School-university partnerships in Australian teacher education in policy and practice

Nailer, Sarah Eileen

School-University Partnerships in Australian Teacher Education in Policy and Practice

Submitted by

Sarah Eileen Nailer

Bachelor of Applied Science (Human Movement)

Graduate Diploma in Secondary Education

Master of Educational Leadership

A thesis submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Institute for Learning Sciences and Teacher Education

Australian Catholic University

October 2022

Declaration of Authorship

This thesis contains no material that has been extracted in whole or in part from a thesis that I have submitted towards the award of any other degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgment in the main text of the thesis.

All research procedures reported in the thesis received the approval of the relevant Ethics/Safety Committees (where required).

Acknowledgements

This thesis has built on the work of 20 years of my professional life spent working in education. In that time I have worked as a classroom teacher across a range of year levels and subjects and in a number of leadership roles. I have also spent many years working in the university sector in teacher education as a lecturer, tutor, and researcher. I bring that experience to this thesis. I would like to acknowledge all the students, teachers and colleagues that have made an impression on me and shaped my beliefs and values in relation to education over that time.

I would like to thank my participants for their generosity in giving up their time and contributing to this research. I acknowledge the work and commitment you have to supporting students and developing teachers.

I would like to acknowledge the work of Alex Kostogriz and Kristina Love for their supervision of this thesis in the early days. Your support and nurturing allowed me to create a framework for the study.

To my supervisors Joce Nuttall and Amy McPherson, whip-smart, savvy, and generous. I have always looked forward to our meetings and felt that I could implicitly trust your advice. Thank you for your wisdom and kindness and for supporting me throughout the thesis.

I would also like to thank the academics who have provided inspiration and support in varying ways at conferences, via email and on twitter. These were critical connections that helped me develop my research and feel part of a community.

Finally, I would like to express my love and thanks to my family for their ongoing support of my endeavours. To Mum, Dad and Luke, and to Jodie, Adah and Caleb for being a constant source of love and support.

Abstract

This thesis is a study of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education. I have explored School-University Partnerships in policy and practice drawing on several key Foucauldian concepts. I show that School-University Partnerships have been an enduring feature of Australian teacher education and that in the past two decades, they have increased in prominence, particularly in initial teacher education. I present evidence that the discourses of School-University Partnerships produce them as everything and nothing. I also argue that in the area of initial teacher education, School-University Partnerships are circulating as a "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131). From these findings, I identify the limiting effects on teacher education and argue for the need for further critique.

This methodology utilised in this thesis is Foucauldian genealogy. I use Foucault's notion of genealogy to construct a "history of the present" (1975/1991, p. 31) of School-University Partnership in Australian teacher education. The prominence of School-University Partnerships is identified as a problem of the present and genealogy is used to de-naturalize it. I engage in a form of poststructural policy analysis to identify the "problems" constructed in policy. I also conducted interviews with a purposive sample of thirteen participants in School-University Partnerships including teachers, teacher education academics, principals, and policy makers.

My main claims are that School-University Partnerships have been discursively constructed as everything and nothing across teacher education whilst at the same time circulating as a regime of truth in initial teacher education. I identify the circulation of School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education as a productive effect of power with subjectification effects. I argue that the discourses of the "real" and "experience" that are dominant in School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education, together with a policy context that sets partnerships up as "formal" and "agreed in writing" (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2015) create the conditions for a model of learning to teach that sees the solution as mere time in schools.

This thesis contributes a theorisation of School-University Partnerships by identifying the discourses of partnership in policy and practice. I show that School-University Partnerships continue to function as an "empty signifier" and that attention is needed to an agreed and working definition in policy and practice. I identify the discourses of the "real" and

experience as central to perpetuating School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education. This thesis has contributed to knowledge of School-University Partnerships by identifying the way power circulates and showing the subjectification effects. This research shows that further critique of partnerships is needed and that a Foucauldian conception of power in partnerships offers theoretical tools for a productive future for School-University Partnerships.

Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education

This thesis explores the production of School-University Partnerships in policy and practice in Australian teacher education. Through this research I investigate the past and the present of School-University Partnerships and I utilise a Foucauldian understanding of discourse to explore the ways in which partnerships are framed and the way power circulates and with what effects. The thesis is constructed as a "history of the present" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 31) and highlights that the current prominence of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education is as strange as the past. In this chapter I introduce key elements of the research and situate the study within the broader field of teacher education. In section 1.10 I provide an outline of the chapters and show how I present my key claims across these chapters.

In this thesis I show that the discourses of School-University Partnership are widespread and varied in Australian teacher education. I show that School-University Partnerships have a long history and continue to be a central feature of teacher education. I utilise Foucault's genealogical methodology and draw on the key concepts of truth, power, discourse and subjectivity in my analysis. I show in Chapter 5 and 7 that the discourses of School-University Partnership have narrowed with a focus on initial teacher education. In Chapter 7 I show that power is circulating in these discourses of partnership in initial teacher education and functioning as a "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131). The discourses of School-University Partnerships in teacher education promote them optimistically as opportunities to work together, often without acknowledging the way power is circulating.

In Chapter 8 I show that discourses of the real and experience are central to the rationale for partnerships and yet this often remains implicit rather than clearly articulated. Out of these discourses emerges a discourse of derision towards teacher education which is

a persistent trope based on common sense assumptions about the value of experience (Hatton, 1994). The effect of the discourses of partnership for teacher education is that it subjectifies participants in ways which reinforce simplistic notions about how, where and why teacher education takes place. This subjectification of participants in partnerships also works to (re)produce participants as *either* teachers or teacher educators, diminishing the possibility of complex subject positions that allow participants to be *both* teacher and teacher educator. This thesis shows that despite the rhetoric of partnerships and the aspirational goals of hierarchy-free "third-spaces" (Green et al, 2021), School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are reinforcing a divide between teachers and teacher educators.

In this chapter I provide some background and context for the study. Firstly, I outline the international context within which teacher education is occurring. Secondly, I provide an overview of the challenges for teacher education and show the place of School-University Partnerships within teacher education. Thirdly, I provide the context for the study in relation to my own development as a researcher. The latter sections of this chapter are dedicated to an overview of the research approach and an outline of the thesis.

1.2 Teacher education around the globe

The preparation and ongoing development of teachers has a long and varied history. There are many different systems of teacher education happening in differing contexts and a range of models promoted as ideal. The way that teacher education is structured differs internationally and is shaped by a range of factors including culture, history and economics (Craig, 2016). Teacher education has been subject to an intensifying focus on reforms in the past 20 years (Gore, 2016) and is increasingly being influenced by politics (Craig, 2016; Ling, 2017).

Teacher education historically has occurred in a variety of organizational settings (Labaree, 2008). A range of past models have included "normal schools" and teachers colleges before becoming a predominantly university-based program of education in contexts such as Australia and the United States (Aspland, 2006; Labaree, 2008). Some approaches to teacher education past and present have framed teaching as a "craft" best learnt "on the job" (Ellis, 2010) or teacher preparation as an apprenticeship (White & Forgasz, 2016). Fast-track approaches to teacher preparation that involve a short course of

formal study followed by a period of two years teaching in under-resourced schools such as the Teach for All model have spread to more than 50 countries since beginning in 2007 (Crawford-Garrett et al, 2021). The manner of teacher preparation is influenced by the prevailing view of what it means to be a "good teacher" (Connell, 2009, p. 213). Furlong and colleagues (2021) argue that behind every system of initial teacher education lies "fundamental assumptions about what education is and how it is best realised" (p. 61). Teacher education is not a neutral endeavour, and systems of teacher education are imbued with the values of their designers and proponents.

The Finnish model of teacher education has attracted international attention due to their high-ranking results in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA). The Finnish model is a highly competitive research-based program where all teacher candidates complete a master's degree (Malinen et al, 2012). While other jurisdictions have looked to policy borrow from Finland, Chung (2016) argues that Finland's teacher education operates in a different "ecosystem" and with a different philosophy to other systems such as that in England. This philosophically different approach in Finland includes a child-centred education system, less emphasis on standardised testing and a culture of trust and which allows teachers greater autonomy (O'Neill, 2021).

Darling-Hammond (2017) conducted research comparing teacher education policies and practices in Australia, Canada, Finland, Singapore and the United States. She identified "leading practices" that provide promise for improving teacher learning including recruiting "highly able candidates into high-quality programmes" and "connecting theory and practice" with "new models for student-teaching, often in 'training schools' or professional development schools" (p. 306). Darling-Hammond (2017) highlights the important role of the university in partnership with schools in Australia and in Finland's model schools. She contrasts this with the situation in the United States where governments "have challenged the idea that there is a knowledge base for teaching" and "have questioned the role of universities in the preparation of teachers" (Darling-Hammond, 2017, p. 293). This has led to support for alternative models of teacher education such as Teach for America, which it has been argued has shifted the focus from teacher education to teacher training (Kretchmar et al, 2018). Models of teacher preparation that focus on training tend to promote "a rather narrow, technicist understanding of teaching" (Biesta et al, 2020, p. 456).

Teacher education in Singapore has been heavily influenced by reforms of the late 1990s that "explicitly redefined the role of teachers" with a focus on teaching as a learning profession (Darling-Hammond, 2017). Similarly to Finland, high standards for admission to initial teacher education are a feature of the system in Singapore as well as "strong induction and professional development" combined with high salaries relative to other occupations (Darling-Hammond, 2017, p. 292). Singapore is a distinct example as initial teacher preparation is solely provided by the National Institute of Education which contrasts with places such as England and the Unites States where a multitude of pathways exist for becoming a qualified teacher.

Teacher education in England provides a contrasting example to Singapore and Finland, where the role of the university in initial teacher education has been under sustained attack since the 1990s (Gilroy, 1992). The distinct contribution of higher education institutions to initial teacher education was diminished by reforms in the 1990s that led to the development of school-based pathways to be an accredited teacher (Furlong et al, 1996). Ellis (2010) argued that the changes in initial teacher education in England had led to a situation where there is "an impoverished understanding of experience that underpins how beginning teachers are intended to learn in schools" (p. 105). Mutton and colleagues (2021) have shown that increasing government intervention, framed by major policy reform initiated in 2010, has led to teacher education being viewed as "on the job training" (p. 57).

Recent reforms to teacher education in Wales were begun in 2015 with a number of new initiatives in initial teacher education courses beginning across 2017-2020 (Furlong et al, 2021). This new model for teacher education in Wales built on learning from the Modes of Teacher Education study of the 1990s (Furlong et al, 2000) which showed that while schools were required to be more involved in initial teacher education the reality was that "schools were merely required to provide opportunities for students to undertake that learning" (Furlong et al, 2021, p. 67)". The changes in the new Welsh model focus on a requirement for the co-construction of courses with school and university staff, a governance structure that involves decision making that includes both school and university staff, and "a radical strengthening of mentor training" (Furlong et al, 2021, p. 73) that focuses on "the educative contribution of mentors to student teacher learning" (Furlong et al, 2021, p. 72).

These varied practices and systems of teacher education historically and globally highlight that there are no agreed answers in the quest for the best model of teacher education. Common themes across high performing systems include careful selection of entrants, financial support while studying, thorough induction and competitive salaries upon graduation (Darling-Hammond, 2017). In Australia, a consequence of the increased scrutiny of teacher education is that it exists in a "dynamic and constant cycle of review and change (Ling, 2017, p. 561). Reforms introduced are often times examples of policy borrowing, which sometimes involved the importing of highly criticised practices or of failing to take account of the different contextual factors in Australia (Chung, 2016; Lingard, 2010).

I have provided an overview of some differences and similarities in teacher education across time and place. In the section that follows I identify some of the key challenges faced by the field of teacher education.

1.3 The challenges for teacher education

Teacher education is a "problematic and contested enterprise, troubled by enduring and value-laden questions about the purposes and goals of education" (Cochran-Smith, 2004, p. 295). Cochran-Smith (2004) argues that in the latter half of the 20th Century the "problem of teacher education" was defined in different ways with at times an emphasis on teacher education as a training problem, a learning problem or a policy problem. These challenges for teacher education continue and are many and varied, with teacher education academics subject to increasing scrutiny (White, 2019). The challenges with the preparation and ongoing development of teachers are being exacerbated by teacher shortages (Welch, 2022).

Teacher education is the subject of persistent criticism (Louden, 2008), with the teachers we have never quite being the teachers we want (Carlgren, 1988). More than 30 years ago, Carlgren (1988) described the situation:

> Since school is an institution that is constantly reformed, the teaching profession is a profession characterized by an almost constant discontent with teachers. The 'desirable' teachers are always different to existing teachers. Thus teacher education programmes have been created to form teachers who are different from most teachers working in schools. (p. 616)

This criticism continues and has led to a situation of near constant review and reform by policy makers in a quest for betterment (Louden, 2008; Ryan, 2014). Reid and Hall (2022) note that “after nearly 20 years of government regulation in Australia, teacher education today is still not producing the teachers wanted for tomorrow” (p. 17). Mockler’s (2022) book on representations of teachers in the Australian print media from 1996-2020 shows that teachers’ work is represented as simple and “teacher bashing” is the norm.

Other challenges for teacher education include the higher education environment within which it operates. Looking back, in 1996 Hogan and Down provided this description of teacher education:

> Currently, teacher education is at the crossroads. Stimulated by a plethora of government reports and inquiries there are cries for reform, restructuring and change. As teacher educators we have grappled with the complexities, contradictions and tensions emanating from these reform efforts on two fronts. At the institutional level, we have suffered the alienating consequences of restructuring through budget cuts, staff sackings, 'efficiencies', and the casualisation of academic work. At the collegial level, we have struggled to make sense of the "teacher training business" and what it means to be a teacher and teacher educator in this increasingly hostile environment. (Bullough & Gitlin, 1994; Knight, Bartlett & McWilliam, 1993). (p. 46)

That the paragraph above could have been written in 2022 is an indication of the longstanding challenges for the field. Aspects of teacher education, particularly the professional experience component, continue to be low status work and to be staffed by casual and sessional employees (Zeichner, 2021).

Vick (2006) argued that she was “struck by a sense of historical amnesia” in relation to reform efforts in teacher education (p. 182). The problems identified in teacher education and the solutions proposed are so often “merely tinkering with the fine tuning and recycling ideas tried long ago” (Vick, 2006, p. 182). Reid and Hall (2022) argue that the field of teacher education needs to take seriously its history “…and learn from it, rather than continually repeating our experience as research “groundhogs” (p. 9).

The criticisms identified by “a small avalanche” of government reports in Australia “are endemic to teacher education as we know it” (Vick, 2006, p. 182). Rowan et al (2015) suggest that a key question for teacher educators is to consider the “kinds of research that

will most effectively allow us to lead debates about teacher preparation" (Rowan et al, 2015, p. 273). It is critical that teacher educators are well positioned to resist "the seductive pursuit of what we now call 'best practice': namely, single, best solutions, to complex problems" (Bullough, 2012, p.344). This means that that teacher education researchers need to make a contribution to developing a strong theoretical base from which to respond to policy reforms.

The first two decades of the 21st Century have seen national and international attention on the importance of teachers and their impact on educational outcomes for students (Hattie, 2009; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 2005). The difficulties with attracting and then retaining effective teachers have been recognised (OECD, 2005). The challenge of how to recruit, prepare and retain the teachers our schools and students need is a problem that has not been easily solved. The COVID-19 pandemic which came to worldwide attention in early 2020 created unprecedented challenges for governments globally and has led to labour shortages across industries including a shortage of teachers (Welch, 2022). This has led to increased attention on the attraction and retention of teachers.

In the next section I provide an introduction to how the focal topic for this research, School-University Partnerships, sits within the broader field of teacher education.

1.4 The place of School-University Partnerships in teacher education

School-University Partnerships have a lengthy history in teacher education. Partnerships rose to prominence in the U.S. in the 1990s through Professional Development Schools (Darling-Hammond, 1994). In England, shifts in teacher education in the 1990s also saw increasing emphasis on School-University Partnerships (Furlong et al, 1996). In Australia, the Innovative Links partnership program was an early example of a large-scale professional learning partnership (Sachs, 1997). The Smarter Schools National Partnerships was another large-scale partnership project in Australia the early part of the 21st Century. School-University Partnerships have become increasingly prominent in initial teacher education since changes in 2015 to accreditation of initial teacher education courses that made "formal partnerships, in writing" a compulsory element (Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership, 2015). This thesis draws on a broad conception of School-University Partnerships, loosely defined in keeping with the work of Heffernan et al (2021)

as “any work being carried out by members of a university and a school” (p. 683). In Chapter 2 I explore notions of partnership in the scholarly literature in order to highlight the breadth of ideas.

School-University Partnerships continue to be prominent as a solution to the challenges of preparing teachers. In the latest report on teacher education, *Next Steps: Report of the Quality Initial Teacher Education Review* (2022), School-University Partnerships were identified as an important part of the findings and recommendations. The report included “strong partnerships between schools and higher education providers” to “increase classroom readiness of Initial Teacher Education students and strengthen professional experience placements” as part of Recommendation 12. Partnerships were also seen as a way to “better connect theory and practice”, “encourage reciprocal sharing of knowledge and experience” and to “support supervising teachers” (Department of Education, Skills and Employment, 2022, p. 56). The report finds a role for School-University Partnerships beyond just being a tool to organise professional experience placement, although that continues to be seen as essential. While School-University Partnerships have been a feature of teacher education in Australia and overseas for a long time, they have developed an increasingly central position, particularly since their identification by the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG, 2015) which has “lifted partnerships to a pivotal role in all [initial teacher education] ITE” (PTR Consulting, 2018, p. 4).

School-University Partnerships have increased in prominence in the last decade and have become established as critical for addressing the challenges of teacher education, with a compulsory place in initial teacher education courses (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), 2015). This thesis explores how and why School-University Partnerships have become so prominent and with what effects. Drawing on the tools afforded by Foucauldian genealogy, this thesis constructs a history of the present, a “critical and effective history” (Dean, 1994) of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education. This history is “to afford an intervention into the present leading to a possible redirection towards another future” (Koopman, 2013, p. 26). Through this process this thesis seeks to better understand School-University Partnerships in the contemporary context with a view to the possibilities in the future of teacher education.

1.5 Why is this research needed for teacher education?

School-University Partnerships have a lengthy history in teacher education (Furlong et al, 1996) and a contemporary prominence in initial teacher education (Manton et al, 2020). School-University Partnerships have been identified as labour-intensive with an under-acknowledged affective component through the role of relationship development in partnership work (Ledger et al, 2020). While I show in Chapter 2 that there are decades of research into School-University Partnerships, it continues to be mostly small-scale with a focus on a single-case studies of partnership and conducted by researchers who are involved in the program, and therefore with a vested interest in positive findings (Clifford & Miller, 2008). This leaves teacher educators in a difficult position with respect to the "insistent discourse of partnerships" (Bloomfield, 2009, p. 27) and now compulsory partnerships in initial teacher education (Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership, 2015). Teacher educators and teacher education researchers need the critical tools to understand the place of School-University Partnerships and to consider their impact.

The field of teacher education needs to work collaboratively to develop a rich research base that can influence policy and practice (Reid & Hall, 2022; White et al, 2018). The challenge to being able to lead the teacher education debates is that major research grants are rare in Australian teacher education and "it is common for teacher educators to study their own teacher education programs" (Rowan et al, 2015, p. 275). These criticisms resonate strongly with the research into School-University Partnerships in teacher education. While Murray, Nuttall and Mitchell (2008) identified some promising signs of a growing research base in teacher education, they acknowledged the limitations of small-scale studies and called for greater cohesion in the field. Bahr and Mellor (2016) noted this as a continued pattern in teacher education research. Small-scale, single case-study research can make a positive contribution to knowledge about School-University Partnerships, but there is a need for the kind of research that is critical to developing the theoretical understandings of the place of School-University Partnerships in teacher education.

The prominence and resource-intensiveness of School-University Partnerships, combined with limited critical research make this an important study at this time. Rather than looking for a model for partnerships (Jones et al, 2016) or key elements of effective

partnerships (Kruger et al, 2009) or attempting to re-frame partnerships drawing on notions of "third-space" (Daza et al, 2021), this thesis takes a broad look at School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education to identify what is happening and with what effects on the field. This research is designed to tackle "the pervasiveness of the idea of partnerships in teacher education and the often uncritical glorification of their worth" (Zeichner, 2021, p. 3).

This research is also crucial for the field of teacher education because of its deep engagement with theory. Putting theoretical tools to work in the exploration of School-University Partnerships in teacher education is critical to interrogate this widespread practice in the field, one that has become more prominent in recent years. In promoting the importance of theory for educational studies Ball (1995) argued that without it the researcher is "prey to unexamined, unreflexive preconceptions and dangerously naïve ontological and epistemological *a prioris*" (p. 265). This research makes use of the tools of Foucauldian genealogy in order to investigate School-University Partnerships in policy and practice in Australian teacher education.

1.6 Contextualising the study

Prior to and during the early part of my doctoral candidature I was involved in two School-University Partnership projects. This led to my engagement in the scholarly literature around partnerships and to experiencing what was happening in these projects, as well as working with teacher education academics who had been involved in prior School-University Partnerships. Initially I felt it wasn't a suitable area for me to explore in my thesis as so much seemed to have already been written. I noticed that the focus of much of this research was on the limits and possibilities of partnerships and seemed to have a focus on what was needed on a practical level to make partnerships work. An early encounter with the writings of Foucault led me to this thesis, taking a different approach than that of the partnerships research I had found. I drew on Foucault's work to help me to formulate the approach I have then taken with this thesis. Rather than a study of "what works" in School-University Partnerships, or a close investigation of a particular partnership, this thesis draws on the tools of Foucauldian genealogy to create a history of the present of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education.

