2007)%20Professional%20Ethics%20in%20Teaching%20and%20Professional%20Teachers%20Organisations%20by%20Eduard%20Dresscher.pdf)
- Dresscher, E. (2008). *Professional ethics in teaching and professional teachers' organisations*. Brussels, Belgium: Education International.
- Drury, K. (2017, October 27). Speaking out on education. *Education Aotearoa*. Retrieved from <http://ea.org.nz/speaking-out-on-education/>
- Duchesne, S., McMaugh, A., Bochner, S., & Krause, K. (2013). *Educational psychology for learning and teaching* (4th ed.). Melbourne, Australia: Cengage.
- Duffy, G. G. (1998). Teaching and the balancing of round stones. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(10), 777.
- Education Council New Zealand (2007). *Graduating teaching standards: Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington: Author.

- Education Council New Zealand. (2017a). *Our code: Our standards. Draft code of professional responsibility and standards of the teaching profession*. Retrieved from <https://educationcouncil.org.nz/sites/default/files/OurCode/OurStandards.pdf>
- Education Council, New Zealand. (2017b). *Our code, our standards: Code of professional responsibility and standards for the teaching profession/ Nga tikanga matatika nga paerewa: Nga tikanga matatika mo te haepapa ngaiotanga me nga paerewa mo te umaga whakaakoranga*. Retrieved from <https://teachingcouncil.nz/content/our-code-our-standards>
- Education Council, New Zealand. (2017c). *The code of professional responsibility: Examples in practice*. Retrieved from <https://teachingcouncil.nz/content/our-code-our-standards>
- Ehrich, L.C., Kimber, M., Millwater, J., & Cranston, N. (2011). Ethical dilemmas: A model to understand teacher practice. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 17(2), 173–185.
- Ell, F., Grudnoff, L., Haigh, M., & Hill, M. F. (2018). Partnering with schools beyond professional experience: Building equity-centred ITE programme alignment and coherence. In D. Heck & A. Ambrosetti (Eds.), *Teacher education in and for uncertain times* (pp. 129–142). Singapore: Springer.
- Ellis, C. (1997). Evocative autoethnography: Writing emotionally about our lives. In W. G. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice* (pp. 115–142). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ellis, C. (2007). Telling secrets, revealing lives: Relational ethics in research with intimate others. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(1), 3–29.
- Ellis, C. (2016). Carrying the torch for autoethnography. In S. Holman Jones, S. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 9–13). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ellis, C., & Adams, T. E. (2014). The purposes, practices, and principles of autoethnographic research. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 254–276). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 36(4), 273–290.

- Fallona, C. (2000). Manner in teaching: A study in observing and interpreting teachers' moral virtues. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(7), 681–695.
- Ferrell, O. C., & Gresham, L. G. (1985). A contingency framework for understanding ethical decision making in marketing. *The Journal of Marketing*, 87–96.
- Ferkins, L., & Fleming, J. (2004). Cooperative education in sports studies. In R. K. Coll & C. Eames (Eds.), *International handbook in cooperative education: An international perspective of the theory, research and practice of work integrated learning* (pp. 141–150). Boston, MA: World Association for Cooperative Education.
- Ferrier-Kerr, J. L. (2009). Establishing professional relationships in practicum settings. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(6), 790–797.
- Fitzpatrick, E., & Mullen, M. (2019). Writing Innovative narratives to capture the complexity of lived experience: Poetry, scriptwriting and prose. In S. Farquhar & E. Fitzpatrick (Eds.), *Innovations in narrative and metaphor* (pp. 73–93). Singapore: Springer.
- Flick, U. (2006). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Frank, A. (1995). *The wounded storyteller*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fransson, G., & Grannäs, J. (2013). Dilemmatic spaces in educational contexts—towards a conceptual framework for dilemmas in teachers work. *Teachers and Teaching*, 19(1), 4–17.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Forster, D. J. (2012). Codes of ethics in Australian education: Towards a national perspective. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(9), 1.
- Foster, E. (2017). Academic labor in the age of anxiety: autoethnography matters. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 17(4), 320–326.
- Foucault, M. (1981). History of systems of thought. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 8(3), 353–359.
- Gilmour, D., & Waters, R. (1975). Wish you were [Recorded by Pink Floyd]. On *Wish you were here* [Vinyl]. New York, NY: Columbia Records.
- Giroux, H. (2004). *The terror of neo-liberalism: authoritarianism and the eclipse democracy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Press.