This approach to researching School-University Partnerships was motivated by what I saw as a field of research and a practice of teacher education that was too narrowly focused on the partnership or multiple partnerships in front of it. I could see a need for research that was not about a particular partnership, or even multiple, but rather looked across School-University Partnership activity over time as well as in the contemporary teacher education landscape to investigate what these partnerships were even about. I wanted to explore their purpose, what, if anything, they were achieving and whether they had changed over time.

I attended an Australian Teacher Education Association (ATEA) conference with partnerships in the conference theme and this provided an insight into the breadth of partnership activity occurring in teacher education in Australia. I worked with colleagues to present our own thinking and research on one of the partnership projects I was then involved with. I heard presentations from interstate and international colleagues about partnership projects and programs that they had developed. This was followed by my employment for a number of years on a government funded partnership project with a focus on initial teacher education. These experiences solidified my desire to conduct more critical research on School-University Partnerships that wasn't limited by a vested interest in a positive portrayal of the success and achievements of any one partnership.

In the years I have been writing and researching on School-University Partnerships there has been a shift in the Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership Accreditation Standards to make partnerships compulsory in initial teacher education as part of professional experience placement (2015). This was part of changes driven by the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) (2015). Yet in the recent past in Australian teacher education, the most high-profile example of partnerships was the large-scale Innovative Links program in the 1990s which had a focus on teacher professional learning. The evidence from this research is that partnerships are dominant in initial teacher education but in the past and present partnerships are also operating in a range of areas including for research and professional learning. The most striking findings of this study relate to initial teacher education, a highly contested space, but the findings also show the breadth and depth of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education over more than 30 years.

School-University Partnerships abound in the Australian and International literature, particularly from England and the U.S. The increasing prominence of partnerships in

Australia, particularly the requirement of partnerships for course accreditation, made this an important study at this time. The use of Foucault's genealogical approach as a framework for the study is also important for the contribution of this research to understanding School-University Partnerships. School-University Partnerships are an example of a practice of teacher education that is at times presented as an innovation even though closer inspection shows that the rationale and the practice are very similar to the past.

1.7 Thesis statement

This thesis argues that School-University Partnerships are complex and messy and in their broad discursive construction can be understood as both everything and nothing. Burgos (2003) argued that partnership was a weasel word and an "empty signifier" (p. 55) that meant it could be used for a range of purposes and to describe almost anything. The findings of this thesis show that this continues to be the case in Australian teacher education. This thesis also argues that in initial teacher education, School-University Partnerships have become dominant and unquestioned, functioning as a regime of truth. This thesis puts forward the argument that this is problematic as it limits critique of partnerships and makes it difficult to imagine alternatives.

1.7.1 Research Aims

This research aims to develop a better understanding of School-University Partnerships in the present. In order to do this, the thesis aims to investigate School-University Partnerships in the past and present in policy and practice and to look at how partnerships are discursively constructed. This research also aims to understand the impacts of School-University Partnerships on teacher education in Australia.

1.7.2 Research Questions

The research questions at the centre of this study are:

1. How have School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education been discursively constructed in policy and practice?
2. How are truth and knowledge produced in the discourses of School-University Partnerships?
3. What are the consequences for the subjectivity of teacher educators?

I present the answers to these research questions through my findings across chapters 5-8.

1.8 Research Approach

This study draws on a range of theoretical and methodological tools, principally from Foucault's genealogical works (1975/1991, 1976/1998). I have particularly used Foucauldian conceptions of power, truth, subjectivity and discourse in order to explore the policy and practice of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education. I employ a methodology inspired by Foucauldian genealogy in order to understand School-University Partnerships in teacher education in the present and highlight the contingent nature of this present in teacher education. I selected a range of relevant policy documents for analysis in order to construct a "history of the present" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 31). I have drawn on the work of Ball (1993, 2003, 2015), Bacchi (2009) and Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) in order to inform my policy analysis. I also conducted interviews with a range of participants, many of whom had decades of experience in a large number of partnerships. I draw on a Foucauldian conception of discourse in order to analyse the interview data and conduct further analysis using the concepts of truth, power and subjectivity.

1.9 Situating the researcher and contribution to the field

Foucault was a proponent of "insider" research and my position is as an insider to two key occupational groups in this study, teacher and teacher education academic. Over the course of this research I worked as a research associate on two School-University Partnerships projects and worked prior and again during the study as a classroom teacher. I also worked as a university teacher educator during the writing of the thesis. Moving across and between institutions and roles deepened my understanding of the opportunities and complexities of School-University Partnerships. I developed a critical poststructuralist framework for understanding School-University Partnerships as I could see that there was a large body of scholarly work on partnerships in teacher education and yet I could see persistent challenges.

1.10 Thesis outline

This chapter has introduced the research and its main aims which are to construct a history of the present of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education. I

have also provided an outline of the significance of the study to the field of teacher education.

Chapter two involves a detailed analysis of the literature on School-University Partnerships. I have reviewed the Australian literature and also looked to other Anglophone nations such as England and the U.S. from which Australia tends to borrow policy; from which I have drawn (Lingard, 2010). I provide evidence of the prevalence of research on partnerships that focus on one or more particular partnerships with a focus on the highlights. I also discuss the critical studies available and show why more critical research on partnerships is needed.

In Chapter three I provide a detailed theoretical framework for the study, highlighting key aspects of Foucault's work that I have drawn from. In particular I explore the ideas of power, discourse, subjectivity and truth as they were used by Foucault and others drawing on his work. I highlight the way that Ball and Bacchi's use of Foucault has informed my approach in this study.

Chapter four is where I outline the genealogical methodology and data collection methods used. In this chapter I show how I have drawn from Foucault's genealogical approach in the design of this study. I then outline the methods utilised for the collection and analysis of the policy data. The final section of the chapter highlights the methods used in the collection and analysis of the interview data.

In Chapter five I provide an in-depth analysis of the selected policies. I use the genealogical approach identified in Chapter three to frame this analysis and then I draw heavily on the work of Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) in my policy analysis. I demonstrate the shifting discourses of partnerships in policy over the past 30 years.

Chapter six is where I begin my analysis of the interview data. I draw on a Foucauldian notion of discourse to explore the many and varied discursive conceptualisations of School-University Partnerships evident in the interview data. I identify that partnerships are a widespread practice of teacher education and are discursively constructed in such a broad way as to be almost meaningless.

In Chapter seven I show how in initial teacher education, partnerships have become so dominant that they can be understood to be circulating as a regime of truth. I also provide evidence of some resistance to School-University Partnerships in initial teacher

education. In this chapter I explore alignments and tensions between School-University Partnerships in policy and practice, connecting the findings across chapter 5-7.

In Chapter eight I provide further analysis of partnerships in initial teacher education and I look closely at a number of key discourses that are functioning within this regime of truth. These discourses of the real, experience and a discourse of derision towards teacher education are circulating and both maintaining and produced by the regime of truth. These discourses relate to the purpose of initial teacher education and the problems endemic to the field (Vick, 2006).

Chapter nine provides a conclusion to the thesis, with an overview of the key findings. School-University Partnerships are widespread in policy and practice in Australian teacher education and they continue to function as an "empty signifier" (Burgos, 2003), discursively constructed as everything and nothing. In initial teacher education partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth making it difficult to question them and limiting the possibilities for alternatives. I make a case for further critique, noting the potential for Foucauldian conceptualisations of power to better understand School-University Partnerships and their circulation as a regime of truth in initial teacher education in the present.

1.11 Conclusion

In this chapter I have introduced the topic for this thesis, School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education. I have outlined the broader context for the study by providing an overview of the teacher education and the major challenges faced by the field. I have shown the place of School-University Partnerships in teacher education and articulated the need for this research. I have also written about how I came to this research at this time and my position as an insider researcher. I also provided a brief introduction to the research approach adopted and presented an overview of the thesis chapters. In the next chapter I provide a review of the scholarly literature on School-University Partnerships in teacher education.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I have introduced the thesis and outlined the context for the study. In this chapter I provide a review of the literature on School-University Partnerships in teacher education. While the focus of this literature review is on the Australian context, I also draw on literature emanating from Anglophone nations as education policy in Australia has a history of "policy borrowing" from the United Kingdom and the U.S. (Lingard, 2010). The development of this literature review has been an iterative process and I have read widely across the School-University Partnerships literature. In this literature review I highlight the discourses of partnership produced. I have also looked beyond School-University Partnerships and in this chapter I explore the discourses of partnership circulating in other similar professions.

In keeping with the genealogical approach utilised in this study, which I describe in detail in Chapter 4, in section 2.3 I look to the history of teacher education to identify the early discourses of School-University Partnerships. I begin to show how the prominence of School-University Partnerships in the present is the result of the circulation of power. I also begin in section 2.3 my analysis of the particularities of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education. The prominent place of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education becomes further evident in policy and practice across Chapters 5 and 7 where I show that partnerships are circulating as a "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131). This conceptualisation of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education as a regime of truth is explained across my background theory chapter in section 3.6.1 and in Chapter 7 of my findings from practice.

The first half of this chapter provides the beginnings of the answer to my first research question, "how have School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education been discursively constructed in policy and practice?", the latter part of the chapter explores the second of my research questions, "how are truth and knowledge produced in the discourses of School-University Partnerships?". I show across sections 2.5 and 2.6 that while the discourses of partnership are broad and have increased in

prominence in initial teacher education, the effects of these discourses have been a considerable body of research that seeks to understand School-University Partnerships. I show in this literature chapter that despite a large body of scholarly work in the teacher education literature on School-University Partnerships, there is limited critique and that this work would benefit from a more prominent place for theory. I begin this literature review with a broad look at notions of partnership.

2.2 Notions of professional partnership: what is a partnership?

> Despite its widespread use, the term 'partnership' is defined in a loose way not only in practical but also in theoretical terms. Practically speaking, partnerships differ enormously from one another in terms of the number, sector and type of partners involved, their scale and their objectives. Theoretically, the term is part of and blurs with a wider family of concepts such as networks, cooperation, coordination and trust. (Cardini, 2006, p. 393-394)

The idea of partnerships is "not all that new or unique" (Franklin et al, 2003, p. 2). As a feature of education reform, partnerships are evident from the late 19th and early 20th Century in the United States (Franklin et al, 2003). Their rise to prominence in teacher education occurred around the 1980s in the U.S. (Goodlad, 1993), and the 1990s in Australia (Hall, 2005; Peters, 2002). Despite their longevity and Goodlad's (1993) prediction that they would become a "common feature of the teacher education enterprise" (p. 24), an agreed definition of what constitutes a School-University Partnership is not easily found (Clifford & Millar, 2008).

Partnerships are often conceived of as "the efforts of groups and individuals including government, business, the church, the voluntary sector, and parents, to work collaboratively to solve problems" (Franklin et al, 2003, p. 3). Burgos (2003) suggested partnership can be associated with "the idea of corporation, company, firm, business, legal relation involving rights and duties, joint venture, participation, close cooperation, and collaboration" (p.55).

2.2.1 Key features of partnerships

In the teacher education literature, Goodlad's (1991) definition has been frequently cited:

> a school-university partnership represents a planned effort to establish a formal, mutually beneficial interinstitutional relationship characterized by the following:
> * Sufficient dissimilarity among institutions to warrant the effort of seeking complementarity in the fulfilment of some function
> *Sufficient overlap in some functions to make clearly apparent the potential benefits of collaboration
> *Sufficient commitment to the effective fulfilment of these overlapping functions to warrant the inevitable loss of some present control and authority on the part of the institution currently claiming dominant interest. (p. 59)

This definition provided by Goodlad (1991) highlights a number of key ideas that have persisted over time in the School-University Partnerships literature, particularly that of mutual benefit and the importance of relationships. Goodlad's (1991) definition also identifies partnerships as "formal", an idea taken up in Australian teacher education policy, discussed in Chapter 5 (section 5.3.3).

The notion of School-University Partnerships being about and for mutual benefit has been widely discussed. Huxham and Vangen (2000) describe it as "the essence of partnership rhetoric may be summed up in the notion of *collaborative advantage*" (p. 293, *emphasis original*). An Australian report which collected detailed data on 35 partnerships highlighted "mutuality" as central to partnerships (Kruger et al, 2009, p.10). Green, Tindall-Ford and Eady (2020) highlighted the benefits of School-University Partnerships including a range of mutual benefits, such as "establish[ing] a sense of community" (p. 415). Mutual benefits in School-University Partnerships can also include research opportunities for teacher educators (Manton et al, 2020). The notion of mutual benefit is a commonly identified feature of partnerships, including School-University Partnerships.

The development of close relationships is frequently identified as a key feature of School-University partnerships (Ryan & Jones, 2014; Zeichner, 2010). The nature of these relationships has also been explored, including highlighting the importance of "trusting relationships" as a feature of School-University Partnerships (Day et al, 2021). For those working with third space theory, the ideal is for "non-hierarchical relationships" (Green et al, 2021, p. 405). While relationships have are seen as important, it has been noted that in order to achieve the mutual benefits identified above, there can be a lengthy investment of time to develop them (Burroughs et al, 2020). Relationships in School-University

Partnerships have also been connected to ideas of "trust, mutuality and reciprocity" (Jones et al, 2016, p. 119).

Goodlad's (1991) definition also identifies planning and their "formal" nature as features of partnerships. The contrast between "formal" partnerships and more ad hoc arrangements was noted by the 2007 Top of the Class report which identified partnerships in Australia as being "determined efforts by inspired individuals" (p. 79). The subsequent report by Kruger and colleagues (2009) also noted this as a feature of School-University Partnerships. Partnerships in teacher education rose to prominence earlier in the U.S, which is the context that Goodlad (1991) is writing from, so it would seem that the idea of "formal" partnerships also came earlier. Thinking with Foucault, this is not accepted as progress towards improvement, rather the formalising of partnerships is understood as evidence of their role as a form of governance (Furlong et al, 2008).

Goodlad's (1991) definition of School-University Partnerships also suggests that a shift in power relations is necessary for partnerships in "the inevitable loss of some present control and authority on the part of the institution claiming dominant interest" (p. 59). Thinking with Foucault, power is seen as productive with the use of power as not necessarily repressive or negative. Foucault (1977/1980a) says "there can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth… we are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth" (p. 93). The control and authority which Goodlad (1991) is describing can be understood as the power to produce these discourses of truth. In the case of teacher education, these "truths" might include: what constitutes "quality" teaching and what teachers need to know and be able to do. In Chapter 7 I show the discourses of the real and experience as the truth of learning to teach in initial teacher education, produced through the circulation of power. Partnerships in initial teacher education are often framed as necessary for developing "quality teachers" (Jones et al, 2016, p. 117). In England the establishment of partnerships in the 1990s was argued for on the basis of "improvement of quality in provision" which the government had argued "was inadequate" (Furlong et al, 1996, p. 41).

Foucault (1980) also argues that "power must be analysed as something which circulates" (p. 98). Goodlad's (1991) definition suggests that the dominant institution, generally understood as universities in teacher education, need to give up some of their

power in order to operate in partnership with schools. Foucault's (1980) conception of power provides the opportunity to think about the complexity in the power dynamics at play in School-University Partnerships and to consider what impact they have on the knowledge that is valued in teacher education. Breault (2014), in his study on the Professional Development Schools literature in the U.S., suggests that there is a "deliberate reticence" to examine power relations in School-University Partnerships (p. 22). He also notes that it is assumed in much of the literature that the capacity to influence the conduct of others in School-University Partnerships is mostly exercised by the university "in the dominant role" (Breault, 2014, p. 22). So even when the notion of power in partnerships is not explored, assumptions are being made about where and how power "circulates" (Foucault, 1980).

2.2.2 Types of partnerships

In attempting to describe and define School-University Partnerships, Clifford and Millar (2008) note the designation of some partnerships as "true" or "authentic" (p. 11). Others have opted for descriptions such as "collaborative" (Furlong et al, 1996), "truly collaborative" (Smith, Brisard & Menter, 2007) or "genuine" (Cochran-Smith, 2003). This suggests that there may be other types of partnerships which are untrue or not collaborative (Clifford & Millar, 2008). Kruger et al (2009) describe the possible consequence of mandated partnerships is that they end up being "contrived collaboration" (p. 46). It has also been suggested that the term partnership is "excessively broad" and often defined in such a way that "essentially all activities involving more than one organization would be partnerships" (Clifford & Millar, 2008, p. 11). A recent Australian study of school university partnerships looked at "any work being carried out by members of a university and a school' (Heffernan et al, 2021, p. 683).

The broad range of activities encompassed in these discourses of partnership connects with the idea advanced by Burgos (2003) that partnership constitutes a "floating and empty signifier" (p.55). Burgos (2003) argues that it is this ambiguity in the term "partnership" that is politically productive (p. 55). The effect of the ambiguity in the term "partnership" creates the opportunity to make use of them to pursue a variety of agendas. Cardini (2006) describes how the UK government had reconstructed and redefined partnerships "as a new way of organising the delivery of social services" which involves

"collaboration and civil society participation" and frames partnerships as "benevolent, neutral and pragmatic" (p. 394). Furlong et al (2008) argue that partnerships in England reveal a tension between "the rhetoric of a new openness to collaboration and to evidence of ever tightening central control" (p. 308). The broad use of the term "School-University Partnership" suggests that they have been widely accepted as unproblematic and that particularly when they are being imposed, they ought to be the subject of scrutiny. Zeichner (2021) argues that we need to address their pervasiveness and the "often uncritical glorification of their worth" (p. 3).

2.2.3 Utopian visions for partnership

Catelli et al (2000) provide a way of framing partnership, that of authentic partnership, which they describe below:

> Whether the relationship is symbiotic or organic, what is clear is that in authentic partnership, as opposed to other types of joint venture, the school and university do act as equal partners. They agree at the outset to work side by side on pre-selected matters" and "their ultimate goals are to institutionalize the partnership in their respective settings, create an inter-institutional structure that will permit change and improvement to occur at both levels, and strive toward a new seamless system of education. (p. 227 in Clifford & Millar, 2008 p. 12)

Catelli et al (2000) definition raises the issue of the origins of the partnership. They seem to be suggesting that "authentic partnership" evolves out of a joint need that leads to equality between the partners. This is supported by Kruger et al's (2009) assertion that mandated partnerships can end up being "contrived collaboration". The English situation in the mid-1990s seems to include instances of "contrived collaboration" with Furlong et al (1996) noting, "pressure on higher education to move rapidly to a partnership model of training has been substantial" (p. 42). They found that almost all teacher education courses "claimed either to be working in partnership with schools" or finalising their transition (Furlong et al, 1996, p.42). This would seem to be evidence of "performativity" (Ball, 2003) in partnerships as teacher education institutions work to fulfil accountability requirements, without this necessarily leading to substantive changes in practices. It is apparent that the notion of partnerships can vary significantly and the use of a range of adjectives with

partnership underscores various authors' sense that the term 'partnerships' does not provide an adequate picture of the practices being examined.

The language of "authentic partnerships" also appears in the family-school partnerships literature and Auerbach (2012) describes these as, "respectful alliances …that value relationship building, dialogue across difference and sharing power in pursuit of a common purpose" (p. 29). The utopian language employed in both of these definitions represent the kind of thinking that led to Goodlad's (1994) claim that School-University Partnerships were "paradise envisioned, rarely gained" (p. 218) and Bullough et al's (1999) later observation that partnerships represented "paradise unrealized". Yet this kind of vision is still a feature of the literature (Allen et al, 2013; Jones et al, 2016). It would seem to be evidence of another case of Vick's (2006) observation of "historical amnesia" in teacher education.

The continuing utopian vision for School-University Partnerships is not surprising given that research is often done out of an effort to "nurture and cement" the existing partnerships (Smedley, 2001, p. 203). Given the policy climate of School-University Partnerships as a "policy panacea" (Kennedy & Doherty, 2012) it is not surprising that when the work of individual partnerships is reported, the tone is generally upbeat. The overwhelming positivity towards partnerships is also reflected in the findings of Clifford and Millar (2008) that identified the significant majority of School-University Partnerships literature as highlighting the benefits of partnerships and which features make them effective. Davies et al (2007), is an example of where the authors explored why their planned "integrative collaboration" did not turn out to be the transformative project the researchers had hoped for. Interestingly, the project Davies et al (2007) report on started out with these same kind of utopian visions. It ended up exploring what "went awry", which stands out amongst a lot of literature on "Successful Teacher Education" (Jones & Ryan, 2014). While research that reports on the success stories of School-University Partnerships can be valuable, the limited critique is a notable absence in the Australian literature.

Scholarly work that offers a critique from a variety of perspectives on School-University Partnerships has been written in the international teacher education literature (Breault, 2014; Kennedy & Doherty, 2012;). Even writing in the 1990s on School-University Partnerships in the U.S.A did not accept them without critique (Bullough & Kauchak, 1997; Bullough et al, 1999). The English context also provided evidence in the 1990s that teacher

educators had reason to be cautious about a partnership agenda (Furlong et al, 1996). Green, Tindall-Ford & Eady's (2020) systematic literature review shows that there continues to be a focus on the benefits of partnership and limited critique in the Australian literature.

2.2.4 Collaboration and partnerships

The concept of collaboration is frequently associated with partnerships. Green, Tindall-Ford and Eady (2020) describe "collaborative school-university partnerships" as those operating in the "third space" (p. 404). Chan (2016) discusses the concept of collaboration as it relates to partnerships and says that it is "a concept that evokes considerable promise" (p. 1). She goes on to discuss how collaboration "has a way of foregrounding itself as being democratic, reciprocal, sustainable and mutually beneficial" (Chan, 2016, p. 1). Franklin et al (2003) discuss the notion of partnerships in similar terms as suggesting "that there exists a consensus among the various parties charged with the solution of any problem" (p.4). Chan (2016) notes the ubiquitous use of the term "collaboration" in the same way that Bloomfield (2009) identifies the "insistent discourse of partnerships". Chan (2016) seems to use the terms somewhat interchangeably with the title of her book using "partnerships" while "collaboration" dominates the discussion within.

This conflation of the terms "partnership" and "collaboration" by Chan (2016) is noteworthy as the term "collaboration" appears in the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers on a number of occasions and yet the term partnership is not used at all (AITSL, 2011a). On the other hand, the term partnership appears frequently in the documents for university accreditation of initial teacher education courses (AITSL, 2015). A number of examples of what *could* be referred to as "School-University Partnerships" opt for alternatives, such as the Coalition of Knowledge Building Schools (Mockler, 2013) and the Collaborative Action Research Network (CARN) (Somekh, 2010). Both of these examples represent what could be described as more 'grassroots' organisations, particularly CARN, and it is possible to speculate that the term "partnership" was avoided for its association with top-down imposed "contrived collaboration" (Kruger et al, 2009). The differing language in the Standards for teachers and the accreditation policy for initial teacher education suggest "partnership" is an expectation of universities and teacher educators, while "collaboration" is what is expected of teachers.

Towndrow (2015) suggests “if we conceive collaboration, for example, as an intellectual undertaking where the combination of unique inputs is greater than the sum of their individual parts, then collaboration, in my opinion, is an inappropriate term to refer to mundane working arrangements” (p. 378). Towndrow’s (2015) discussion of collaboration argues it is not a term that should be used for every day or administrative tasks. This is a point of interest as the term School-University Partnerships is sometimes used to describe the process of universities sending their pre-service teachers out to schools on professional experience arguably without any “intellectual undertaking” or “collaboration” based on Towndrow’s (2015) conception. This type of partnership has been referred to by Furlong et al (2000) as “complementary partnerships” which involve clear division of responsibility between the university and the school. Clifford and Millar (2008) argue that this type of arrangement is more comparable to a service agreement between organisations. I discuss a range of ways of classifying partnerships in section 2.6 where I explore frameworks that have been developed for School-University Partnerships. The main target of the current requirement for “formal partnerships” (AITSL, 2015) in Australia is the professional experience component of initial teacher education. The heightened scrutiny and accountability for higher education institutions is around this element of “partnership”. In Chapter 6 I highlight a range of discursive conceptualisations of partnership from interviews with participants including partnerships as professional experience placement (section 6.2.1) and partnerships as a fee for service arrangement (section 6.2.6).

2.2.5 Defining School-University Partnership

An agreed definition of partnerships in general and School-University Partnerships in particular is not easily identified, with “a substantial amount of ambiguity about how partnership is defined (Clifford & Millar, 2008, p. 13). Partnerships are frequently defined as “an organization populated by members of two or more other organizations” (Clifford & Millar, 2008, p.10).

Bloomfield & Nguyen (2015) discuss the varying definitions of “partner” in the Oxford English Dictionary, including as associate, companion or accomplice to highlight the “the complexity and even ambiguity held within the reach of notions of partnership” (p. 25). Edwards, Goodwin, Pemberton and Woods (2001) argued that partnership “is neither a neutral term, nor one with a fixed definition; rather the meaning of “partnership” is

discursively constructed and contested through political rhetoric, policy documentation, programme regulations, and grassroots practice (p. 295). Bloomfield and Nguyen (2015) suggest that the common understanding of partnership is a "sustained relationship and equal exchange as well as reciprocity and mutuality achieved through a process of negotiation of relationship in terms of common purpose, forms and practice" (p. 24). In this definition the common themes of equality of partners and mutual interest are evident. The acknowledgement of the need for "a process of negotiation" suggests an awareness of the circulation of power within partnerships.

For the purposes of this research, a precise definition of School-University Partnerships is not necessary as the interest is partly in the productive power of the ambiguity (Burgos, 2003). Drawing from Bloomfield and Nguyen's (2015) definition, this study conceives of School-University Partnerships broadly, encompassing a "sustained relationship" between one or more schools and one or more universities involving some degree of, or perception of, interinstitutional mutual benefit (borrowing from Goodlad, 1991). This thesis is interested in exploring School-University Partnerships, not to identify whether they are positive or negative, but to find out what are "the discourses of true and false" that arise out of them in teacher education, and the "effects in the real to which they are linked" (Foucault, 1980, p. 237). I further explore these discourses of partnership in policy and practice across chapters 5-8. In the section which follows, I turn my attention to the literature beyond School-University Partnerships to partnerships in other fields. I make this comparison in order to clarify the place of partnerships, their purpose and how they are understood.

2.3 Partnerships in the professions: where else are partnerships happening?

Partnerships have been promoted in a range of fields including in business and in healthcare (Clifford & Millar, 2008). Comparisons with other "social" professions, with a similar history in terms of preparation and entry into the profession, make partnerships in fields such as nursing and social work of interest to this study. The organisations with which universities might partner differ, but there are some similar trends in the espoused motivation for and purpose of these partnerships. The quote below from the Nurse Education Today journal exemplifies the sort of rationale also found in teacher education:

> A competent nursing workforce is important for an effective healthcare system. However, concerns on the poor quality of nursing care and poor competencies among nursing students, nurses, and midwives are increasing…Furthermore, a large gap between theory and practice exists. This study described the role of academic–clinical partnership in strengthening nursing education. (Bvumbwe, 2016, p. 314)

The kind of ideas expressed in this quote reflect the underlying assumptions of much of the literature on School-University Partnerships, namely that there are concerns about poor "quality" teacher preparation, a "theory-practice gap" and that partnerships between universities and workplaces are the solution (see Allen et al, 2013; Jones et al, 2016).

The same sorts of criticisms of initial professional preparation for nurses are evident in the literature with the suggestion that the reality of nursing practice and employers' expectations means nurses need to be "accountable practitioners at the point of registration" (Edmond, 2001, p. 253). This sounds reminiscent of the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group's (2014) call for "classroom ready" (p. 12) teachers. Issues around the appropriateness of the role of academics or clinical staff in providing mentoring to the student nurse are linked to the "clinical credibility and acceptance by the clinical team" (Edmond, 2001, p. 255). The enhanced "credibility" of current practitioners is also a motivator identified in some School-University Partnerships (Bullough et al, 2004). Britzman (2003) raised credibility as linked to practice in her influential work on teacher education.

While they had existed previously, collaborative partnerships in nursing education were being established in the early 2000s (Edmond, 2001, p.257). It would seem that there are similar patterns in the motivation for the adoption of partnerships in nursing. Where preparation previously occurred "on the job in hospitals, the move to universities was seen as a way "to improve the quality of education and give recognition to nursing as a discipline with academic, as well as, practice dimensions" (Budgen & Gamroth, 2008, p. 273). Yet once nurse education was delivered in universities, there emerged criticism of inadequacies in practical skills (Edmond, 2001).

Like teacher education, the push to partnerships in the 1990s was evident in social work research in Britain (Taylor & Le Richte, 2006). Also, with resemblances to teaching, the Department of Health (2002) required that all social workers "learn and be assessed on partnership" (p.16) and yet the National Occupational Standards for Social Work do not "explicitly mention partnership working" (Taylor & Le Richte, 2006, p. 419). As with

Bloomfield's (2009) claim about the "insistent discourse of partnerships" in teacher education, Ager et al (2005) argue there is a "formidable mandate" for partnership in social work education.

Taylor and Le Richte's (2006) study echoed many of the findings on School-University Partnerships with "conceptual confusion about partnership …found to be rife in the theoretical and empirical literature and the practice surveys" (p. 422). They also found that partnership work is "more often implicit than explicit, and it is regarded as self-evident that partnership will be central to learning" (Taylor & Le Richte, 2006, p. 422). In addition, Taylor and Le Richte (2006) note that "partnership is resource-intensive, requiring a delicate balance to be struck between tokenistic and genuine involvement" (p. 424). This discussion parallels discussion in the teacher education literature around "genuine" partnership (Jones et al, 2016) versus "contrived collaboration" (Kruger et al, 2009).

Similar patterns in the motivation for and emphasis on partnerships in other social professions provides a helpful backdrop for this genealogical study of School-University Partnerships. Moving from notions of partnership and the place of partnerships in the professions, the next section explores in more detail the emergence of School-University Partnerships in teacher education.

2.4 The emergence of School-University Partnerships: where did partnerships come from?

In order to understand the place of School-University Partnerships in the late 2010s and early 2020s, it is useful to take a brief look back at teacher education in Australia since the 19th Century. Given what Bloomfield (2009) has identified as the "insistent discourse of partnerships" in teacher education in the early 21st Century, the following section will look at what came before. Working within a Foucauldian theoretical framework, a grand historical narrative is rejected. That is, the idea that as a society we are always progressing in a linear fashion, improving on what we did before. Contemporary social practices in teacher education are understood as "the result of struggles for power, not the conclusive enlightened answer (Bourke, 2011, p. 6). An exploration of the current state of partnerships in teacher education is enhanced by situating the problem in context.

Teacher education in Australia has been conducted in a range of settings since the 19th Century. The move to mass schooling in the 19th Century led to a need for large numbers of teachers (Vick, 2006). Models of teacher education since that time have

included: an apprenticeship model; recruitment without any particular teaching qualification; a three-month teaching course; "normal" schools with one month training; and formal study in teachers' colleges (Aspland, 2006). Universities began to offer some teacher education courses from the 1960s and 1970s, particularly in secondary specialist subjects (Mayer, 2014). The Dawkins reforms (1987, 1988) saw the amalgamation of Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) with universities and from then on universities have been a key site for the education of teachers. At no point has teacher education occurred solely in a higher education setting, with an important role for the variously named teaching rounds, practicum, placement, and professional experience involving weeks of time spent in schools as part of learning to teach (Allen & Wright, 2014; Bloomfield, 2009; Le Cornu, 2016). While the connection between higher education and schools for the purpose of this professional experience has not always attracted the label "partnership", the importance of this relationship has long been recognised (Vick, 2006).

The involvement of schools and higher education providers in the education of teachers has been standard practice since the emergence of teachers' colleges in the early 20th Century. The Australian teacher education system has been heavily influenced by the federal governance structure. Teachers' colleges were controlled by the states, whereas universities are controlled by the federal government (Knight, Lingard & Bartlett, 1994). The closer ties between the teachers' colleges and the state based education system prior to the Dawkins reforms (Knight, Lingard, & Bartlett, 1994) meant that there was not the same need to promote "partnerships". Teachers' colleges and public schools in particular were much more connected to one another through their governance structures. Shifting teacher education into universities, argued at the time as a means of promoting Australia's economic performance and increasing the status of the teaching profession, meant shifting control for the preparation of teachers away from state governments (Knight, Lingard & Bartlett, 1994; Watts, 2006).

Watts (2006) further argues that "Dawkins made it clear from the outset that higher education, would have to become 'more efficient and competitive', that it would have to be 'better integrated with national economic priorities' and that it would 'have to do more with less'" (p. 236). So at the time that teacher education came under the primary control of universities, the motivation was less about increasing teacher "professionalism" and more about "greater efficiency and economy" (Knight, Lingard & Bartlett, 1994, p. 458). Given

that School-University Partnerships emerged out of this situation, the claim that partnerships in teacher education are a form of governance (Furlong et al, 2008) appears to also apply in the Australian context.

It is clear that the idea of partnerships in the 1990s was not new (Franklin et al, 2003; Kruger et al, 2009), with evidence of education departments promoting close relationships with schools in the early 20th Century (Vick, 2006). What was new was the naming of these relationships as "partnerships". Drawing on Foucauldian theoretical tools, further exploration of these "insistent discourses of partnership" (Bloomfield, 2009) are needed to understand these shifting discourses in teacher education. The discourse of partnerships emerged in Australia very soon after universities became the primary sites for teacher education with the Dawkins reforms happening in the late 1980s and the rise to prominence of the discourse of partnerships in the early 1990s (Kruger et al, 2009).

In the 1990s the emphasis in School-University Partnerships was around professional learning. The Innovative Links project, a large-scale example, ran from 1993-1996 and involved over 100 schools and 14 universities nationally (Sachs, 1997). Mockler (2013) traces a shift over time in the nature of partnerships, much like that noted by Furlong et al (2008), where the understanding of the role of teachers and the nature of teaching had shifted. Mockler (2013) argues that by the late 1990s partnerships were operating "within the discourse of school effectiveness and improvement" (p. 276). Partnerships had become part of the "solution" to the "problem" of "teacher quality", which over time came to be enforced through "neoliberal accreditation agendas" (Bloomfield, 2009, p. 27).

Partnerships in general and in teacher education in particular have risen to prominence within the time period characterized by neoliberalism (Connell, 2013; Davies & Bansel, 2007). The following section will explore neoliberalism and its impacts on teacher education in Australia as well as how School-University Partnerships operate as a form of neoliberal governmentality.

2.5 Neoliberalism and School-University Partnerships: what is the broader context for partnerships?

Neoliberalism, according to Peters (2001), might be "the most powerful reigning global metanarrative (to use Lyotard's term)" (p. vii). Neoliberalism has brought changes in many areas of public policy and has had a significant impact in education (Connell, 2013;

Davies & Bansel, 2007). Harvey (2005) describes neoliberalism as an economic and political ideology that promotes human advancement through an emphasis on "strong private property rights, free markets and free trade" (p.2). Connell (2013) further describes neoliberalism as "the agenda of economic and social transformation under the sign of the free market" (p. 99). Practices of neoliberal governance are identified as the "expansion of market relations" and deregulation which allows "a lower level of public spending" (Connell, 2013, p. 100). Connell (2013) goes on to argue that "once a neoliberal policy regime had been established, around the mid-1980s, a cascade of 'reforms' followed" with a significant impact on education (p. 102).

The impacts on education of these neoliberal reforms have been described by Kostogriz and Doecke (2011) as having "significantly affected public education" in "multidimensional and profound" ways (p. 397). These reforms are also evident in the US, England and many other nations and have been described by Apple (2001) as "conservative modernisation". He argues that these reforms and the language of competition, accountability and standards work to "cement conservative educational positions into our daily lives" (Apple, 2001, p. 184; Apple, 1996). Keddie (2013) has described the current context in education as "hyper-accountable and competitive" (p. 752). The way in which teaching and education are viewed within a neo-liberal framework is significantly different to that within a welfare state. The emphasis is now on "quality" and "effectiveness" as measurable "outcomes" rather than education for the public good and "personal betterment" (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2011, p. 398).

Evidence of these neo-liberal reforms can be seen in the international trend towards what Smith (2016) has called the Global Testing Culture, creating an environment where "testing becomes synonymous with accountability, which becomes synonymous with education quality" (p. 7). Internationally, growth in participation in international assessments such as the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), as well as rapid growth in national assessment programs, shows the dominance of this testing culture in measuring educational "quality" (Smith, 2016). In Australia, standards-based accountability measures have been imposed on schools where they are measured and compared based on their performance in high-stakes testing regimes such as the National Assessment Project - Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2011; Lingard, 2010). These standards-based accountability measures are also evident in neoliberal

discourses which emphasise “teacher professional standards as a means of guaranteeing quality and holding teachers and teacher educators accountable” (Allard, Moss & Meyer, 2014, p. 426).

Neoliberal reforms have had a significant impact on universities and teacher educators (Nuttall & Brennan, 2016), who are operating under different but comparable “policy technologies” (Ball, 2005). University teacher educators’ work practices are highly monitored and there is pressure to attract grant money and produce publications or “outputs”, as well as evidence of “impact” (Le Cornu, 2015, p. 4; Thomson & Mockler, 2016). In the United States, teacher education providers are also subject to public rankings based on their “products”, graduate teachers (Apple, 2001). In Australia, the 2016 introduction of literacy and numeracy tests for graduates of teacher education is another example of this accountability climate which, like other accountability measures, “serves to reinforce a general deficiency view of teacher education” (Reid, 2011, p. 383). Media coverage of the Literacy and Numeracy Test for initial teacher education use crisis rhetoric to paint a picture of pre-service teachers as “failing” and “flunkers”, reporting on the concern among principals that only one quarter to a third of teachers were “well prepared to teach numeracy and literacy” (Powley, 2015). Testing, according to neoliberal logic, is the way to ensure “quality” teachers and a “quality” education system (Smith, 2016).

It is within this standards-based accountability environment that teachers and teacher educators come together in School-University Partnerships, each bringing the particular accountability and performance measures of their own institution with them into what has been described as the hybrid or “thirdspace” of the partnership (Zeichner, 2010). Teacher educators come with the backdrop of successive government reports, including Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (2014) and the Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) accreditation standards (2011, 2015) shifting to an emphasis on “formal” school-university partnerships. Teachers on the other hand, have the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers as their most visible accountability measure, a document that does not include the word “partnerships” or university (AITSL, 2011a). There is some mention of collaborating beyond the school but this includes working with parents and community members or professional associations (AITSL, 2011a). These differing pressures must be acknowledged in order to productively explore School-University Partnerships.

The next section will explore the enactment of different types of partnerships evident in Australian teacher education. A range of groupings for partnership activity have been described and developed by scholars working in the field in order to better understand School-University Partnerships as a prevalent practice in teacher education.

2.6 Enacting partnerships: what are partnerships for?

School-University Partnerships has been used to describe a wide range of connections and collaborations between teachers and teacher educators, schools and university. As discussed in section 2.1, there is no ready definition of School-University Partnerships (Clifford & Millar, 2008). A number of researchers have attempted to categorise partnerships according to type or purpose in order to provide further analysis or explore their effects. One common way of distinguishing School-University Partnerships is to separate them into the one of three main categories: initial teacher education, professional learning, research or a combination of one or more of these aspects (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Hall, 2005; Kruger et al, 2009; Mockler, 2013; Peters, 2002). In the following sections I look at these three broad categories of School-University Partnership reported in the teacher education literature.

2.6.1 Initial teacher education

There is considerable literature on School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education. The focus of this research relates to the professional experience component of teacher education courses whereby pre-service teachers spend time in schools. Green, Tindall-Ford and Eady (2020) conducted a systematic literature review on School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education across 2012-2017 and identified 59 studies and found that all 59 noted the benefits of the partnership. This review is an indicator of the strength of the prominence of studies in the field and of the support for School-University Partnerships in the area of initial teacher education. The work of Manton and others (2020) also reported by Heffernan and others (2021) continues to highlight the breadth of "integrated partnerships" happening in Australian teacher education.

Allen, Howells & Radford (2013) reported on a partnership between the state government and one university to address the government's concern that graduating teachers have the skills and knowledge "to effectively teach literacy and numeracy" (Allen et al, 2013, p. 101). The partnership aimed to contribute to the development of "quality

teachers" through "increased in-school time for a small number of pre-service teachers" (Allen et al, 2013, p. 101). The partnership was also developed to respond to the policy imperative to strengthen, "the link between the practical and theoretical components of teacher preparation", in order to "reduce the theory-practice divide" (Allen et al, 2013, p. 101).

The kind of rationale put forward by Allen et al (2013) is echoed elsewhere in the literature on School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education. Jones et al (2016) argue that "the theory-practice nexus is accomplished" through support for pre-service teachers in School-University Partnerships. Jones et al (2016) note that School-University Partnerships are generally about, "teacher education taking on increased school-based approaches" (p. 109). Jones et al (2016) identify the limitations of "overly theoretical approaches" of university-based teacher education and the "lack of theory-informed practice" in "excessive school-based models" (p. 109). Jones et al (2016) argue for "effective partnerships" to shape "quality teachers" (p. 117). The idea that the purpose of School-University Partnerships is to "bridge the gap between schools and universities" (Brady, 2002) or "bridge the gap between theory and practice" (Green et al, 2020, p. 424) persists.

Similarly, Grudnoff, Haigh & Mackisack (2016) report on their "re-envisaging and reinvigorating" of professional experience through developing partnerships with schools due to there often being "a disconnect between campus and practicum components" (p. 2). Grudnoff et al (2016) suggest that "striking the right theory-practice balance has been a long-standing challenge for ITE (Allen, 2009)" (p. 2). The re-envisaging reported on in this project included redefined roles and relationships for school and university personnel, including more shared decision-making to create a situation "where teacher professional knowledge and university scholarly knowledge were equally valued and respected" (Grudnoff et al, 2016, p. 10). So in this article the emphasis for the partnership is addressing a "disconnect" experienced by pre-service teachers through working more closely with schools in negotiating the nature and structure of professional experience.

Grima-Farrell et al (2014) describe a partnership developed in the area of inclusive education. The findings suggest that such a project may help reduce "the well- articulated gap" between theory and practice and assist teachers to feel "sufficiently prepared" to meet the needs of all students (Grima-Farrell et al, 2014, p. 97). The details of the partnership in

question are similar to that described by Allen et al (2013) in that it involves more time in schools and a financial incentive for Pre-Service Teachers. The major "solution" to the "theory-practice gap" being articulated seems to be a shared language amongst teacher educators, teachers and pre-service teachers and "open communication with the same university-based facilitator" (Grima-Farrell et al, 2014, p. 96).