- Goodman, J. (1986). *The socialization of potentially empowered preservice teachers: A case study and theoretical analysis*. Paper presented at the Bergamo Curriculum Theory and Practice Conference (Dayton, OH, 1986).
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Goodson, I. F. (1991). Sponsoring the teacher's voice: Teachers' lives and teacher development. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 21(1), 35–45.
- Gordon, W., & Sork, T. J. (2001). Ethical issues and codes of ethics: Views of adult education practitioners in Canada and the United States. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 51(3), 202–218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/07417130122087241>
- Grant, B. M. (2005). Fighting for space in supervision: Fantasies, fairytales, fictions and fallacies. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18(3), 337–354.
- Griffith, R. (2005). Book review. *The Ethical Teacher* by Elizabeth Campbell. *Journal of Thought*, 40(1), 98–100.
- Groundwater Smith, S., Cusworth, R., & Dobbins, R. (1998). *Teaching challenges and dilemmas*. Melbourne, Australia: Harcourt.
- Gudmundsdottir, S. (1990). Values in pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), 44–52.
- Hall, S. (1996). Who needs 'identity'? In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.) *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1–17). London, England: Sage
- Hay, C. (1995). Mobilization through interpellation: James Bulger, juvenile crime and the construction of a moral panic. *Social & Legal Studies*, 4(2), 197–223.
- Haynes, F. (1998). *The ethical school*. London, England: Routledge.
- Hernandez, K. C., & Wambura Ngunjiri, F. W. (2016). Relationships and communities in autoethnography. In S. Holman Jones, S. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 262–281). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Heyward, P. R. (2008). Reflecting from multiple perspectives in multiple worlds: Drama as an approach for engaging student teachers in critical reflection. In C.M. Rubie-Davies & C. Rawlinson (Eds.), *Challenging thinking about teaching and learning* (pp.189–208). New York, NY: Nova.

- Heyward, P. (2010). Emotional engagement through drama: Strategies to assist learning through role-play. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(2), 197–204.
- Hick, C. (1998). Codes and morals: Is there a missing link? (The Nuremberg Code revisited). *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy* 45(1), 143–154.
- Holman Jones, S. (2005). Autoethnography: Making the personal political. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 763–791). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holman Jones, S. (2016). Living bodies of thought: The “critical” in critical autoethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 22(4), 228–237.
- Hollon, R. E., Kolis, M. W., McIntyre, S. R., Stephens, J. T., & Battalio, R. L. (2010). Putting dispositions in the driver’s seat. In P. C. Murrell Jr., M. E. Diez, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. L. Schussler (Eds.), *Teaching as moral practice: Defining, developing and assessing professional dispositions in teacher education* (pp. 117–140). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Honig, B. (1996). Difference, dilemmas, and the politics of whom. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference. Contesting the boundaries of the political* (pp. 257–277). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hornbrook, D. (1998). Drama and education. In D. Hornbrook (Ed.), *On the subject of drama* (pp. 6–17). New York, NY: Routledge
- John, E. (2019, May 26). They wanted to tone down the sex and drugs. But I haven’t led a PG-13 life. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/global/2019/may/26/elton-john-in-my-own-words-exclusive-my-life-and-making-rocketman>)
- Johnston, B., Juhasz, A., Marken, J., & Ruiz, B. R. (1998). The ESL teacher as moral agent. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 32(2), 161–181.
- Jones, A. (2004). Social anxiety, sex, surveillance and the safe teacher. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(1), 33–56.
- Jones, P. & Linn, P. (2004). Cooperative education in liberal arts. In R. K. Coll & C. Eames (Eds.), *International handbook in cooperative education: An international perspective of*

the theory, research and practice of work integrated learning (pp.123–130). Boston, MA: World Association for Cooperative Education.

Kane, R. G., Burke, P., Cullen, J., Davey, R., Jordan, B., McCurphy-Pilkington, C., ...Stephens, C. (2005). *Initial teacher education policy and practice. Final report*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Lasky, S. (2005). A sociocultural approach to understanding teacher identity, agency and professional vulnerability in a context of secondary school reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(8), 899–916.