The broadly accepted rationale for School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education is that it "relates to the apparent divide between practice and theory, between practitioner and academy" (Hall, 2005, p. iii). Green, Tindall-Ford & Eady (2020) argue that partnerships have been established for the purpose of connecting theory and practice in meaningful ways. This notion is accepted without significant critique in many of these studies and forms the basis of many assumptions about the purpose of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education. If a gap between "theory" and "practice" in teacher education is accepted as "truth" then School-University Partnerships offer an opportunity to "solve" this "problem" and the challenge for researchers is to find the best way to operationalize them. This provides some explanation for the dominance of studies focused on "successful university-school partnerships" (Jones et al, 2016) and "Pitfalls of School-University Partnerships" (Ledoux & McHenry, 2008) where the authors highlight what to do and what not to do to make partnerships work. The acceptance of a "theory/practice gap" is also evident in attempts at "reimagining" (Fancourt et al, 2015), "rethinking" (Day, 1998) and "re-envisaging" (Grudnoff et al, 2016) School-University Partnerships in order to improve on an accepted "solution" to the "problem" of teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 2004).

The Australian literature seems vulnerable to the criticism made by Kennedy (2011) that "researchers themselves can become smitten by them [partnerships] and become advocates more than examiners of these new ideas" (p. 3 cited in Kennedy & Doherty, 2012). The finding that all 59 studies celebrated the benefits of partnership in the systematic literature review by Green and others provides support for this idea (Green et al, 2020). Kennedy and Doherty (2012), in their study of the Donaldson Report in Scotland, and Furlong et al (2008) in their study of the National Partnership Program in England, engage in the kind of critical policy study that appears to need further exploration in Australian teacher education in relation to School-University Partnerships. The reason for this gap in the literature can be at least partly explained by the challenges of securing research funding

in education (Rowan et al, 2015). This results in teacher educators conducting research on their own work (Murray, Nuttall & Mitchell, 2008), with minimal or no funding with the dual aim of meeting the performance demands of their institutions (Le Cornu, 2015) and cementing their partnership relationships (Smedley, 2001). In this climate, a critique that looks to "what type of assumptions", "familiar notions" or "established and unexamined ways of thinking the accepted practices are based" (Foucault, 2000, p. 456) is unlikely to occur. In my findings in Chapter 7 I identify School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education as circulating as a regime of truth, dominant to the point where critique is difficult.

2.6.2 Professional learning and research

The rationale for School-University Partnerships with a focus on professional learning and/or research appears to differ from those in initial teacher education. School-University Partnerships for professional learning were the focus of the large-scale Innovative Links project which ran from 1993-1996 (Sachs, 1997). Innovative Links "utilised an inquiry-based model of professional learning, where participant teachers undertook an action-oriented research project and were supported in their learning by an 'academic associate'" (Mockler, 2013, p. 275). The idea of professional learning was connected with research as Innovative Links emphasised practitioner research in order to confront the "unchallenged wisdom of experience" and provide teachers with "a critical and analytic orientation to their practice" (Sachs, 1997, p. 450). This seems to suggest that the partnership was about challenging the theory/practice binary which has been identified as a perennial problem in teacher education (Korthagen, 2010).

Moss's (2008) study of a School-University Partnership for professional learning provides another contrast to the literature on partnerships in initial teacher education. This partnership developed through a connection with the Professional Learning coordinator at the school who invited the academics to be involved. The focus of the research was on the professional identity of the staff with the university academics "highlighting and situating the significance of occupational and personal identity formation as having a pedagogic relationship to teacher professional learning and wider school improvement" (Moss, 2008, p. 353). It would seem that the discourses of "theory-practice divide" are less evident in the

literature on School-University Partnerships for purposes other than initial teacher education.

At other times School-University Partnerships are designed with the aim of incorporating initial teacher education, professional learning and research (Fancourt, Edwards & Menter, 2015). The Oxford Deanery is one such example which "grew out of a long-standing ITE partnership" (Fancourt et al, 2015, p. 369). Parallels can be drawn with the language of 'authentic partnerships' (Catelli et al, 2000) in that the Oxford Deanery partnership came out of a perceived need by the people and institutions and "was not a response to the policy churn" (Fancourt et al, 2015, p. 369). Operating outside of the highly scrutinised policy space of professional experience placements for teacher accreditation also enhanced the science partnerships that informed the work of Jones and colleagues (2016).

Distinguishing between different "types" of partnerships and their main purposes may be useful in order to better understand them. The differing discourses operating in the literature on School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education point to the more contested nature of these types of partnerships. Given the "recurrent nature of debates about teaching and teacher education" (Loughran, 2016, p. 253) it would seem that School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are at risk of reinforcing the idea that university teacher education is "out of touch with contemporary school practices" (Chadbourne, 1996, p. 219). The nature of the literature suggests at least a partial admission that criticisms of teacher education courses as "too theoretical, ideological and faddish" (Knott, 2014 in Gore, 2016, p. 18) are legitimate and that School-University Partnerships are the solution.

Early incarnations of School-University Partnerships, such as the large-scale Innovative Links project appeared to have a different purpose than that evident in more recent partnership promotion (Mockler, 2013). Mockler (2013) questions whether changes in the School-University Partnership agenda over time represent "the slippery slope to efficiency", echoing the concerns of Furlong et al (2008) that partnerships have shifted from having "epistemological and pedagogical dimensions" (p. 311) to become a form of governance, a way of controlling the work of teachers and teacher educators.

2.7 Frameworks for partnerships: how can we understand partnerships?

The scholarly literature on School-University Partnerships includes numerous attempts to develop a framework or model for understanding the different types of partnership activities happening between schools and universities (Burroughs et al, 2020; Furlong et al, 1996; Kenny et al, 2014; McLaughlin & Black-Hawkins, 2004; Smith, 2016). This kind of review of School-University Partnerships is an example of the ways in which researchers in the field have tried to make sense of partnerships and understand them better. Classification of partnerships seems to acknowledge that they are not all the same and that perhaps by distinguishing between them we can better understand the most effective types and their impacts. Much of the research in this area seems to accept what Foucault critiqued as a teleological view, of the history of teacher education, assuming that teacher education is on a linear path to improvement. They seem to rest on the belief that School-University Partnerships are an improvement on previous models of teacher education and that we need simply understand them better and refine our processes so that they can reach their potential. A number of these frameworks for classifying partnerships are explored below.

McLaughlin and Black-Hawkins (2004) outlined six models of school–university research partnerships but also acknowledge that the reality in practice "is both more messy and richer than any typology allows" (p.274). One of the distinctions between these models is the degree to which one or more partner is considered an "expert". Another distinction is whether the relationship goes in multiple directions with learning and benefits seen as flowing to all partners. Model 6 seems to be presented as the ideal whereby the partnership exists "within and between institutions, all partners are experts, facilitators and critical friends to one another" (McLaughlin & Black-Hawkins, 2004, p.277). This model, while specifically related in this article to research partnerships, could be used to understand other types of School-University Partnerships. The description of Model 6 sounds like the kind of utopian "thirdspace" in initial teacher education described by Zeichner et al (2015). In this conceptualisation, hierarchies of power and knowledge are broken down and teachers, teacher educators and community members all work together as equally valid participants in teacher education (Zeichner et al, 2015). Model 6 also fits with Catelli et al's (2000) description of authentic partnerships whereby all are "equal partners".

The teacher educators in Kenny et al's (2014) study worked to develop both a model for developing school-university partnerships and an interpretive framework that identified three types of partnerships: connective, generative and transformative. They associate the descriptor "connective" with short-term partnerships that meet a curriculum or service need while 'generative' partnerships are long-term and provide opportunities for "mutual professional learning" (Jones et al, 2016, p. 116). These teacher educators identify "transformative" partnerships as those "based on active professional learning" that are "embedded in the ongoing structures and practices of the institutions" (Jones et al, 2016, p. 116). These "transformative" partnerships resemble Model 6 in McLaughlin and Black-Hawkins (2004) and the "collaborative" partnerships identified as operating in English teacher education in early work by Furlong and others (1996).

Smith (2016) proposed a model for partnerships framed as a continuum that ranged from "separated" to "cooperative" based on teacher education in Norway. On this continuum described by Smith (2016) it was about the segregation of duties, with practice schools having a separation of the theoretical components to universities and the practical skills work being the responsibility of the school. In partner schools there is a formal agreement to reduce the level of separation and in the emerging university schools there is a focus on improving professional experience placement, but also on research and professional learning for teachers and teacher educators (Smith, 2016). The "cooperative" end of the partnership continuum is presented as ideal and aligns with both the "transformative" partnerships of Kenny and others (2014) and Model 6 outlined by McLaughlin and Black-Hawkins (2004).

The development of a partnership framework to describe the continua of work with schools in initial teacher education was the basis of a study by Burroughs and colleagues (2020) in the U.S. The framework developed consisted of six levels beginning with "Level 1: Taking from schools" through to "Level 6: Learning Community". The authors of this framework acknowledge it may be possible to be working simultaneously across multiple levels and they also argue these levels are dynamic not static. It was only at Level 3 of this framework that it was considered that the arrangement constituted an "emerging partnership". This framework identified the ideal partnership as "learning through the third space" in a learning community (Burroughs et al, 2020, p. 130). This framework also identifies Level 6 as where university staff and school staff "construct knowledge together"

and where schools and teacher education programs are “simultaneously restructur[ed]” (Burroughs et al, 2020, p. 131). Level 6 of this framework is quite similar to the “transformative” partnerships (Kenny et al, 2014).

In their systematic literature review, Green, Tindall-Ford and Eady (2020) developed broad categories for partnerships adopted from Zeichner’s (2010) work. While not as clearly an attempt to create a framework for partnerships, this research demonstrated continuing efforts to identify different types of partnerships in order to work out which ones are successful or what the barriers are. All the partnerships in their study were in the area of initial teacher education but some also incorporated professional learning and research. The categories were: “mediated instruction, extended placements in selected school settings, hybrid teacher educators, bringing school staff into the university setting, and community knowledge” (Green et al, 2020, p. 413). Across these categories of partnership, Green, Tindall-Ford and Eady (2020) identified three key characteristics of successful partnerships: shared understanding, relationships, and resources.

The frameworks above highlight that there are a wide variety of School-University Partnerships happening for an array of espoused purposes. This supports Burgos’ (2003) suggestion that the notion of partnerships is a “floating and empty signifier” (p. 55) and Stronach and McNamara’s (2002) description of partnership as a political weasel word. It also provides evidence for the claim by Kennedy and Doherty (2012) that School-University Partnerships are operating as a “policy panacea” and are offered as the unproblematic solution to an array of situations. While not all these frameworks identify the ideal kind of partnership, all of them identify a difference between partnerships which involve a relationship resembling consulting work or a fee for service arrangement, and one where influence and ideas flow in both or many directions. This flow of ideas and influence can be understood within Foucault’s later conceptualisations of power. Foucault says that power is productive in that it makes things happen (Lynch, 2013). Power is a way to change people’s conduct, “a mode of action upon the action of others” (Foucault, 1982, p. 790). The partnerships with transformation of practices in multiple directions are generally presented as desirable and variously described as “transformative” (Jones et al, 2016) or “cooperative” (Smith, 2016).

The models and frameworks explored in this section are in part an effect of the prominence of partnerships. The abundant literature on partnerships had created a desire

to understand partnerships better and creating frameworks, models and continua contribute to this understanding. While various methods for grouping and classifying School-University Partnerships can be helpful for exploring problems in the operation and functioning of partnerships, they may also serve to obscure important elements. They allow for a distinction between less desirable models of partnerships and models that are held up as ideal, such as Model 6 (McLaughlin & Black-Hawkins, 2004) or the "university schools" (Smith, 2016). These frameworks do not provide a general critique of partnerships but rather the focus continues to be on how to do partnerships better.

Breault (2014) in his study on the literature on Professional Development Schools in the U.S., suggests that there is a "deliberate reticence" to examine power relations in School-University Partnerships (p. 22). While some analysis of power is evident in some of this literature, much of it seems to accept the "insistent discourse of partnership" (Bloomfield, 2009). Zeichner (2021) has recently argued for a "deeper examination of the power and knowledge relationships that exist within partnerships" (p. 3). While the framework outlined above all make a contribution to understanding the kinds of relationships involved in School-University Partnerships, further examination of the circulation of power and the production of knowledge in these partnerships is needed.

2.8 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a detailed review of the literature on School-University Partnerships. I have shown that School-University Partnerships have been prominent in the scholarly literature for the past 30 years. This chapter provides evidence that a clear and agreed definition of School-University Partnerships is not found in the literature. It also shows that partnerships have been seen as a possible solution to similar challenges in professions with some shared history with teaching, such as nursing and social work where there are also questions of how to best prepare graduates. While the idea of a relationship between schools and universities has a lengthy history, discourses of School-University Partnerships became evident in Australia in the 1990s and have come to an increasingly prominent place in initial teacher education in the 21st Century. There have been recent and past attempts to understand partnerships by looking across the scholarly literature and attempting to create frameworks or categories for partnership.

While much research has been conducted on School-University Partnerships in Australia and internationally, critique is limited. Bloomfield (2009) articulates why this is of concern:

> The concept of partnership can carry such a persuasive tone of collaborative advantage and unproblematic connection that raising critical questions can be seen as engagement in unproductive scepticism. Yet, such critical thinking is important. The pervasiveness of the term 'partnership' in recent policy relevant to teacher education, as well as the apparently unproblematic way in which the concept is employed, should be sufficient to invite caution. (p. 30)

This persistent sense that partnerships are relatively unproblematic and beneficial was reiterated in the work of Green, Tindall-Ford & Eady (2020) who identified all 59 published studies as celebrating the benefits of partnership. This thesis, constructed as a "history of the present" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 31), identifies partnerships as prominent and questions the effects on teacher education as a field. This literature review shows that while there is abundant literature on School-University Partnerships, they are broadly accepted as positive. This research offers a critique of School-University Partnerships and across Chapters 3 and 4 I set out how I draw upon theoretical tools and the approach used to construct this critique.

The challenges of partnerships are often presented as issues that can be fixed through tinkering with the practical arrangements of the partnership. I argue in this thesis that this is problematic and I draw on the tools afforded by Foucault to engage in critique of School-University Partnerships. In my findings chapters, I show that the limited critique of School-University Partnerships is creating space for the proliferation of unhelpful discourses for the field of teacher education. I argue that the limited role of theory in research into partnerships contributes to their production as an "empty signifier".

Debates around the relationship between universities and schools and their respective roles in teacher education would seem to be endemic to the field (Vick, 2006). Bullough et al (1999) argued that "educational reform runs in cycles and enthusiasm wanes over time" (p. 381). School-University Partnerships have demonstrated some longevity both in terms of the idea of close collaboration and in the specific naming of School-University Partnerships in policy and the literature since the 1990s. This calls for a need to "question those divisions or groupings with which we have become so familiar" (Foucault, 1972/2010,

p. 24). The under theorizing of teacher education noted by Burridge, Hooley & Neal (2016) supports the need for further investigation of School-University Partnerships as a widely promulgated "solution" to the "policy problem" of teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 2004). Bloomfield's (2009) caution above combined with the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (2014) report that argued that "close partnerships" are the "single most important" (p. v) aspect of improvements to teacher education support the critical nature of this research to teacher education in Australia.

I have laid out my argument in Chapter 2 that despite an abundance of scholarly literature on School-University Partnerships, much of the research is focussed on the benefits of partnerships or highlighting how to have successful partnerships. The problems in partnerships are often presented as issues that can be fixed through tinkering with the practical arrangements of the partnership. I argue in this thesis that this is problematic, and in the next chapter I show how I draw on the tools afforded by Foucault to engage in critique of School-University Partnerships. In my findings chapters, I show that the limited critique of School-University Partnerships is creating space for the proliferation of unhelpful discourses for the field of teacher education. I argue that the limited role of theory in research into partnerships contributes to their production as an "empty signifier".

Chapter 3

Foucault and School-University Partnerships

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the theoretical framework that has been used in this study to examine School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education. In this thesis I have drawn upon the work of Michel Foucault to interpret policy texts and data gathered through interviews. I have worked with ideas from Foucault's genealogical work (1975/1991, 1976/1998), to develop a "history of the present" (p.31) of School-University Partnerships with a focus on the central concepts of truth, power, subjectivity, and discourse. In the first part of this chapter I provide the background to my use of Foucault and then in 3.6-3.10 I explain the key concepts that have informed my analysis. In 3.11 I show how I have used these ideas in the development of this thesis.

3.2 Why Foucault?

While I was aware of Foucault's work from my undergraduate student days, I had not read his original works until the early stages of this study. At that point I was yet to precisely define my topic but I knew I was broadly interested in the preparation and ongoing professional learning of teachers. I wanted to explore ideas around what teachers need to know and be able to do. I had been involved in a School-University Partnership project and was familiar with some of the literature in this area but I had ruled it out as a PhD topic as it seemed that plenty had been said and there wasn't anything particularly interesting left to say. The focus of the literature I had read was on the benefits of partnerships and how they could be improved. Reading Foucault was a turning point as I realised his ideas provided an opportunity to ask different questions about School-University Partnerships than those that were being asked. Rather than start from the assumption that they were a good idea, I have undertaken a critique of what they are and what they are for. I have explored School-University Partnerships not as the result of linear progress in teacher education, an improvement on what came before, but rather treated them as arbitrary and contingent.

3.3 Introducing Foucault within the broader history of ideas

The work of Foucault has been notoriously difficult to classify. Foucault (1988) said, "I have never been a Freudian. I have never been a Marxist, and I have never been a structuralist" (p. 22 cited in Olssen, 2004 p. 454). He resisted labels and developed his own title when appointed to the College De France as the Chair in the History of Systems of Thought. His work was historical and philosophical in orientation and is best understood in the context of mid-late 20th Century France when he was writing. His influences were vast, though it is Nietzsche that is considered the most significant influence on his ideas (Mahon, 1992; Rosenberg & Westfall, 2018). His mentor and teacher Canguilhem has also been identified as influential (Schuerich & McKenzie, 2008).

Although Foucault has and had many critics, his vast erudition is widely acknowledged. He drew on a broad range of sources but also didn't directly acknowledge his sources in a traditional academic manner. In an interview about *Discipline and Punish* he said, "I often quote concepts, texts and phrases from Marx, but without feeling obliged to add the authenticating label of a footnote" (Foucault, 1975/1980, p. 52). Foucault was critical of Marx and in particular the project of Marxism, but he did draw on Marxist ideas in his work (Foucault, 1975/1980). Some scholars have argued that Marx's ideas were more central to his work than often thought (McDonald, 2002; Olssen, 2004). Foucault himself acknowledged that it was "impossible… to write history without using a whole range of concepts directly or indirectly linked to Marx's thought" (Foucault, 1975/1980, p. 53). For Foucault though, in simple terms, the focus for Marx was "the production relation" (Foucault, 1975/1980, p. 53), whereas his own project centred on the historical constitution of the subject.

Foucault was heavily influenced by the work of Nietzsche, with evidence of this influence from his early writing through to his final works (Rosenberg & Westfall, 2018). Foucault described Nietzsche as "the philosopher of power" (Foucault, 1975/1980, p. 53) and built his own ideas on power from Nietzsche's work. Nietzsche conceived of power as related to growth or improvement and self-overcoming with a focus on the psychological and existential and rarely used it in the sense of political power or power over others (Rosenberg & Westfall, 2018). Foucault was drawn to Nietzsche "who problematized truth as intimately entwined with relations of power" (Mahon, 1992, p. 2). Foucault also developed his method of genealogy from Nietzsche's ideas and discusses this most explicitly

in his essay, “Nietzsche, Genealogy History” (Foucault, 1984). Foucault was also influenced by Nietzsche’s critique of the “privilege of the subject” and drew upon Nietzsche’s genealogical critique that pointed to the contingent and “historical conditions of our existence” (Mahon, 1992, p. 2).

Foucault’s significant contribution to intellectual thought over the course of three decades in the late 20th Century provides a wealth of theoretical tools for the analysis of a problem. His work challenged traditional boundaries and ways of thinking in the social sciences. With such an extensive oeuvre it is difficult to identify the central themes or key points of interest in Foucault’s work. Foucault’s writing has been described as representing the “dawn of a new age” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 1). Some undoubtedly important themes were power and subjectivity. In his published books Foucault explored a range of topics such as “madness”, prisons and “sexuality”, problematizing the foundations of the ideas and institutions in these broad fields. Peters and Besley (2007) describe his later work in particular as to “emphasize and unpack the conceptual and historical relations between notions of truth, power and subjectivity” (p. 7). While Foucault’s work defies easy characterisation, in a broad sense his work is both historical and philosophical in nature. Foucault’s work “interrogates the conditions under which modern societies operate” (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1997, p. 287). Foucault attempted “to find a position of the human sciences from which to see the social world, and to see the human sciences as part of that social world” (Ball, 2012, p. 2). He asked new kinds of questions to “disturb tranquillity” (Sidhu, 2003).

Foucault’s work challenges any idea of “truth” or universals, and his historical work is characterised by the assumption that history is not linear, there is no “grand historical narrative”. It is a significant challenge to the traditional ideas that rest on the “supposed linear evolution of history” (Tamboukou, 1999, p. 203). While Foucault’s work is certainly “historical” in many ways, he eschews traditional forms of history. Foucault described his work as a “history of the present” (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 31). The aim of this work is not to attempt “writing a history of the past in terms of the present” (Foucault, 1975/1991, p.31). This means avoiding taking the pre-suppositions and “regimes of truth” of the current moment and using them to try to make sense of past events. Although Foucauldian genealogy explores past events and practices the focus is on an analysis of the present. Foucault’s work helps to show the “pervasiveness, dispersion, intricacy, contingency and

layering of our social practices" and that "any attempt to sum up what is going on is bound to be a potentially dangerous distortion" (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982, p. xxvi). At the centre of his writing are "very precise historical changes, and the ways in which these ideas have become normative or universal" (Ball, 1990, p.1).

Foucault's work does not offer methodological certainty (Tamboukou, 1999). Deleuze (1988) said that Foucault "deliberately refuses to give examples" (p.2). There is "no ready-made formula for analysing power in education" (Marshall, 1999, p. 25). Foucault "remains consciously, frustratingly elusive" and deliberately avoids any "general formulae" (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982, p. xxvi). This lack of certainty or a formula to follow can be a deterrent to some (O'Farrell, 2005). As Graham (2005) argues though, one can be confident that Foucault never intended that a fear of getting it wrong would paralyse scholars or put them off using his work.

For this research project, Foucault's ideas offer a way to investigate School-University Partnerships that asks critical questions and seeks to understand how the field of teacher education has arrived at the present moment where partnerships are prominent. As I show in Chapter 2, there is an abundance of literature on School-University Partnerships stretching over decades. In section 3.5 of this chapter I show that there has also been some rich engagement with theory in relation to School-University Partnerships. The way in which Foucault's ideas help show that things have not always been as they are and that they need not be the way they are made them suitable for this project and in particular, these research questions:

1. How have School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education been discursively constructed in policy and practice?
2. How are truth and knowledge produced in the discourses of School-University Partnerships?
3. What are the consequences for the subjectivity of teacher educators?

In the next section I narrow my focus to the uses of Foucault for research in education.

3.4 Foucault in Education

Foucault's extensive writing and his ideas presented through his lectures at the College de France have led to the international prominence of his work. It has been used in a wide variety of fields including cultural studies, sociology, anthropology, psychology, literary criticism and gender studies. Foucault's writing has been very influential in the humanities and social sciences (Prado, 1995). The uses of Foucault in the field of education are of greatest interest for this work and I highlight some of the uses of Foucault in education that have informed the development of the research approach used in this study, which I outline in detail across 3.6-3.11.

Foucault's work has been used widely in various fields of education. This work includes early examples such as Marshall's (1989, 1996) writing on schools as institutions and Walkerdine's (1984) critique of developmental discourses in early childhood education. Prominent examples of the use of Foucault in education include Brennan and Popkewitz's (1998), the writing of Ball (cf. 1990, 2013), Olssen (2003, 2016) and Peters and Besley (2007). This thesis has been informed by the uses of Foucault in a number of education research projects undertaken in the Australian context. I outline some key studies below.

The work of Graham (2005) was influential in the early stages of the research design for this study. Graham (2005) writes about bringing a "post-structural sensibility" to discourse analysis (p. 665). Graham (2005) explored discourses relating to "disordered behaviour" in school behaviour policies and argued that these discourses function with "constitutive effects" (p.10). Graham's (2005) study highlighted the way in which these discourses relating to behaviour produced subjectivities. While Graham (2005) also worked with some theoretical concepts from Foucault's earlier works (1972/2010) and Deleuze (1988) in her framing, her work demonstrated to me the possibilities of using Foucault to critique taken-for granted concepts in education, to "render the familiar strange" (p. 4). Graham's (2005) research was not about identifying whether particular discourses in relation to "disordered behaviour" were "true", but rather showing these discourses and their effects. I have drawn on Graham's (2005) ideas in framing my analysis of School-University Partnerships. This study has looked at how School-University Partnerships have been discursively produced and then looked the effects of these discourses. Within the Foucauldian framework for the study, "School-University Partnerships" are no more "true"

than “disordered behaviour” but in both cases the research identifies the ways in which their discursive production has effects.

Two other studies, Gormley (2018) and Bourke (2011), have drawn on Foucauldian notions of discourse to explore the subjectification effects of discourses in policy and practice. These have also informed the research approach used in this study. The discursive construction of “creativity” was the central topic in Gormley’s (2018) work, with an analysis of the effects on student and teacher subjectivities. Bourke (2011) also explored the subjectification effects of discourse in her study of professionalism. Bourke’s (2011) research approach used tools from Foucault’s “toolbox” and explored the concept “professionalism”, which like “creativity” is not neatly defined. Bourke (2011) found that the introduction of the Professional Standards for teachers reinforced deficit discourses around professionalism in ways that shaped the subjectivities of the teachers. Gormley (2018) identified the “malleability of the concept” of creativity as part of its productive power. These uses of Foucault have informed this research. I have shown the prominence of partnerships, made compulsory in initial teacher education through policy (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), 2015), and the ways that this has shaped the subjectivity of teachers and teacher educators.

Heffernan (2018) and Niesche (2011) in their respective research on principals were also influential to this study. Both Heffernan (2018) and Niesche (2011) used Foucault to critique discourses impacting on principals in order to understand the subjectification effects. While studies in educational leadership often focus on the qualities of good leaders or how to improve leadership, Heffernan (2018) and Niesche (2011) instead looked at the way the role of principal and the subjectivities of those in that role were being shaped by the discourses of leadership. In my final findings chapter (Chapter 7), I draw on these uses of Foucault to show how the discourses of School-University Partnerships shape the subjectivities of teachers and teacher educators.

The concept of “regime of truth” (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131) has been put to work in several important works. Gore’s (1993) study of critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth was an important resource for the way she drew on Foucault’s work to explore a problem identified in the present. Gore (1993) provided a critique of these particular discourses which were generally understood in positive terms and showed how their dominance was problematic and limiting. Bekerman and Zembylas (2017) put the

concept of regime of truth to work in relation to psychologized language in education. They explore how psychologized language has become dominant in education and schooling and argue that this regime of truth needs to be rendered strange or "denaturalized" (Bekerman & Zembylas, 2017). Discourses of "quality" in teacher education have also been described as contributing to contemporary regimes of truth (Hoyte et al, 2020). In this study I make use of the concept of regime of truth, detailed in section 3.9.2, and argue that School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth in initial teacher education (see Chapter 7).

3.5 Use of theory in research on School-University Partnerships

I have shown in Chapter 2 that there is a wide range of literature on School-University Partnerships over the past few decades. In this section, I explore some of the theoretically rich approaches that have been used in the study of School-University Partnerships. I highlight the uses of theory in research on partnerships.

There have also been a range of researchers who have taken a variety of theoretical lenses to the study of School-University Partnerships. Chan's (2016) study made use of Foucault in a critique of collaboration in a School-University Partnership based in Hong Kong. Chan's (2016) study focused on English language educators involved in a professional learning partnership and explored what she described as the 'politics of collaboration'. She explored the discourses of collaboration and the ways in which the educators in her study "enacted, negotiated and contested" (p. 3) these discourses within a School-University Partnership. Chan (2016) also drew on a Foucauldian understanding of discourse as an effect of power within a genealogical framing. Chan's (2016) work differs from most starkly from this study in that the method employed focused on one particular partnership.

An Australian study by Williams (2014a) offered a critique of School-University Partnerships, drawing on Marx and Freire in the theoretical framing. For Williams (2014a) the focus of her study was to understand "the possibilities and constraints for achieving social justice outcomes through educational partnerships" (p. 64). Williams (2014a) used a Marxist framing of capital and labor and framed partnerships as a "neoliberal logic" (p.223). The approach used by Williams (2014a), like Chan (2016) was a critique of partnerships but Williams (2014a) established partnerships as a tool of capitalism and set out to explore how/if there were "possibilities for counter hegemonic practices" (p. 223).

Third-space theory has also been used as a tool for theorizing School-University Partnerships and has been prominent for the past decade (Daza, Gudmundsdottir & Lund, 2021; Forgasz et al, 2017; Green et al, 2021; Martin, Snow & Franklin-Torrez, 2011; Zeichner, 2010: Zeichner, Payne & Brayko, 2015). Daza et al's (2021) scoping review found that while third space theory was continuing to grow in popularity, there was still considerable tension in relationships and also in the sustainability of partnerships. Daza et al's (2021) study also found that research framed around third space emphasized the need to assign all voices from schools, community and university "equal value" (p. 11). In this way the theoretical framing of third space in teacher education literature acknowledges the circulation of power but has a tendency to suggest that issues of power can be avoided or ignored by declaring the partnerships non-hierarchical. Zeichner (2021) argues that program exemplars have "levelled the hierarchies of power and knowledge" (p. 5). The approach taken in this thesis draws on a Foucauldian notion of power as potentially repressive and productive (described in detail in 3.7). Rather than try to create a framework for partnerships where there is "equal" power, this thesis assumes that "power is everywhere" (Foucault, 1976/1998, p. 93) and looks at the way in which the discourses of partnership are an instrument and effect of power (see Chapter 6).

There continues to be scholarly literature on School-University Partnerships that accepts them as "true", as objects in and of themselves rather than discursively produced and in need of a more fundamental questioning. Much of the literature highlighted in Chapter 2 continues to be more "tips and tricks" for how to make partnerships work rather than a more critical analysis of their existence. This study takes a neutral stance towards School-University Partnerships, not assuming they are inherently good or otherwise. It builds on the work of Chan (2016) and Williams (2014a) in constructing a theoretically informed critique of School-University Partnerships, yet it differs in the way these theoretical tools are utilized.

This work makes a contribution to theoretical understandings of School-University Partnerships in teacher education and it is also distinguished by the methodological approach outlined in Chapter 4, which draws on Foucauldian genealogy and constructs a history of the present of School-University Partnerships across policy and practice. This

study avoided a focus on one or even many *particular* partnerships but rather deliberately collected data that was not from one place and time or one project but sought breadth in experiences of School-University Partnerships. I outline the methodological approach in detail in Chapter 4.

In the following sections I outline the key concepts from Foucault that have been used to frame this study. In section 3.10 I show how I have drawn these concepts together and made use of them in this research. I have drawn on four key conceptual tools which I discuss below. Truth, power and subjectivity have been described as the three "genealogical axes" (Mahon, 1992, p. 1), and I outline my use of a genealogical methodology in Chapter 4. This study also makes use of a Foucauldian conceptualisation of discourse. In the following sections I provide a more detailed explanation for the key concepts I have used to frame this study.

3.6 Foucault and Truth

Like many others classified under the umbrella term "poststructuralist", Foucault regarded truth as arbitrary and contingent. Foucault identifies what is 'truth' as determined by power/knowledge and as historically and culturally specific. For Foucault, "truth isn't outside power, or lacking in power" but rather truth "is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint" (1977/1980b, p. 131). In this study I explore the production of "truth" in the discourses of School-University Partnerships and in Chapter 5 I identify the ways in which policies contribute to this production. In Chapter 6 I further identify the particular ways in which "truth" is produced in the discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education.

Foucault argues that the problem for the scholar is "ascertaining the possibility of constituting a new politics of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 133). This research explores how the circulation of power in the discourses of School-University Partnerships produces particular truths. This research highlights the way in which these discourses, particularly in initial teacher education, produce a "truth" about learning to teach. Foucault developed a particular concept in relation to truth which he described as a "regime of truth" and which I discuss below.

3.6.1 Regime of truth

This research utilises the Foucauldian notion of "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131) as a conceptual tool for analysis. Foucault takes the notion of truth as contingent and produced, rather than pre-existing and waiting to be discovered, and describes the idea below:

> Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131).

O'Farrell (2005) says that genealogy "examines the constraints, the 'regimes of truth' that underlie the historically variable divisions between the true and the false in knowledge and culture" (p. 72). "Regimes of truth" have also been described as "those fields of knowledge that maintain power within a society" (Smith, 2010, p. 193). The notion of "regimes of truth" is about recognizing the productive power involved in dominant ideas that are repeated to the point of excluding other possibilities. Foucault and others of a "poststructural sensibility" (Graham, 2011, p. 665) problematize the notion of "truth". Foucault was very interested in the construction of "truths" and the "struggles" between power/knowledge and "truth" (1975/1991, p. 28). In his genealogy of prisons Foucault painstakingly details how ideas about crime and punishment have shifted historically, with the focus moving from the body with crimes punished by public execution to what is generally seen as the more "humane" approaches of prisons and questions this as an "advance" (Foucault, 1975/1991). "Truths" around criminals and crime shifted from the body to the soul and "intent" became important in a way that was not a key question in past responses to crime (Foucault, 1975/1991).

Foucault's work reveals the operation of different "regimes of truth" that are dominant in particular times and places, not in order to find "hidden truths" but to "understand how norms are established within discourse, and how discourse creates a normative context for possible thought and action, which then becomes legitimised as truth" (Olssen, 2006, p. 137 in Hall & Noyes, 2009, p. 851). Foucault's work has had the effect of historicising "truth" (Peters, 2003, p. 208). In his work on the History of Sexuality,

Foucault (1976/1991) shows that shifts in the 20th Century that tend to be understood by many as an opening up of restrictions around sex really involved more ways in which sex and sexual behaviour was categorised and controlled. Foucault argues that the idea that sexual behaviours are a central part of an individual and constitute their sexuality was a new idea that was not liberating but offered more opportunities for control and connected sexual behaviour with the psychiatric industry which he had previously critiqued in Madness and Civilisation (Foucault, 1976).

The concept of "regime of truth" has been put to work in many fields. A notable early education example is Gore's (1993) study that explored how "self-proclaimed emancipatory discourses" like those of critical and feminist pedagogies, "can have dominating effects" (p. xii). These dominating effects occur when there is "a totalising group of truth claims that occlude other ideas and make them unthinkable" (Bartholomaeus, 2016, p. 914). The dominating effect is a result of "the consistency in which an idea is forwarded and the emphasis placed on it by those in power that elevate and incite participants to endorse it (Foucault, 1980)" (Smith, 2010, p. 200). These studies have identified the need for critique where ideas have become entrenched and accepted, normalised to the point where they are not being scrutinised. As Foucault (1983) argued, "everything is dangerous", and ideas that have become difficult to critique are the result of the productive effects of power. In Chapter 6 I have put the concept of regime of truth to work in relation to School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education.

In other more recent scholarly applications, regimes of truth have been analysed for their impact on developmental discourses in childhood (Bartholomaeus, 2016). Drawing on earlier work in this area by Walkerdine (1984), it has been argued that developmental discourses operate as a regime of truth that "produce children in particular ways" and impact on the way research with children is and can be done (Bartholomaeus, 2016, p. 914). In another Australian study, Hunkin (2018) used genealogy in her work to explore the discourse of "quality" in early childhood education as a "regime of truth". Hunkin's (2018) work shows the range of possibilities for operationalising the notion of "regime of truth" in order to better understand the present.

Bartholomaeus (2016) conducted interviews with children around gender and was interested in the way that developmental discourses operated as a "regime of truth" to constrain the methods for the research based on assumptions of children at different ages.

Hunkin (2018) conducted analysis of early childhood education policy and also interviewed people working in a range of roles connected with the early childhood sector. Her research, like that of Gore's (1993) work on critical and feminist pedagogies, wasn't about critiquing the idea or concept of quality necessarily but rather critiquing the effects of its dominance and the lack of critique that is happening. Hunkin (2018) explores the underlying assumptions in the discourse of "quality" and how the way in which the power of the concept is in how it "masks a substantial part of itself" and that "its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms" (Foucault, 1976, p. 86). School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education have something in common with the foci of these studies in that the problem identified is not in the notion itself but in the effects of its ubiquity, how it functions as a regime of truth. I have shown in Chapter 7 the effects of School-University Partnerships circulating as a regime of truth in initial teacher education.

3.7 Foucault and Power

> Power produces; it produces reality. It produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. (Foucault, 1979, p. 194)

Scheurich and McKenzie (2008) argue that "Foucault's greatest contribution to intellectual thought has been his reconceptualization of power" (p. 334-335). While power has been a persistent theme in Foucault's work, the way in which he has used and understood the concept of power has shifted over time (Garland, 2014; O'Farrell, 2005). Scheurich and McKenzie (2008) also argue "one of Foucault's favourite genealogical manoeuvres is to focus not just on the negative or repressive effects of power but also on the positive or productive effects of power" (p. 331). Foucault's later conceptualisations of power as productive and constitutive, rather than repressive (Lynch, 2013) inform this research. In one of his lectures he states, "the question 'What is power' is obviously a theoretical question that would provide the answer to everything, which is just what I don't want to do" (Foucault, 1973, p. 13). This statement is indicative of Foucault's view that the search for universals or a grand theory of everything was futile and in fact, "part of the problem" (Rabinow, 1984, p. 13). While Foucault doesn't provide a straightforward definition of "power", his conceptualisation of power can be studied through his work and applied analogously to the issue at hand (O' Farrell, 2005).

In a 1976 lecture Foucault discusses power saying,

> there can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth. (Foucault, 1980, p. 93)

He goes on to argue that "power must be analysed as something which circulates" and "only functions in the form of a chain" (Foucault, 1980, p. 98). He says that individuals are "always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power" (Foucault, 1980, p. 98). Foucault challenges traditional notions of power by arguing this simultaneous dual use and experience of power. Foucault's linking of power to the production of "truth" is useful in exploring teacher education. The production of "truth" in and through School-University Partnerships can be understood as an instrument and an effect of power. I show in Chapter 6 how School-University Partnerships are produced as a regime of truth. In Chapter 7 I explore the role of the discourses of the real and experience produced by the circulation of power in initial teacher education.

Crowley (2009) describes the Foucauldian notion of power below:

> Power is not an institution, a structure, a strength people are endowed with, something that can be held or transmitted. Power is not simply imposed in a repressive way from the top of a visibly demarcated social hierarchy, through the state or major dominations (for example religious authorities, dictators and so on) in society. Power works from diverse places and at different levels, working in and through space, among individuals, families, social groups, in institutions, simultaneously constraining and enabling. Power is incessant, constant, and wholly relational. (p. 345)

The notion of power has been explored in this study of School-University Partnerships. Foucault's link between power and knowledge has also informed the analysis in this study as the validation of particular knowledge and "truths" through the discourses of School-University Partnerships have been discussed in Chapter 7.

3.7.1 The relationship between power and knowledge

In describing the relationship between power and knowledge Foucault says, "we should admit rather that power produces knowledge… that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge" (1975/1991, p. 27). For

Foucault, power and knowledge are intertwined and therefore what he refers to as "power-knowledge relations" need to be analysed in a particular way (1975/1991, p. 27). He argues that we shouldn't be studying a "subject of knowledge" and the way they operate in relation to the power system but "power-knowledge", which means investigating the "processes and struggles" that determine the possible "domains of knowledge" (1975/1991, p. 28).

A more traditional view of power might look for who has the power in School-University Partnerships, with an assumption that some individuals or institutions hold power while others do not. Using Foucault's notion of power this study assumes that power is at work in School-University Partnerships but not necessarily in a top-down way and that it can be a factor that both constrains and enables the work of teacher education. This conception of power-knowledge described above and by Foucault in *Discipline and Punish* can be understood in connection with this project. It is not investigating who knows what about School-University Partnerships and how can we know more but rather how School-University Partnerships have come to exist as a domain of knowledge. In Chapter 7 I show in my findings that power is circulating in the production of discourses of the real and experience as the "truth" of learning to teach.

Using *Discipline and Punish* as an exemplar for possible areas of work for the genealogist, Schuerich and McKenzie (2008) highlight Foucault's interest in understanding punitive methods in a particular way. Rather than see punitive methods, in this example, as a consequence of legislation or social structures as social scientists and critical theorists typically would have, Foucault explores punitive methods as "techniques possessing their own specificity in the more general field of other ways of exercising power" (1975/1991, p. 23). Governmental actions or processes, like "punitive methods", "are ways that power multiplies" and can be understood as a "practice of power" (Scheurich & McKenzie, 2008, p. 311). Foucault also argues that "penal leniency" can be understood as a "technique of power" (1975/1991, p. 24). Drawing on these notions of power, School-University Partnerships can be understood as just as oppressive of teacher educators than other more seemingly blatant examples of top-down direction such as compulsory days of professional experience for pre-service teachers or mandated Literacy and Numeracy testing in the form of LANTITE (Literacy and Numeracy Test for Initial Teacher Education students). In Chapter 6 and 7 I demonstrate how the discourses of School-University Partnerships, with their "empty signifier" status, saturate the field of teacher education in ways that limit the

possibility of critique or the capacity to think outside of partnerships. I show how this "empty signifier" status as well as the production of School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education are a productive effect of power.

The way in which Foucault conceptualises power provides a useful point of interrogation in order to problematize the broadly accepted practices of School-University Partnerships. Central to his understanding of power is that it is everywhere and that it is not something which a person has but rather is "exercised" (Sidhu, 2003, p. 39). Foucault acknowledges the existence of "top-down" power but "rejects notions of its all-encompassing effects" (Sidhu, 2003, p. 39). This creates space for resistance and helps people to see that they "are much freer than they feel" (Foucault, 1982/1988, p. 10). I argue in Chapter 9 in my conclusion that it is critique of partnerships that will create spaces of freedom.