Law, J. (2000). On the subject of the object: Narrative, technology, and interpellation. *Configurations*, 8(1), 1–29.

Leskinen, H. (1993). Ethical dilemmas. *Adult Learning*, 5(2), 6–6.

Le Roux, C. S. (2017). Exploring rigour in autoethnographic research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(2), 195–207.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. London, England: Sage.

Lockford, L. (2001). Talking dirty and laying low: A humble homage to humanity. In L. C. Miller & R. J. Pelias (Eds.), *The green window: Proceeding of the Giant City conference on performative writing* (pp. 113–121). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

Lockford, L. (2017). Welcome to the neoliberal university. *Cultural Studies↔ Critical Methodologies*, 17(4), 361–363.

Lovat, T. J. (1998). Ethics and ethics education: Professional and curricular best practice. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 18(1), 1–7.

Lowe, N. (1979). (What's so funny 'bout) peace love and understanding [Recorded by Elvis Costello and the Attractions]. On *Armed forces* [Vinyl]. New York, NY: Columbia Records.

Luckowski, J. A. (1997). A virtue-centered approach to ethics education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(4), 264–270.

Luehmann, A. L. (2007). Identity development as a lens to science teacher preparation. *Science Education*, 91(5), 822–839.

- Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60(2), 159–181.
- McCadden, B. M. (1998). *It's hard to be good. Moral complexity, construction, and connection in a kindergarten classroom*. New York, NY: Lang.
- McDowell, L., Batnitzky, A., & Dyer, S. (2007). Division, segmentation, and interpellation: The embodied labors of migrant workers in a greater London hotel. *Economic Geography*, 83(1), 1–25.
- McKelvie-Sebileau, P. (2011). *Patterns of development and use of codes of conduct for teachers in 24 countries*. Paris, France: IIEP.
- MacLure, M. (1993). Arguing for yourself: Identity as an organising principle in teachers' jobs and lives. *British Educational Research Journal*, 19(4), 311–322.
doi/pdf/10.1080/0141192930190401
- Madison, D. S. (2012). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics and performance* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Martin, C. (2013). On the educational value of philosophical ethics for teacher education: The practice of ethical inquiry as liberal education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(2), 189–209.
- Maxwell, B., & Schwimmer, M. (2016). Seeking the elusive ethical base of teacher professionalism in Canadian codes of ethics. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 468–480.
- Miller, D. E. (2010). *J. S. Mill. Moral, social and political thought*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2017). *Addressing teacher supply*. Retrieved from <https://education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Ministry/Information-releases/Addressing-Teacher-Supply.pdf>
- Moody, H. (1992). Gerontology and critical theory. *The Gerontologist*, 32(3), 294–295.
- Moore, A., Edwards, G., Halpin, D., & George, R. (2002). Compliance, resistance and pragmatism: The (re) construction of schoolteacher identities in a period of intensive

educational reform. *British Educational Research Journal*, 28(4), 551–565.