3.8 Foucault and Subjectivity

An important aspect of Foucault's contribution was his writing on subjectivity. Foucault (1982) argued that his aim has been, "to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects" (p. 777). Foucault focused on problematizing the idea of a "rational, logical, continuous trajectory" in history as well as critiquing the human subject or subjectivity and described these as "two sides of the same system of thought" (Foucault, 1972/2010, p. 12). The subject for Foucault, is not another word for person, it is about "the possibility of being a certain kind of person" and this is a "contingent historical possibility" (Heyes, 2010, p. 159). For Foucault, particularly in his genealogical works *Discipline and Punish* (1975/1991) and History of Sexuality (1976/1998), he sees a system of power which "creates our possibilities and constrains our existence" (Heyes, 2010, p. 159).

This study included a range of participants in School-University Partnerships occupying different professional roles within different institutions including schools, universities, and school systems such as government departments. In Chapter 8 I show the way in which the discourses of School-University Partnerships subjectify participants, producing "teacher" and "teacher educator" as distinctive subject positions.

This thesis investigates the role of the discourses of School-University Partnerships in the formation of subjects in teacher education whereby distinctions are made between

teachers/teacher educators. What Foucault calls “dividing practices” are an important tool for objectification of the subject such as “mad/sane” and “sick/healthy” (Besley, 2007, p. 1443). Central to the notion of School-University Partnerships in policy and scholarly literature is that they appear to be about bringing institutions and people together. The use of the theory of third space in writing about partnerships discusses blurring the boundaries of the roles and institutions in order to value the input of all partners in teacher education (Daza et al, 2021; Zeichner, Payne & Brayko, 2015). The emphasis in partnerships is about coming together and reducing distance and difference. This research has utilised Foucauldian notions of subjectivity to explore the ways in which School-University Partnerships, while aspiring to bring people together and blur boundaries, play a role as a dividing practice in producing teacher/teacher educator. The points of demarcation particularly for teachers and teacher educators are clear and School-University Partnerships subjectify participants in ways which reinforce these roles. In Chapter 8 I draw on my interview data to show this.

The connection between subjectivity and knowledge production is important to this study of School-University Partnerships. Scott (1991) described the link between subjectivity and knowledge below:

> it is not individuals who have experience, but subjects who are constituted through experience. Experience in this definition then becomes not the origin of our explanation, not the authoritative (because seen or felt) evidence that grounds what is known, but rather that which we seek to explain, that about which knowledge is produced. (p. 779-780)

This applies to both the constitution of subjects within School-University Partnerships, but also the constitution of subjects through research into School-University Partnerships. The bulk of research on School-University Partnerships involves teacher educators researching their own practice as a result of some material support for partnerships through time and money (cf Grima-Farrell, 2015; Young, 2020). This leads to the availability of certain subject positions for researchers of School-University Partnerships. I show in Chapter 7 and 8 how this has led to reinforcement of partnerships as there is little room for critical reflection when this is the context in which the research occurs.

Subjectivity is central to many of Foucault’s published works including his earlier archaeological studies. His exploration of “madness” and psychiatry critiqued the notion of

this thing called “madness” and instead showed how the emergent field of psychiatry had created the “madman(sic)” as a possible subject position (Foucault, 1961/2005). This same critique was central to his work on prisons, whereby the “criminal” is identified not as a pre-existing category but as a subject position. Foucault said that “to get rid of the subject itself” whereby the analysis “can account for the constitution of the subject within a historical framework” is what he refers to as genealogy (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 117). Scheurich and Mackenzie (2008) argue for the centrality of subjectivity to Foucault’s work. I have drawn on Foucauldian notions of subjectivity in the analysis of policy documents and interviews in this study. As part of this genealogical study I have shown in Chapter 8 how participants in School-University Partnerships are formed as subjects.

3.9 Foucault and Discourse

The concept of discourse is also central to the work of Foucault. For Foucault (1972/2010), discourses are “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (p. 49). Foucault said that discourses “do not identify objects, they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention” (Foucault, 1974, p. 49 in Ball, 2013). Bacchi & Goodwin (2016) state that “following Foucault, discourses are understood as socially produced forms of knowledge that set limits upon what it is possible to think, write or speak about” (p. 35). Ball (2013) argues for the importance of discourse to Foucault’s work because for Foucault “discourses constrain the possibility of thought. They order and combine words in particular ways and exclude or displace other combinations” (p. 2).

In arguably Foucault’s most well-known genealogical work, *The History of Sexuality* (1976/1998), he argues that “it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together” (p. 100). Foucault (1976/1998) describes how discourse can be “both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy” (p. 101). In this study I investigate the discourses of School-University Partnerships as an instrument and effect of power. I show how School-University Partnerships are discursively constructed as everything and nothing in Chapter 6 as well as how they are circulating as a regime of truth in initial teacher education in Chapter 7.

Hall (1992/1996) described a Foucauldian framing of discourses as:

> ways of talking, thinking, or representing a particular subject or topic. They produce meaningful knowledge about that subject. This knowledge influences social practices, and so has real consequences and effects. (Hall, p. 89)

Thomson et al (2013) articulate a Foucauldian notion of discourse, not just "as talk, or talk and text", "*but also* as ways of thinking and sense-making *and* as behaviours, relationships, interactions and arrangements of signs and material objects" (p. 157). This thesis works from an understanding of discourse that includes both language and practice (Bacchi & Bonham, 2014; Hall, 2001; Muller, 2008). Foucault also linked power with "discourses of truth" (1980, p. 93). In this study I use a Foucauldian notion of discourse to investigate School-University Partnerships. In Chapter 7 I show how the circulation of power in the discourses of partnership produces School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education. The importance of the interrelationship between the concepts of power and discourse was noted by Weatherall et al (2003), who argued that "to understand discourse we have to see it as intermeshed with power/knowledge where knowledge both constitutes and is constituted through discourse as an effect of power" (p. 275).

Foucauldian notions of discourse have been widely used in education research. Hunkin (2018) explored the truth assumptions underpinning the deficit discourse around "quality" in early childhood education and care. Hunkin (2018) challenges the notion of "quality" and explores the discursive construction of "quality" in early childhood education and care in policy and practice. Bourke (2011) used a similar research approach in her study of 'professionalism' as discursively constructed. Both "quality" and "professionalism" are hard to argue with and like "partnerships" are ambiguous and have had shifting meaning over time. There are parallels in the way in which these two studies have been conducted and the approach used in this thesis, particularly the analysis of policy in Chapter 5 where I draw on Bacchi and Goodwin's (2016) work in order to explore the assumed problems in teacher education that policies are set up to "solve"

This study sees the discourses of School-University Partnerships not as the naming of something "naturally" occurring but as a result of the circulation of power in teacher education with constitutive effects. I show in Chapter 5 how School-University Partnerships are discursively produced in policy and in Chapter 6 and 7 I highlight the discourses evident in practice. The effects of these discourses are explored in Chapter 8.

3.10 The use of these central concepts

These key concepts of truth, power, subjectivity, and discourse have been used to help answer my research questions. These concepts are important to Foucault's genealogical method, which I detail in section 4.3 of Chapter 4. I have drawn on these key concepts to develop an understanding of the present with regard to School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education. Foucault himself made use of these concepts to great effect, particularly in his studies of prisons and sexuality.

These central concepts are interconnected, and I draw on Ball (1993), Bacchi (2000, 2012) and Bacchi and Goodwin's (2016) work which frames policy *as* discourse. In my analysis of policies in Chapter 5 I explore the ways in which they "exercise power through a *production* of "truth" and 'knowledge" (Ball, 1993, p. 14, *emphasis in original*). I also explore the ways in which subjects are produced in policy and identify this as an effect of the discourses. Bacchi & Goodwin (2016) argue that there are three "kinds" of interconnected effects to consider in their process for policy analysis and this includes discursive effects, subjectification effects and lived effects.

In my analysis of interview data in Chapter 6, 7 and 8 I draw on these central concepts in a range of ways. I identify the discourses of School-University Partnerships, enabled by the circulation of power. I show how within initial teacher education, School-University Partnerships are being discursively produced as a regime of truth. In Chapter 8 I highlight the effects of these discourses on the subjectivities of teachers and teacher educators.

These concepts are critical to understanding the ways in which the discourses of School-University Partnerships form participants in particular ways, with particular subjectivities and how power and regimes of truth are central to understanding the effects of partnerships. I have shown in Chapter 2 that School-University Partnerships remain relatively unquestioned in the scholarly literature and this thesis has explored the way that power operates within and around School-University Partnerships.

I have also drawn on the work of Niesche (2011) and Heffernan (2017) who have used Foucault to explore the impact of particular discourses, those of educational leadership and school improvement respectively, on the subjectivities of school leaders. The framing of these studies, with their emphasis on Foucauldian conceptions of power, discourse and subjectivity have informed my use of these concepts. Niesche (2011) and

Heffernan (2017) look at prominent discourses and how they produce particular school leaders. Both Niesche (2011) and Heffernan (2017) also look at the way power circulates in discourses that impact on the work of principals in Australian schools.

I have drawn on the concept of discourse as a deductive category for analysis with my interview data and used this to frame my analysis in Chapter 6. In Chapter 6 and 7 I also present my findings in relation to the discourses of partnerships and show the distinctive production of partnerships in initial teacher education. In Chapter 8 I focus on the central discourses of partnership in initial teacher education and explore the circulation of power and the way in which partnerships in initial teacher education subjectify participants. Further details of the methodological approach utilised in this study are contained in Chapter 4.

3.11 Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented the theoretical framework used in this study. I have identified the key concepts that I have drawn on in my analysis, particularly evident across my findings chapters 5-8. I have drawn on these ideas because what Foucault offers is, "a devastating critique of the subtle and complex power relations that pervade educational institutions, which shape our identity, and which make us governable by masking the reality that our identities are being constituted" (Marshall, 1996, p. 216).

This thesis uses these concepts in order to provide an analysis of the ways in which School-University Partnerships are discursively produced and their subjectifying effects. Foucault's ideas have been used to elucidate how School-University Partnerships have come to be accepted as the solution to the "problem" of teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 2004). I explore how the subjectivities of teachers and teacher education academics have been shaped by the circulation of power in School-University Partnerships. This analysis is critical to the consideration of alternatives and ensuring that the field of teacher education is not limited by this regime of truth. As Foucault (1982/1988) says,

> All my analyses are directed against the idea of universal necessities in human existence. They show the arbitrariness of institutions and show which space of freedom we can still enjoy and how changes can still be made. (p. 11).

School-University Partnerships are not a natural progression from our previous, less helpful practices. They are not "innovations" and they are not the only way to think about

or go about teacher education. The analysis I provide in my findings chapters demonstrates this space of freedom which Foucault spoke of and seeks to problematize the limits imposed by School-University Partnerships.

Chapter 4

A Genealogical Methodology

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter I present the methodology for this research. The methodology has been informed by the findings from my review of the literature in Chapter 2, and the Foucauldian theoretical framing outlined in Chapter 3. In this chapter I begin by situating this study within a poststructural research paradigm and outline the conceptualisation of qualitative research and methodology that has formed the basis for this study. I then describe the genealogical framework that I have used and show how this approach has created the space to answer my research questions. Thirdly, I outline the methods used for gathering data, including policy document analysis and interviews. I highlight the methods of selection and analysis for the policies and the methods of selection and analysis for the interviews. I conclude the chapter by outlining my position as researcher and the ethical considerations for this study.

4.2 Research Paradigm

This research is a qualitative project conducted within a poststructural research paradigm. Poststructuralism is a contested idea but theorists "reject the idea of universal truth and objective knowledge, asserting that truths are always partial, and knowledge always 'situated'- in other words produced by and for particular interests, in particular circumstances, at particular times" (MacLure, 2013, p. 167). Also central to a poststructuralist approach is to "insist the realities we live are contingent, open to challenge and change" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, p. 4). The poststructuralist research paradigm for this study seeks to "think of a science that is accountable to complexity and multiplicity" (Lather, 2012, p. 1024) where the idea that any research can be "objective", quantitative or otherwise is highly contested (Fontana & Frey, 2008).

Lather (2012) uses this quote from Namenwirth (1986) to illustrate a key point about the "science" of educational research, "Scientists firmly believe that as long as they are not conscious of any bias or political agenda, they are neutral and objective, when in fact they are only unconscious" (p. 106). This research has been conducted in a manner which is conscious of the researcher's position and acknowledges that the data is "thoroughly

contaminated" (Ellingsdon, 1986 in Pillow, 2003, *emphasis original*). That is, I concur with St. Pierre (2013) that data can't "speak for itself" and Popkewitz' (2004) assertion that "there is no data without theory" (p. 72). In other words, I do not claim to be a neutral or objective observer and my reading of the data is informed by my theoretical position.

Foucault has been described as one of poststructuralism's "most important thinkers" (Williams, 2014b, p. 1). In the next section I outline how I have worked within this poststructural research paradigm, using Foucault's genealogical approach.

4.3 Genealogical approach

This study uses Foucault's genealogical approach as the methodology. Foucauldian genealogy is not easily defined and in keeping with his general approach, he did not provide step-by-step instructions. Foucauldian genealogy is a form of history, but it doesn't assume a linear path. This approach begins with a problem in the present and explores the ways in which that present came to be, with the assumption that the way things are is historically contingent, and not the way things have to be. Genealogy explores the relationship between knowledge and power and the constitution of the subject and it also explores the production of truth. A genealogical approach is not used to evaluate aspects of society but to make possible an analysis by understanding that the way things are is not inevitable. In this thesis, a genealogical approach is used to make possible an analysis of the ways in which School-University Partnerships are produced as well as how they contribute to the production of truth and knowledge in teacher education. In sections 4.3.1-4.3.5 I outline the central aspects of genealogy and then in 4.3.6 I explain how I make use of genealogy for this study. In sections 4.3.6 and 4.3.7 I provide the methodological rationale that underpins the methods used in this research.

4.3.1 What is genealogy?

Genealogy is best understood as "a narrative describing how a certain belief, concept, value, or practice came about or might be imagined to have come about" (Lorenzini, 2020, p. 1). Foucault's genealogical approach is about "emphasising the historically contingent origins of concepts and practices" (Lorenzini, 2020, p.3). Tamboukou (1999) described Foucault's genealogy as "his reflection on the nature and development of modern power" and went on to say that it "is concerned with the processes, procedures and apparatuses by which truth and knowledge are produced" (p. 202).

Foucault (1984) described his genealogical approach as “gray, meticulous, and patiently documentary” and as work that “requires patience and a knowledge of details” (p. 76). Foucault said it was an error to assume “that words had kept their meaning” (Foucault, 1984, p. 76). He described genealogy as recording events but that “it must be sensitive to their recurrence, not in order to trace the gradual curve of their evolution, but to isolate the different scenes where they engaged in different roles” (Foucault, 1984, p. 76). Genealogy draws on history but is significantly different from traditional approaches to history.

4.3.2 A historical approach

Genealogy can be understood as a particular historical approach. A genealogical approach has been described as a history of the present, and “begins by identifying a present-day practice that is both taken for granted and yet, in certain respects, problematic” (Garland, 2014, p. 373). This “history of the present” or “effective history” involves “a more strategic use of history which is willing to shorten its vision to those things nearest to it” (Hook, 2005, p. 23). Foucault’s genealogical approach has also been “critical history” (McLachlan, 2016) and as “radical historicism” (Bevir, 2008) in order to identify genealogy as containing elements of history whilst also resisting history.

Foucault’s work “requires us to resist conventional views of history as the logical and orderly fine-tuning of a problem via successive policy iterations” (Rowan & Shore, 2009, p. 59). Foucault had a critical focus “on modernity’s teleological assumption that history moves upward or forward from some origin” (Scheurich & McKenzie, 2008, p. 326). Foucault said that genealogy “does not oppose itself to history” but it does “oppose itself to the search for ‘origins’” (Foucault, 1984, p. 77). Foucault argues that a search for origins is a search for the “essence of things” which suggests a search for “that which was already there” whereas the genealogist finds that things “have no essence or that their essence was fabricated in a piecemeal form” (Foucault, 1984, p. 78).

A genealogical approach begins with a problem in the present and then asks critical questions such as: “What is happening now? What is this present of ours? How have we become what we are and what are the possibilities of becoming “other”?” (Tamboukou, 1999, p. 215). Foucault’s method is not a search for origins or the creation of a linear narrative over time but a critique that denaturalises the present in order to understand it is just as strange as the past (Foucault, 1984, p. 77). The strength of genealogy rests on “an

analysis formed in the present of the present" (Garland, 2014, p. 378-379). The analysis of the problem is in the present, but then genealogy looks to the past in order to understand the present, so that the possibilities of doing something different are visible. It is this focus on the present as historically contingent that is central to a genealogical approach.

McLachlan (2016) describes genealogy as taking "a problem in the present and working backwards to understand how things came to be the way they are" (p. 474). The aim of such genealogical inquiry is to open up the possibility for changing the present "by grasping (more fully) what it is" (McLachlan, 2016, p. 474). Foucault's genealogy provides tools for this critical questioning to enable a better understanding of the "contingency and contestability" (Bevir, 2008, p. 263) of the present. Foucault's genealogical studies demonstrate that the present is just as strange as the past (Foucault, 1976/ 1998, Foucault, 1975/1991).

4.3.3 Foucault's genealogical work

Foucault describes what he wanted to do in the second volume of his genealogical study of "sexuality" thus, "to stand detached from it, bracketing its familiarity, in order to analyse the theoretical and practical context with which it has been associated" (1985/1990, p. 3). He takes an idea which has grown in prominence and come to be accepted as "truth", "sexuality" and rather than construct a history of this thing, "sexuality", his is a history of the concept, the idea itself. How did we come to understand a particular collection of practices as this thing called "sexuality"? When did participating in a set of particular practices become a critical part of a person, central to their place in the world? Foucault points out the emergence of the term itself at the beginning of the nineteenth century but argues that this "should be neither underestimated nor over-interpreted" (Foucault, 1985/1990, p. 3). The emergence of the term "sexuality" at this particular historical point "does not mark the sudden emergence of that to which "sexuality" refers" (Foucault, 1985/1990, p. 3).

Foucault's genealogical work, particularly on sexuality, explored "changes in the way individuals were led to assign meaning and value to their conduct" (Foucault, 1985/1990, p. 4). Foucault was interested in a "history of the experience of sexuality" which included an exploration of "fields of knowledge, types of normativity, and forms of subjectivity" (Foucault, 1985/1990, p. 4). Foucault's (1985/1990) work provided a radical re-examination

of sexuality that questioned how we had arrived at the point where sexuality was accepted and understood in particular ways. He provided evidence that "sexuality" wasn't true or false, but that it had been produced in particular ways with particular effects. Foucault (1985/1990) showed the ways in which truth and knowledge were being produced in and through the concept of sexuality and the ways in which this led to the formation of subjects.

4.3.4 Exploring knowledge, power and the subject through genealogy

A number of concepts that Foucault used are central to genealogy, including knowledge, power and subjectivity. Crowley (2009) describes genealogy below:

> Genealogy is a historical perspective and investigative method, which offers an intrinsic critique of the present. It provides people with the critical skills for analysing and uncovering the relationship between knowledge, power and the human subject in modern society and the conceptual tools to understand how their being has been shaped by historical forces. (p. 2).

This description highlights genealogy as a methodological approach that draws these concepts together within a historical approach.

A critical aspect of genealogy is that it is a form of analysis "which can account for the constitution of the subject within a historical framework" and that it is "a form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledges, discourses, domains of objects" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 117). This research uses a genealogical approach in order to understand how the discourses of School-University Partnerships are constituted and how subjects are constituted within partnerships in the present.

Importantly, genealogies "are usually histories of present subjectivities, for their critical impact depends on people still being immersed in the beliefs and practices that they denaturalize" (Bevir, 2008, p. 272). Genealogies look to the past in order to develop an understanding of the present, to put current beliefs and practices under scrutiny. This description underscores the relevance of genealogy as a framework for this study as the discourses of School-University Partnerships are prominent in policy and practice, constraining and enabling subjectivities in the field of teacher education.

Genealogy involves a detailed investigation into a problem in the present and "provides a forum for decentring what we think we know and for tracing how we come to know it" (Pillow, 2003, p. 149). Foucault's notion of power is central to the genealogical

approach as what we "know" is "always embedded in power relations" (Pillow, 2003, p. 149). Foucault (1977/1980c) has described a "purely negative conception of power… as inadequate" (p. 184). Gordon (1980) describes genealogy as drawn to understanding the "positive, productive characteristics" of power where the goal is not to form judgement on the "features of our society produced by such forms of power, but to render possible an analysis of the process of production itself" (p. 237). This is critical to Foucault's genealogical approach and is central to this thesis which seeks to show the ways in which School-University Partnerships are produced and to provide an analysis of the ways this contributes to the production of truth and knowledge in teacher education in Australia.

For Foucault, power is productive and "produced from one moment to the next…power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere" (Foucault, 1976/1998, p. 93). This is distinct from "a common representation of power" (Foucault, 1976/1998, p. 83) as something held only by the "powerful". Foucault argues that power is "always-already present, constituting that very thing which one attempts to counter it with" (Foucault, 1976/1998, p. 82). He also argues that his aim was "to move less toward a theory of power than towards an analytics of power" and that this was only possible if the analysis does not rely on "common representations of power" (Foucault, 1976/1998, p. 82-83). This thesis has drawn on a Foucauldian conception of power, particularly how by exploring the inextricable link between truth and power (Gore, Ladwig & King, 2004).

Foucault has said, "there can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980a, p. 93). Foucault went on to argue that "power must be analysed as something which circulates" and "only functions in the form of a chain" (Foucault, 1980, p. 98). He says that individuals are "always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power" (Foucault, 1980, p. 98). Foucault's linking of power to the production of "truth" is important for this exploration of teacher education. The contribution of policy and of the interview participants in School-University Partnerships to the production of "truth" has been examined to illuminate the power relations in operation.

Scheurich and McKenzie (2008), in their analysis of Foucault's methodologies, note an important rule for the genealogist is to look at social acts or policies "not simply as consequences of legislation or as indicators of social structures, but as techniques possessing their own specificity in the more general field of other ways of exercising power" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 23). Scheurich and McKenzie (2008) argue that the genealogist ought to look at educational reforms "as a practice of power that has emerged and circulates more broadly in society as a practice of power" (p. 332). This approach has been used in this study to investigate the practices of power in School-University Partnerships as one feature of teacher education reform in the past few decades.

4.3.5 Putting a genealogical approach to work

The aim of genealogy was described by Hook (2005) as being to "produce counter-intuitive ways of seeing, to enforce an awareness that things have not always been as they are" (p. 7) and to analyse the object of investigation, in this case School-University Partnerships, "according to the multiple and complex processes that constitute it" (p. 13). Foucault was notably reticent to declare a method (Luke, 1997; O'Farrell, 2005). He said that his work was "an experiment much more than a system. No recipe, hardly any general method" (Foucault, 1983, p. 414 cited in O'Farrell, 2005, p. 52). However, as is evident in his prolific writing, his work involved extensive "documentation, research, verification" (Foucault, 1983, p. 414 cited in O'Farrell, 2005, p. 52). For Foucault, this lack of a step-by step method was deliberate as he was against the idea of any sort of "grand theory of everything" and saw attempts to "lay down the law for each and every science" as the "project of positivism" (Foucault, 1976/1980, p. 65). As a result of this, the use of Foucault's work is generally, "the transfer, via a process of analogy, of his concrete ideas about specific historical situations to other situations" (O'Farrell, 2005, p. 53). I have made use of Foucault's work in this way as well as drawing on the notions of "thinking with theory" (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) and "plugging in" (St. Pierre, 2013) to Foucault. Foucault's genealogical work has informed the way in which I have selected and analysed the policy documents and the way in which I have designed and conducted my interviews.

Working with the notion of a "history of the present" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 31), this research has identified School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education as the present circumstance to be investigated. This area was identified as a result of "a

certain puzzlement or discomfiture about practices or institutions that others take for granted" (Garland, 2014, p. 379). In order to investigate this topic I have conducted policy analysis and undertaken individual interviews with a view to better understanding the present and opening up a "different catalogue of possibilities" (Green, 2003, p. 2; Tamboukou, 1999). In order to conduct an "effective history" of School-University Partnerships I sought a wide range of participants who have been involved in partnerships in their professional lives in the broad field of teacher education.

Teacher education as a practice and as a scholarly field is often guilty of the assumption that new ideas are drawing us ever closer to solving problems when in fact we are often returning to previous ideas and practices which have been "rebranded" as "innovative", what Vick (2006) describes as "historical amnesia" (p. 182). In my findings chapters 5-8 I highlight the way the discourses of partnership promote longstanding ideas such as the value of time in schools for learning to teach as if they are the new way forward.

School-University Partnerships have been the subject of a significant amount of research, but the emphasis is typically on how to do them well, with an acceptance of their status as "benevolent, neutral and pragmatic" (Cardini, 2006, p. 394). There is a tendency in the scholarly literature to focus on the benefits of School-University Partnerships (Green et al, 2020), and to highlight successful partnerships (Jones et al, 2016) with limited critique. This led me to identify the tools offered by Foucault as central to an alternate examination of School-University Partnerships, not with a focus on "what works" but with a detailed examination of the discourses of partnership and their effects on teacher education. A genealogical approach is appropriate to this study as it has a critical focus "on modernity's teleological assumption that history moves upward or forward from some origin" (Scheurich & McKenzie, 2008, p. 326). School-University Partnerships have been frequently touted as an alternative to "historically dominant" modes of teacher education (Zeichner, 2010, p. 90) or presented as "innovations" (Sewell et al, 2017; Young, 2020) and are in need of this critique.

The approach taken by Foucault in his genealogical works has informed the framework for this study. This is not a history of School-University Partnerships, but a questioning, a critique of how an often diverse set of practices has been produced as School-University Partnerships and how they have achieved dominance as a central solution to the problems of teacher education. Through the literature review in Chapter 2, the policy

analysis in Chapter 5 and through analysis of interview data in Chapter 6 I show how the discourses of partnership are messy and complex, describing at times everything and nothing, and that School-University Partnerships continues to be an "empty signifier" (Burgos, 2003). I show in Chapter 7 that the discourses of School-University Partnerships have become increasingly prominent in initial teacher education and yet many of the practices are not new, with a more significant role for schools in teacher education in the past with apprenticeship models and a focus on more time in schools prevalent in the 1970s with the extension of many programs (Aspland, 2006).

4.3.6 On the use of policy

This thesis makes use of policy as a form of data. Working within the poststructural research paradigm of this study, policy is understood in particular ways. According to Bacchi (2000), "in traditional approaches, policy is 'what governments do' (p. 48). Maguire, Braun and Ball (2015) argue that often the meaning of policy is taken for granted and/or seen as an attempt to "solve a problem" (p. 485). They further argue that "policy is detailed and circulated through texts and artefacts" (Maguire, Braun & Ball, 2015, p. 485) suggesting policy is more than just a single document, words on a page.

Ball's (1993) influential work questioned "what is policy?" and argued that policies are not just "things" but also "processes and outcomes" (p. 11). Ball (1993) further describes policies as "textual interventions into practice" that may constrain but never determine practice (p.12). This conception of policy is still evident in his later work on "how schools do policy" (Maguire, Braun & Ball, 2015). Ball (1993) argues that policies restructure, redistribute and disrupt power relations, which creates the conditions for different people to do different things (p.13). He describes how "policy ensembles, collections of related policies, exercise power" through the ways in which they produce "truth" (Ball, 1993, p.14).

Bacchi's (2000) work explored the ways in which various policy scholars' study "policy- as- discourse". She begins to outline the way in which policy-as-discourse analysts, herself included, draw attention to the difficulties of progressive change because of the ways that problems "get 'created' in discourse" (p. 48). Edelman (1988) also identifies "the discursive construction of policy problems" and defines policy as "a set of shifting, diverse, and contradictory responses to a spectrum of political interests" (p. 16 cited in Bacchi, 2000,

p. 48). Foucault's genealogical work looked closely at practices and rules governing practices in settings such as the prison system (Foucault, 1975/1991).

Ball (2015) again asked the question "what is policy?" and suggests that his intention in the earlier work was "to reorient policy analysis research" (p. 311). He goes on to admit that it was not a success because there is still a greater emphasis on "what is written and said, rather than how those statements are formed or made possible" (Ball, 2015, p. 311). Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) refer to "policy itself" (p. 3) but argue that policy analysis of the sort they are encouraging should look broadly at "the knowledges that support policy and policy proposals, as well as conventional forms of policy analysis" (p. 3). Ball (2015) and Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) seem to be promoting something similar, conceptualising policy as what is written and said, but arguing that policy analysis should look beyond this at the broader conditions that create space for the production of policy texts.

Ball (2015), who has drawn heavily on Foucault in his work, says that the emphasis of policy analysis should most productively be on "the structures and rules that constitute a discourse rather than the texts and utterances produced within it" (p. 311). Foucault's investigation into the prison system takes this approach, looking at rules and schedules of prisons at the time and the way in which the conception of crime and punishment have changed over time (Foucault, 1975/1991). Maguire, Braun and Ball (2015) argue that "policy is not 'done' at one point in time, it is always a process of 'becoming'" (p. 487). The analysis of policy in this thesis in Chapter 5 looks at "policy itself", with an understanding that as part of this genealogical study, the edges of what "policy" is are blurred and that policy is not a discrete object separated from practice.

In this study I draw on this broad understanding of policy as conceived by Bacchi and Goodwin (2016), and I also adopt a broad idea of "policy-makers". Policy-makers have been described by Rickinson, Sebba and Edwards (2011) as "local, regional and national politicians, civil servants and administrators, political advisors, research funders and government agencies staff" (p. 4). White (2016) used this definition in her study with education policy-makers and this broad definition of who makes policy, and what counts as policy has been adopted for this study. Working with this definition, the key documents analysed in Chapter 5 have been produced by policy-makers at the national level. As higher education is controlled by the government at the national level, this is where the most relevant policy documents have been produced.

4.3.7 On the use of interviews

This thesis makes also makes use of interviews as a form of data collection. Interviews are prominent as a research method within qualitative research in education and the social sciences (King et al, 2019). Seidman (2006) argues that the purpose of interviewing in qualitative research is to understand "the lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience" (p. 9). Interviews have been used in research conducted under a wide range of theoretical frameworks, including those within a poststructuralist research paradigm.

The "voices" of speaking subjects are a source of data gathered in interviews in a range of research within poststructuralist frameworks (see Bourke, 2011; Chan, 2016; Hunkin, 2018; Thorne, 2015; Thomson & Mockler, 2016). Davies and Gannon (2005) argued that while the type of data gathered may be similar in feminist/poststructuralist research to more conventional qualitative studies, the way data are examined differs in that they "are examined not as if they described or explained an independently existing 'real world' but as constitutive work that itself is implicated in the production of 'the real'" (p. 320). Davies and Gannon (2005) also argue that in poststructuralist research "any setting where discourses are being mobilized either in speech or in writing, can be chosen for research" (p. 320). A poststructural approach to interview data does not approach the accounts of participants as "truth", but rather as implicated in the production of "truth".

St. Pierre and Jackson (2014) critique the privileging of participant voices in interview, but they acknowledge, "this is not to say that participants don't have many interesting things to tell us, else we wouldn't talk with them" (p. 716). While scholars such as St. Pierre and Jackson (2014) and Jackson and Mazzei (2012) have been critical of the construction and conception of "data" in qualitative research, many researchers continue to find value in the use of interviews as a form of data generation. Jackson and Mazzei (2012) in their important work on "thinking with theory" find what they argue is a way to better integrate theoretical tools into analysis of interview data to explore their research questions and draw conclusions. Foucault and others have been critical of whose voices are privileged in debates and how power is implicated in who can speak and what is seen to be valid and true.

Working within the poststructural research paradigm for this study, I make use of interviews as a form of data generation. Semi-structured interviews have been used to get a

range of perspectives on the object of investigation for this research, School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education. I am interested in the perceptions of people involved in School-University Partnerships. They are a lived experience in teacher education that provide evidence, not of the "truth" of partnerships, but of the productive effects of the circulation of power in School-University Partnerships. While policy documents tell a story relating to the development of School-University Partnerships, they do not provide a picture of the constitutive effects on the working lives of teachers and teacher educators. Hearing from the participants in School-University Partnerships has been done in such a way that these are not presented as the "truth" about the subject at hand, but rather representations of School-University Partnerships as understood by the participants in this research, with consideration of how the discourses of partnerships constrain and enable the subjectivities of teachers and teacher educators.

I have investigated the productive effects of the discourses of partnership in policy and my project seeks to understand School-University Partnerships beyond the rhetoric by hearing from those involved in partnerships and their perception of the impact on their professional lives. An understanding of the practices engaged in by the participants in School-University Partnerships is needed to answer my research questions. While observation, or other more ethnographic type methods might have been another way to gain this understanding, the complex web of participants in School-University Partnerships, as well as the fact that it is not the sole element of any of my participants working lives means that this would not be feasible. I couldn't easily observe "the partnership" in action, as it doesn't happen in one place with one set group of people but rather across institutional boundaries and as one part of the professional lives of those involved. Therefore, talking with those involved in School-University Partnerships is necessary to gain a further understanding of the participants perceptions of how they operate, and therefore to try to understand their influence on teacher education overall.

4.4 Methods

In this section I outline the methods used in conducting this research. Firstly, I outline the methods for selecting the policy documents. Secondly, I explain the process used to select participants for interviews and the methods for conducting the interviews.

4.4.1 Policy document selection

Policy documents provide a valuable source for an "effective history" of School-University Partnerships as teacher education policy has been a significant source of the push to partnerships. The policy documents analysed were selected on the basis of their role in the construction of the field of teacher education in the present. The genealogical approach for this study, outlined in Chapter 4, informed the selection of policy documents. This research, in order to understand the production of partnerships in the present, identified recent influential policies in teacher education. Using a purposive and snowball sampling approach, I then identified relevant historical policies through the scholarly literature on partnerships. The approach to policy selection was informed by the work of Bacchi (2000) and scholarly writing on teacher education policy (Mockler, 2018; White, 2016).

The key documents analysed were three recent policy documents: Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures (Accreditation Standards) (Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), 2011b) and the next iteration of this document, the Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures (Accreditation Standards) (2015) and the Australian Government Response to Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) (2015). These documents were selected for their influence on mandating School-University Partnerships in order for teacher education courses to be accredited. The two iterations of the Accreditation Standards were selected for comparison to understand how the discourses of School-University Partnerships have shifted over time.

The Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) report was considered significant by many at the time, with the period between establishing the group and delivering the report dubbed "waiting for TEMAG" (White, 2016, p. 254). I have selected the Government response to TEMAG as the policy document for analysis as it provides a clearer indication of the intended policy direction of the government of the day (Mockler, 2018). Given the breadth of the TEMAG report, the Government response, in its brevity, shows the elements the government intended to focus on.

The Smarter Schools National Partnerships reform was also identified as critical to this genealogy of School-University Partnerships as it was a large-scale education policy with a focus on partnerships across 2009-2013. In particular, the Victorian Implementation Plan (Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD), 2010) gave a more

specific outline of the intended action to achieve the goals of the National Partnerships funding.

A selection of earlier policies in teacher education were also identified*:* A Class Act (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998) and Top of the Class (Commonwealth of Australia, 2007) with the analysis focussed on the Australian Government Response to these reports (Commonwealth of Australia Senate, 1999; Commonwealth of Australia, 2008). These policies were selected purposively based on their prevalence in teacher education and School-University Partnerships literature and because they contribute to this history of the present by demonstrating that School-University Partnerships have not always been as prominent in teacher education. The significance of Top of the Class and the Australian Government Response is evident in the subsequent development of an influential report based on an evaluation of 35 partnerships (Kruger et al, 2009).

This collection of policies allows the researcher to explore this problem in the present by looking to the past and challenge grand historical narratives that might position School-University Partnerships as a natural or logical progression from past, flawed practices in teacher education. In the following section I provide a detailed explanation of the method used for policy analysis.

4.4.2 Method of policy analysis

I began by collecting the policy documents that I had selected purposively and reading them thoroughly, "poring over the data, annotating, describing, linking, bringing theory to bear" (MacLure, 2013, p. 174). I had initially planned to start with the oldest policy document selected and work in chronological order to the most recent. On reflection, it seemed that my starting point within a genealogical approach was the problem in the present so instead I started with the most recent, the Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures (Accreditation Standards) (AITSL, 2011b) and Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures (Accreditation Standards) (AITSL, 2015) documents and the Australian Government Response to Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) (2015). I conducted my analysis of these three documents in an iterative and integrated way. I then looked backwards in time, reviewing the earlier policies, seeking to answer my

first research question, how have School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education been discursively constructed in policy and practice?

Using Bacchi's (2009) and Bacchi and Goodwin's (2016) method for policy analysis I focussed on the question "what is the problem represented to be?" (Bacchi, 2009, p. 1). This method recognises the importance of identifying the problem creation mechanism of policy because "'solutions' necessarily flow from the kinds of problem definitions that are produced, and hence they emphasise the politics behind problem definition" (Bacchi, 2000, p. 49). This method allows for exploration of what is said in policy texts, but it is more interested in what creates the conditions that allow the policy texts to "function as true" (Foucault, 1980, p. 131). This form of analysis has "the intent to disrupt any assumption that what *is* reflects what *has to be*" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, p. 22, *emphasis in original*).

I have worked with a "policy as discourse" approach which frames discourse as "about what can be said, and thought, but also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority' (Ball, 1990, p. 17-18 cited in Bacchi, 2000, p. 51). Drawing on the ideas of Foucault, discourse is understood as both language and practice (Bacchi & Bonham, 2014; Hall, 2001). Bacchi & Goodwin (2016) argue that in a "Foucault-influenced poststructural analysis, discourses refer to knowledges rather than to language" (p. 21). This form of policy analysis is not a detached linguistic analysis, but rather an immersive engagement with policy texts while exploring what enables their production and their role in practices.

The method developed by Bacchi (2000; 2009) and Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) aligns with the poststructural research paradigm of this study. The focus is on exploring the "problems" presented in policy (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016). Bacchi & Goodwin's (2016) What's the Problem Represented to be? (WPR approach) has been used with a focus on the "critical task" of "interrogating the particular problematizations within policies" (p. 16). Problematizations, for Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) are understood as both a form of critical analysis and "to refer to the products of governmental practices" (p. 16). Policy texts are defined broadly by Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) and they argue that "if a text is selected for analysis, it provides only a starting point" (p. 18). The most central distinguishing feature for selection of material for the WPR approach are that they are "*a form of proposal* and a guide to conduct" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, p. 18, *emphasis in original*), drawing on Foucault's (1985/1990) outline of the relevant texts being those "written for the purpose of offering rules, opinions, and advice on how to behave as one should" (p. 12).

The WPR approach is an analytic strategy that draws on the key concepts outlined in the theoretical framework for this study in Chapter 3, including truth, power, discourse and subjectification (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016). This approach questions the "common view that the role of governments is to solve problems that sit outside them, waiting to be 'addressed'" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, p.14). Using the WPR approach in this study, I critically analyse how policy produces "problems" and with what effects? The starting point for the WPR approach is that proposals for action in policies identify what is seen as in need of change and therefore produces a "problem" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016).

The WPR approach sets out 7 questions but Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) make clear that this serves a heuristic function to guide analysis and need not be treated as a step by step guide. In my policy analysis I have initially focussed on the first two questions, what the problem is represented to be and what assumptions underlie this problem representation. I also asked question 3, "how has this representation of the 'problem' come about?" Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) describe question 3 as involving "a form of Foucauldian genealogy" (p. 22). Genealogies are described as "records of discontinuity, of twists and turns" (p. 46).

I used Question 2 in a WPR analysis to focus on "unexamined ways of thinking" (Foucault, 2000, p. 456) in the form of discourses and Questions 4 and 5 to explore the effects of these discourses identified in Question 2. I brought these key concepts to bear on my interview data as well, identifying the discourses of partnerships in practice and their effects across Chapter 6 and 7.

4.4.3 Participant selection

The process used to select the participants for this study was purposive and snowball sampling. Purposive sampling is used where the researcher "specifies the characteristics of a population of interest and then tries to locate individuals who have those characteristics" (Johnson & Christensen, 2012, p. 231). Snowball sampling was also used to recruit participants. This involved asking participants to suggest other potential research participants that I should approach. I sought participants who were currently or had been involved in School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education. Participants were purposively identified in several ways. Some participants were known to me through their published work in the field or from education conferences or from previous School-University Partnerships that I had been involved in. From this initial sample, I followed up on

participant suggestions in order to recruit the final sample. The geographical scope for the participants was the state of Victoria, Australia. This limit was necessary due to time and financial constraints on the study. I contacted potential participants using the email script (see Appendix D) which was included in my ethics approval. All prospective participants were sent a copy of the Participant Information Letter (Appendix A) and Consent Form (Appendix B). Recruitment of participants proved to be more difficult than anticipated, particularly recruiting staff in schools. Even with email and follow-up phone calls it was difficult to recruit school-based participants. I had hoped to recruit one or more graduate teachers with experience in partnership models of initial teacher education but was not able to. The three principals who participated were not able to nominate a suitable staff member for me to approach within their schools. Through a contact I managed to secure permission from a fourth principal who indicated I could approach staff. The graduate who was suggested was reluctant to get involved as they were concerned that they didn't have anything to contribute and would be "wasting my time". Despite reassurances from me that any contribution would be welcome I was unable to schedule this interview.

The recruitment of participants working outside of schools and universities but involved in School-University Partnerships occurred in a range of ways. One of the policy workers was recruited via snowball sampling as another university-based participant suggested staff at the teaching regulatory body. Another policy worker was recruited by emailing the education department and requesting someone with experience in School-University Partnerships. This participant then contacted me to offer to participate. The third policy worker/education consultant was identified based on their involvement in teacher education and approached directly via their workplace email.

The final number of participants interviewed was thirteen. There were not a pre-determined number of participants that I planned to interview. I sought a wide range of perspectives on School-University Partnerships and through initial analysis as well as the practical constraints of needing to move to the next stage of the research, determined when I had gathered sufficient data to answer my research questions. The aim in selecting my research participants was to interview people with many experiences with School-University Partnerships. I was able to answer my research questions and develop my findings on the discourses of School-University Partnerships due to the wealth of experiences of the

participants I was able to interview. Below is an overview of the participants and their connection to School-University Partnerships and teacher education:

Table 1: Profile of participants

Pseudonym	Background
Helen	Teacher educator who has worked at 3 different universities
Wendy	Teacher educator for over 20 years
Tara	Teacher educator, previously a teacher
Patricia	Professional staff-partnerships
Esther	Professional staff, project management, previously teacher, school governance roll
Jacob	Research and policy work, think tank, private consulting
Craig	Principal, long history in schools in metro, regional and rural
Rachel	Principal
David	Principal
Brigid	Professor with an extensive history in teacher education, previously a teacher
Christine	Policy worker, previously consultant and teacher
Carol	Project and management role at teacher regulatory body
Deb	Pre-service teacher coordinator for 15 years and over 30 years as a teacher

As is evident from the Table 1 above, participants in the study come from a wide variety of backgrounds and are currently working in eleven different institutions. All participants had worked in more than one role in education, with many of those not currently in schools having previously been employed as teachers. All participants were currently working in metropolitan or regional areas in Victoria, Australia. At least three

participants had previously worked in rural areas. At least two participants had also worked in other states in Australia.