doi:10.1080/0141192022000005823

- Morgan, K. (2013). How to create a faction for a fiction story. *Pen & the Pad*. Retrieved from <https://penandthepad.com/create-faction-fiction-story-4523.html>)
- Morris, P. (2019). When I was seventeen. In S. Farquhar & E. Fitzpatrick (Eds.), *Innovations in narrative and metaphor* (pp. 29–37). Singapore: Springer.
- Murphy, P. K., & Alexander, P. A. (2007). Cherishing students' meanings while seeking change: Walking an ethical tightrope. In S. E. Israel & C. A. Lassonde (Eds.), *The ethical educator: Integrating ethics within the context of teaching and teacher research* (pp. 9–18). New York, NY: Lang.
- Mutch, C. (2013). *Doing educational research*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.
- New Zealand Teachers Council. (2004). *Code of ethics for registered teachers*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- New Zealand Teachers Council. (2005). *Code of ethics for registered teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.teacherscouncil.govt.nz/ethics/code-of-ethics-poster-english-4a.pdf>
- New Zealand Teachers Council. (2007). *Graduating teaching standards: Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington: New Zealand: Author
- New Zealand Teachers Council. (2012). Review of the New Zealand Teachers Council – Teaching: Profession for the 21st Century. Retrieved from <https://teachingcouncil.nz/sites/default/files/Review%20of%20the%20NZ%20Teachers%20Council%202012%20-%20report%20to%20Minister%20of%20Education.pdf>
- Newman, I., Ridenour, C. S., Newman, C., & DeMarco, G. M., Jr. (2003). A typology of research purposes and its relationship to mixed methods. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 167–188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Noddings, N. (1988). An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional arrangements. *American Journal of Education*, 96(2), 215–230.
- Nucci, L. P. (2001). *Education in the moral domain*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- O'Neill, J. (2016). Teachers and ethics. In D. Fraser & M. Hill (Eds.), *The professional practice of teaching in New Zealand* (5th ed., pp. 261–277). Melbourne, Australia: Cengage Learning.
- O'Neill, J., & Bourke, R. (2010). Educating teachers about a code of ethical conduct. *Ethics and Education*, 5(2), 159–172
- Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313–345.
- Ontario College of Teachers. (2003). *The foundations for professional practice*. Toronto, Canada: Author.
- Ontario College of Teachers. (2006). *The ethical standards for the teaching profession*. Toronto, Canada: Author.
- Ormrod, J. E. (2016). *Human learning* (7th ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Peach, D., & Allen, J. M. (2011). Assessing for work integrated learning experiences: A pre-service teacher perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 12(1), 1–17.
- Pelias, R. J. (2004). *A methodology of the heart*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Pelias, R. J. (2005). Performative writing as scholarship: An apology, an argument, an anecdote. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, 5(4), 415–424.
- Pelias R. J. (2016). Writing autoethnography. In S. Holman Jones, S. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 384–406). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Peters, W. (1985). *A class divided* (Film) Washington DC: Public Broadcast Station Video.
- Pope, N., Green, S. K., Johnson, R. L., & Mitchell, M. (2009). Examining teacher ethical dilemmas in classroom assessment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 778–782.
- Preston, N., Stamford, C., & Connors, C. (2002). *Encouraging ethics and challenging corruption*. Sydney, Australia: Federation Press.
- Rachels, J. & Rachels, S. (2015). *The elements of moral philosophy*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Education.

- Raiborn, C., & Payne, D. (1990). Corporate codes of conduct: A collective conscience and continuum. *Journal of Business Ethics* 9(11), 879–889.
- Ralph, E. G. (2003). Enhancing mentorship in the practicum: Improving contextual supervision. *McGill Journal of Education*, 38(1), 28–48.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Richardson, L. (1999). Feathers in our cap. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 28(6), 660–668.
- Richardson, L. (2000). New writing practices in qualitative research. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17, 5–20.
- Richardson, L., & Pierre, A. S. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 959-978). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rodgers, C. R., & Scott, K. H. (2008). The development of the personal self and professional identity in learning to teach. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 732–755). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: Competing discourses, competing outcomes. *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(2), 149–161. doi:10.1080/026809301116819
- Sachs, J. (2003). *The activist teaching profession*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Schwimmer, M., & Maxwell, B. (2017). Codes of ethics and teachers' professional autonomy. *Ethics and Education*, 12(2), 141–152.
- Shapira-Lishchinsky, O. (2011). Teachers' critical incidents: Ethical dilemmas in teaching practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(3), 648–656.
- Shortt, D., Hallett, F., Spendlove, D., Hardy, G., & Barton, A. (2012). Teaching, morality, and responsibility: A structuralist analysis of a teachers' code of conduct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(1), 124–131.
- Sikes, P. (1985). The life cycle of the teacher. In S. J. Ball & I. F. Goodson (Eds.), *Teachers' lives and careers* (pp. 27–60). Basingstoke, England: Taylor & Francis.

- Smyth, J. (2001). *Critical politics of teachers' work*. New York, NY: Lang.
- Smyth, J. (2002). Unmasking teachers' subjectivities in local school management. *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(4), 463–482.
- Smyth, J. (2011). *Critical pedagogy for social justice*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Snir, R. (2015). *Who needs Arab-Jewish identity? Interpellation, exclusion, and inessential solidarities*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Snook, I. (2003). *The ethical teacher*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Sockett, H. (1990). Accountability, trust, and ethical codes of practice. In J. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. Sirotnik (Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching* (pp. 224–250). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sockett, H. (1993). *The moral base for teacher professionalism*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Soltis, J. F. (1986). Teaching professional ethics. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(3), 2–4.
- Søreide, G. E. (2006). Narrative construction of teacher identity: Positioning and negotiation. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 12(5), 527–547.
- Sparkes, A. C. (2002). Autoethnography: Self-indulgence or something more. In A. Bochner & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Ethnographically speaking: Autoethnography, literature, and aesthetics* (pp. 209–232). Lanham, MD: Altamira.
- Sparkes, A. C. (2007). Embodiment, academics, and the audit culture: A story seeking consideration. *Qualitative Research*, 7(4), 521–550.
- Starratt, R. J. (1994). *Building an ethical school: A practical response to the moral crisis in schools*. London, England: Falmer.
- Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strike K. A. (1999). Justice, caring and universality: In defence of moral pluralism. In M. S. Katz, N. Noddings, & K. A. Strike (Eds.), *Justice and caring: The search for common ground in education* (pp. 21–36). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Strike, K. A., & Soltis, J. F. (2009). *The ethics of teaching* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sumsion, J. (2000). Caring and empowerment: A teacher educator's reflection on an ethical dilemma. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(2), 167–179.
- Terhart, E. (1998). Formalised codes of ethics for teachers: Between professional autonomy and administrative control. *European Journal of Education*, 33(4), 433–444.
- Thomas, J. (1993). *Doing critical ethnography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Thomas, R., & Goc, N. (2004). Cooperative education in journalism studies. In R. K. Coll & C. Eames (Eds.), *International handbook in cooperative education: An international perspective of the theory, research and practice of work integrated learning* (pp. 151–158). Boston, MA: World Association for Cooperative Education.
- Tilley-Lubbs, G. A. (2016). Critical autoethnography and the vulnerable self as researcher. In G. A. Tilley-Lubbs & S. B. Calva (Eds.), *Re-telling our stories: Critical autoethnographic narratives* (pp. 1–15). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Brill Sense.
- Tom, A. R. (1984). *Teaching as a moral craft*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Tullis, J. A. (2016). Self and others: Ethics in autoethnographic research. In S. Holman Jones, S. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 244–262). New York, NY: Routledge.
- UNESCO. (2016). *The world needs almost 69 million new teachers to reach the 2030 education goals*. Retrieved from <http://uis.unesco.org/en/document/world-needs-almost-69-million-new-teachers-reach-2030-education-goals>
- Van Maanen, J. (2011). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Van Maanen, J. (2015). The present of things past: ethnography and career studies. *Human Relations*, 68(1), 35–53.
- van Nuland, S., & Poisson, M. (2009). *Teacher codes: Learning from experience*. Paris, France: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- van Nuland, S., & Khandelwal, B. (2006). *Ethics in education: The role of teacher codes; Canada and South Asia*. Paris, France: IIEP.

- Vokey, D. (2005). Book review: The ethical teacher. *Theory and Research in Education*, 3(3), 379–382.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Watson, C. (2007). Small stories, positioning analysis, and the doing of professional identities in learning to teach. *Narrative Inquiry*, 17(2), 371–389.
- Wells, G. (2001). The case for dialogic inquiry. In G. Wells (Ed.), *Action, talk and text: Learning and teaching through inquiry* (pp. 171–194). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Wetherell, M. (2010). The field of identity studies. In M. Wetherell & C. T. Mohanty (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of identities* (pp. 3–26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wilding, P. (1982). *Professional power and social welfare*. London, England: Routledge.
- Woodrow, C. (1999). Revisiting images of the child in early childhood education: Reflections and considerations. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 24(4), 7–12.
- Woods, P. (1987). Ethnography at the crossroads: A reply to Hammersley. *British Educational Research Journal*, 13(3), 297–307.
- Woods, P. (1993). Managing marginality: Teacher development through grounded life history. *British Educational Research Journal*, 19(5), 447–465.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the US. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(8), 1544–1552.
- Zembylas, M. (2005). Discursive practices, genealogies, and emotional rules: A poststructuralist view on emotion and identity in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(8), 935–948.
- Zembylas, M., & McGlynn, C. (2012). Discomforting pedagogies: Emotional tensions, ethical dilemmas and transformative possibilities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(1), 41–59.