4.4.4 Conducting the interviews

All participants in this study participated in an individual interview. Eleven of the interviews were conducted face-to-face and two of the interviews were done over the phone. The phone interviews occurred for the convenience of these participants due to scheduling difficulties. In person interviews were conducted at the university or at the workplaces of participants according to convenience for participants.

The interviews were semi-structured and involved seven questions with prompts (Appendix C). In a number of interviews, I left out some of the later questions as I felt the participant had already addressed the question in previous responses. In some of the early interviews, participant responses to the first question, "Tell me about your experiences with School-University Partnerships in teacher education" were so detailed and extensive that they went for upwards of twenty minutes out of an intended maximum one hour interview. For this reason, I began to preface the beginning of the interview by outlining the first question and letting the participant know that it was up to them what they talked about and they were welcome to select what they felt was most relevant or important.

Twelve of the interviews were voice recorded and transcribed through a transcription service. One of the interviews participants requested that that I take notes rather than use a voice recorder. I wrote a combination of general notes and verbatim quotes for key points.

4.4.5 Interview data management and analysis

The recorded interviews were electronically shared with a professional transcription service. The transcriptions were returned via email and I then kept the electronic files on a password protected computer as outlined in my ethics approval. I also kept field notes from interviews, and I began an initial analysis of each interview following it. I opted to use a transcription service in order to ensure the quality and accuracy of the transcription and that it was completed in a timely manner to allow me to proceed with data analysis.

In order to analyse my interview data, I draw on a form of coding that aligns with the poststructural research paradigm of this project. This is not an approach that "assumes data exist out there somewhere in the real world to be found, collected and coded" (St. Pierre &

Jackson, 2014, p. 715). I utilise MacLure's (2013) broad description of coding as "looking for pattern or order in a body of data" (p. 164). Saldana (2009) says that a code is "a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data" (p. 15). MacLure (2013) identifies a number of key elements in coding: a body of data such as interviews; a search for recurrence or patterns through naming or categorising; and reducing the complexity by putting data into categories. While acknowledging criticism of the limits of coding, MacLure (2013) argues for coding "as an analytic practice" because of the way it "demands immersion in, and entanglement with, the minutiae of 'the data'" (p. 174). Coding can be enacted in ways that align with positivist approaches, but coding can also be done in ways that bring "theory to bear" (MacLure, 2013, p. 174). I have taken this approach to coding my interview transcripts, also drawing on the notion of "thinking with Foucault" (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012).

I started out using deductive codes drawn from the theoretical framework and literature and I developed inductive codes as I went. An example of a deductive code from the literature was "defining partnerships" and I sought instances in the data where participants provided a definition or a description that suggested a particular definition. An example of a deductive code from the theoretical framework was "power" and I analysed the interview data for instances where power was being discussed. As the idea of partnerships as a "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131) developed through the research process, this then became a code as I looked in the data for representations of School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth. The intention of this initial analysis was to inform later interviews. My intention was to continue interviewing participants until I felt I had enough data to answer my research questions.

The next stage of my interview data analysis was to draw together the data under the deductive and inductive codes developed to look for patterns, compare and contrast participant responses and to look for findings in order to respond to my research questions. With these early and tentative findings in mind, I returned to a re-reading of Foucault's genealogical work, in particular *History of Sexuality: Volume 1* and *Discipline and Punish*, as well other key works drawing on Foucault (Bourke, 2011; Chan, 2016; Graham, 2005; Heffernan, 2018), including those working specifically within a genealogical framework (Hunkin, 2018; Niesche, 2008; Tamboukou, 1999).

I found, for example, that in looking at the ways in which participants discussed and described examples of School-University Partnerships that there was a lot of breadth. I found that these examples defied easy categorisation but that in order to make sense of partnerships it was possible to loosely group these conceptualisations of partnership. It was from this that I developed findings Chapter 6, with my interpretation of the data leading me to identify particular discursive conceptualisations. Further analysis of these discourses identified in Chapter 6 led to my findings and discussion outlined in Chapter 7.

4.5 Situating the researcher

I bring my own subjectivity as teacher, teacher educator and researcher to this study having spent over a decade as a teacher and leader in schools, more than seven years as a teacher educator and prior and ongoing research in School-University Partnerships. I have been involved in two School-University Partnerships in varied capacities both as teacher educator and as researcher. This work has driven my interest in this topic.

In this project, my own role in School-University Partnerships can be considered as an "insider", described by Asselin (2003) as someone who "shares an identity, language, and common professional experiential base" with the research participants (p. 100). This research, while recognising the contested nature of the concept of reflexivity, acknowledges the limits of any knowledge claims made and that "what I must do is take caution to be explicit about what I am doing" (Graham, 2005, p. 6).

Foucault (1976/1980) talked about the importance of being an "insider" to research as critical, "if one is interested in doing historical work that has political meaning, utility and effectiveness, then this is possible only if one has some kind of involvement with the struggles taking place in the area in question" p. 64). He said that he started out doing a genealogy of psychiatry because of his "practical experience in psychiatric hospitals" and his awareness "of the combats, the lines of force, tensions and points of collision" which he had been exposed to (Foucault, 1976/1980, p. 64). This investment in the topic at hand is central to my engagement in this research project.

Reflexivity has been identified as an important element of research (Pillow, 2003). The concept of "reflexivity" is often understood as "involving an ongoing self-awareness during the research process which aids in making visible the practice and construction of knowledge within research in order to produce more accurate analyses of our research"

(Pillow, 2003, p. 178). Davies et al (2004) describe reflexivity within a poststructural framework below:

> It entails the development of a kind of "critical literacy" in which the researchers understand that they are also caught up in processes of subjectification and see simultaneously the objects/subjects of their gaze and the means by which those objects/subjects (which may include the researcher as subject) are being constituted. (p. 361)

Davies et al (2004) also argue that reflexivity, within poststructuralist thought, "involves turning one's reflexive gaze on discourse—turning language back on itself to see the work it does in constituting the world" (p. 361).

The notion of researcher reflexivity has its critics with Haraway (1992) cautioning that reflexivity has turned into a methodological trope/trap (cited in Pillow, 2015). Reflexivity has "become associated with or used as a measure of legitimacy and validity in qualitative research" (Pillow, 2003, p. 179). Lather (1992) points out that one must be careful in being reflexive to note the limits of self-reflexivity. Reflexivity is an important consideration for the qualitative researcher but it is not a panacea for validity in research. This research draws on Davies et al 's (2004) notion of reflexivity and recognises the limitations of approaches that suggest one can engage in a step-by-step process to ensure reflexivity is "done" right (Phillips & Hardy, 2002; Pillow, 2003).

An important part of this research project is the way in which I arrived at the topic of investigation. In the early stages of my studies I had ruled out the topic of School-University Partnerships as an area where I could make a contribution. It seemed that so much had been written on the topic over more than 20 years and that the bulk of the findings were about the challenges of time and relationships. It was only through reading Foucault's work that it occurred to me that I could explore the topic of School-University Partnerships, not from an angle of "what works" but in a way that problematizes them as a taken- for-granted way of doing things in teacher education. Here I had happened upon a topic that captured my imagination and where the opportunity to make a contribution was found. I am not a neutral observer of School-University Partnerships, but I also have divided loyalties having recently worked in both schools and universities.

4.6 Ethical considerations

Consideration of ethical principles informed by the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) were central to the data gathering process. The research was carefully planned with regard to the involvement of the interview participants. The research was approved by the Australian Catholic University Human Research Ethics Committee (see Appendix D). Consideration was given to a range of ethical issues and I outline my specific actions with regard to benefit, non-coercion and confidentiality below.

4.6.1 Benefits of the research

I have conducted this research following a thorough investigation of the literature in teacher education and on School-University Partnerships. I also engaged in the selection and analysis of relevant policies in teacher education. This background work helped me to establish that interviewing human participants would provide important insights into the topic of this research. Participants in this research were all involved in School-University Partnerships as part of their professional roles and the semi-structured interview format provided an opportunity for consideration of a range of issues encountered in practice. The contribution of this research to knowledge about School-University Partnerships is also of benefit to participants in their future work in this field. The Participant Information Letter set out the proposed benefits of the research for prospective participants to consider (Appendix A).

4.6.2 Non-coercion with human participants

Recruitment of participants was carefully considered. All research participants provided informed consent for the study before the commencement of data collection. A participant information letter (see Appendix A) and a consent form (see Appendix B) were provided to each participant to ensure that they had a full understanding of the research project. The Participant Information Letter detailed to participants that they could withdraw from the study at any time up to the end of the data collection phase without any adverse consequences (Appendix A). As outlined in the Participant Information Letter (Appendix A), participants were provided with a copy of the transcript for approval prior to the data analysis stage.

4.6.3 Confidentiality

As part of ensuring participant confidentiality, interviews were arranged at a mutually agreed location. These interviews were conducted in private meeting rooms at Australian Catholic University or on the university or school campus of the participant. The interviews were digitally recorded and then stored on a password protected computer as outlined in the Participant Information Letter (Appendix A) and Consent Form (Appendix B). The names of participants were not used in the interviews. A professional transcription service was used and I then assigned participants a pseudonym for the purposes of data analysis, management and the write up of findings.

As well as assigning participants a pseudonym, detailed information about institutions and the roles held by participants have been minimised in order to prevent them from being identifiable. I considered that a detailed biography of participants or a detailed description of their current role may make them identifiable to others working in the area of School-University Partnerships and have therefore not included this information. An example of this is where a specific role title for a participant may make the person and institution identifiable I have assigned them a more generic description such as “policy worker” or “partnerships project role”. For participants who have been involved in particular combination of partnership projects I have been careful not to provide details which may make the participant identifiable. As outlined in the Participant Information Letter (Appendix A), participants were also provided a copy of the transcript for their consideration.

4.7 Summary

In this chapter I have outlined the methodological approach used. I began by outlining the poststructural research paradigm and then detail the genealogical approach that has been used in this study. I have outlined the approach the theoretical justifications for the the use of policy and interviews in order to generate findings. I have then explained the methods for data collection, data management and data analysis. I provide support for these methods in order to answer my research questions. I have also provided a background to my position as a researcher and highlighted the relevant ethical considerations for this research project. In the chapter that follows, I begin to present my findings, beginning with my policy analysis.

Chapter 5

The production of School-University Partnerships in policy

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter I explore School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education through policy. This is the first of three chapters in this thesis where I detail my findings. The findings are presented in relation to the teacher education policies analysed and I show the shifts over time in the ways in which School-University Partnerships feature and the ways they are produced in relation to teacher education. The findings presented in this chapter provide the beginning of an answer to my research questions:

1. How have School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education been discursively constructed in policy and practice?
2. How are truth and knowledge produced in the discourses of School-University Partnerships?
3. What are the consequences for the subjectivity of teacher educators?

This chapter sets out to explore the presence of partnerships in the policy landscape of teacher education in Australia since the late 1990s. The analysis has been conducted "under the influence" (Maclure, 2013) of Foucault's genealogical method (1976/1998, 1977/1991) and using Bacchi (2000), Bacchi (2009) and Bacchi and Goodwin's (2016) method for poststructural policy analysis. Thinking with Foucault (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012), this chapter starts with a problem in the present, the prominence of partnerships. The genealogical strategy of identifying a problem in the present has led to the identification of School-University Partnerships as a dominant solution in Australian teacher education. Therefore, this policy chapter seeks to conduct a "history of the present" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 31) to identify how the field of teacher education has arrived at this point. I begin with a brief introduction to the field of policy studies, particularly in relation to education policy, and then present the findings of my policy analysis using the approach to poststructural policy analysis developed by Bacchi and Goodwin (2016).

5.2 Ways of thinking with policy in education research

Education policy scholars frame policy differently to engage in critical study (Mockler, 2018). They use a wide range of concepts such as policy networks, policy

ensembles (Ball, 1993), policy technologies (Ball, 2005), and more recent work on "policy assemblage" (Savage & Lewis, 2018; Savage, 2020; Thomson, 2020). Maguire, Braun and Ball (2015) argue for the study of policy enactment, rather than implementation, whereby enactment is understood as "messy, incomplete and a form of interpretation and intersubjectivity in action" (p. 487). While often policy studies look at the way a particular policy reform is worked out in a school, Maguire, Braun and Ball (2015) argue that this doesn't help us to understand "how it is that certain policies, or strands within policies, are selected and who selects them and what alternatives are discarded along the way" (p. 486). The What's the Problem Represented to be? (WPR) approach to policy analysis, detailed in section 4.4.2 of Chapter 4, involves an examination of both the "policy itself" and the omissions, the silences, and the effects (Bacchi, 2009, p. 1). This approach looks at what makes the discourses in policy "in the true" or "sayable" (Foucault, 1991 in Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, p. 21). This study is interested in how the focus on partnerships may have displaced other approaches in teacher education. I argue that the prominence of partnerships has limited the possibilities for other ways of thinking and working in teacher education.

The study of policy implementation, critiqued by Maguire, Braun and Ball (2015) tends to find that if policies haven't been effective, it is due to faults of those implementing the policy. This could be argued as the case with school-university partnerships, where it is up to the university-based staff to create the "mutual benefits" and "trust" (see section 2.1) required for their success. Much of the literature on school-university partnerships could be described as studies in policy implementation (cf. Allen, Howells, Radford, 2013; Kertesz & Downing, 2016; Neal & Eckersley, 2015). A need for more critical approaches to policy study in relation to School-University Partnerships has led to the use of the WPR approach (Bacchi, 2009) and a poststructural approach to policy analysis (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016). I now turn to the policy texts and present my analysis. The methods for policy document selection were outlined in section 4.4.1 and the methods of policy analysis were outlined in section 4.4.2.

5.3 School-University Partnerships in policy (2011-2020)

Recent policies in the area of School-University Partnerships have been largely focussed on the professional experience component of initial teacher education. The

Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) was founded in 2010 and has had a significant impact on the teaching profession. AITSL is "a wholly-owned company funded by the Commonwealth Government" that works within the "national education architecture and has a national remit to work with the education community" in all states and sectors (AITSL, 2018). The work of AITSL in developing the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (AITSL, 2011a) has impacted on teachers who are required to demonstrate that they have met these standards. The Australian Professional Standards for Teachers set out what teachers must know and be able to do (AITSL, 2011a). Connected with these standards for teachers, AITSL developed a policy for the accreditation of initial teacher education courses. This policy, the Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education Programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures (AITSL, 2011b) set out the requirements that initial teacher education programs need to meet to achieve national accreditation. This document is suitable for analysis using the "What's the Problem Represented to be?" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, p. 13) approach because it is a guide to conduct, identifying what is required of initial teacher education providers.

5.3.1 Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education Programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures (AITSL, 2011b)

The 2011 Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education Programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures includes a quote on the contents page from the Top of the Class (2007) report that sets up the text as being about "ensuring high quality teacher education". The preamble uses the language of "shared commitment" that people entering teaching are of the "highest quality" and are "recognised". This policy identifies the need for graduates with the necessary "professional knowledge and skills" that are again "recognised" and "fostered". This preamble situates the problem as teachers not necessarily having the knowledge and skills they need, and also that they need to be supported and recognised as they develop. A lack of skills and knowledge, and a lack of support and recognition are among the problems being produced in these Accreditation Standards.

The preamble identifies "diversity" in teachers as an "expectation" as long as they are "literate and numerate". It also notes that there are "multiple pathways to excellence" which gives providers and program participants "flexibility" for achieving and demonstrating high standards. These statements suggest that "diversity" will be tolerated in graduates as

long as they fit into the now defined categories of “literate and numerate” with the introduction of the Literacy and Numeracy Test for Initial Teacher Education Students (LANTITE) (Australian Council for Educational Research, 2017).

The 2011 document sets out six principles for national accreditation and “Partnerships” is number 4. This principle identifies partnerships as the basis for national accreditation and seems to use the term “partnership” here to mean “shared responsibilities and obligations”. In other words, a range of people and institutions are involved. There is not much more to partnerships in the way it is described in these principles, and it is framed as “multiple stakeholders” with different but complementary roles to play. The kind of language used here provides an indication of why the literature on partnerships is littered with reference to “true” or “authentic” partnerships (Clifford & Millar, 2008), “truly collaborative” partnerships (Smith, Brisard & Menter, 2007; Sewell et al, 2017) and “genuine” partnerships (Cochran-Smith, 2003). Those involved in and researching partnerships recognise that there are “partnerships” out there that are about “multiple stakeholders” fulfilling their role and want to make a distinction between these. In section 6.2.9 in Chapter 6 I describe the discourses of partnership as a bureaucratic requirement which align with the discourses of partnership present in this AITSL accreditation document.

Standard 5 in the 2011 accreditation document is “School partnerships” and states: 5.1 Providers have established enduring school partnerships to deliver their programs, particularly the professional experience component.

Drawing on Bacchi’s (2009) and Bacchi and Goodwin’s (2016) methods for policy analysis, the problem represented here is with the delivery of university programs, in particular professional experience. The emphasis on “enduring” school partnerships suggests that there has been a problem with partnerships that are brief or transitory in nature and that the expectation for course accreditation is evidence of the longevity of the partnerships. This notion of endurance in partnerships was captured in the 2009 report into “Effective and Sustainable School-University Partnerships” (Kruger et al, 2009). A lack of ongoing resources has been identified as a challenge to sustaining partnerships (Ryan et al, 2016; Sewell et al, 2017).

Standard 5 goes on in 5.2 to outline the minimum number of days of professional experience stating that programs “must include” and that they be “well-structured, supervised and assessed” (p.14). This situates the problem of teacher education as being

around the amount of time spent in schools (Reid, 2011) and the nature of that experience, in other words, the "quality" of the professional experience (Allen & Wright, 2014; Grudnoff, 2011). In this policy, School-University Partnerships are being positioned as the solution to this problem of the amount and nature of professional experience that pre-service teachers are exposed to. In section 1.3 I explore the way the conceptualisation of the problem of teacher education has changed over time.

The expectations of what partnership entails is described further in 5.3 where "providers describe in detail the elements of the relationship between the provider and the schools" (p. 14). So while there is no explicit mention of a written partnership agreement in the 2011 Accreditation standards, it is assumed in Standard 5.3 that "providers" will have a detailed outline of the precise nature of the connection between the school and the university and the expectations of each party in providing professional experience for PSTs.

Standard 5.4 and 5.5 see a shift from the expectation solely resting with the "providers" (universities or other teacher education providers) to enact the "partnership" to identifying both "providers and their school partners" as responsible for a range of requirements. These include ensuring pre-service teachers get to work with, or "appreciate" a range of students. Standard 5.5 has a focus on the appropriateness of the supervising teachers and ensuring that they are qualified, registered, have expertise and are supported in coaching, mentoring and assessing pre-service teachers. Given the competitive placement environment (Gutierrez, 2016), it is not clear how careful selection of appropriate and skilled mentors is to be assured.

The discursive conceptualisation of partnership in the AITSL (2011b) Accreditation standards is not as an intellectual, collaborative relationship. Rather partnership seems to be an administrative arrangement which compartmentalises all the ways in which professional experience must be "administered". It does not present professional experience within a collaborative or "learning communities" model popular in the literature (Le Cornu, 2015; Sewell et al, 2017), but rather the "partnership" is about role clarity and enforcing "standards" on both the university and the school to ensure that professional experience happens in a particular way. The scrutiny of initial teacher education courses at this level suggests a general distrust of teacher educators and schools to provide professional experience of the sort needed to develop the "high quality" (AITSL, 2011b, p. 1) teachers that are sought.

The nomination of both providers and "their school partners" as responsible for a number of elements is curious given it is only universities who must gain accreditation. Schools do not have to gain accreditation in order to supervise pre-service teachers for professional experience placement so this suggests an expectation that universities are responsible for ensuring the appropriate participation of the schools they partner with.

5.3.2 Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures (AITSL, 2015)

The updated Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education Programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures (Accreditation Standards), released in December 2015, increased in length to 31 pages (up from 22 in 2011). The additional pages are mainly in the form of "explanatory information" about "evidence of impact", "teacher performance assessment" and "demonstrating impact on student learning" and a shift in the way the program standards are presented.

The tone of the document shows "evidence" of a shift in mood, with the frequent appearance of the term "evidence" in the preamble and the remainder of the document. The other idea that is prominent is the notion of "performance" which featured just the once in the 2011 document but is littered throughout AITSL (2015).

The preamble provides a further indication of the motivation of the policy text and establishes the problem being addressed. The second paragraph identifies, "a collective sense of accountability and acknowledge that evaluation of initial teacher education is a shared responsibility" (p. 3). This paragraph establishes the problem and the proposed solution being promoted through this policy text. The language of "collective" "shared" and "acknowledge" suggest that "we", those involved in schools and education, and all Australian governments mentioned just prior, have come to a group consensus. It seems that "we", have realised that it is a foregone conclusion that "accountability" be achieved through "evaluation". The question of who initial teacher education is accountable to and how it will be evaluated are answered in the following sentence. "Quality assurance" is described as "essential to ensure every program is preparing classroom ready teachers with the skills they need to make a positive impact on school student learning" (p. 2.)

The identification of "every" program suggests that the problem lies in some programs failing to live up to the standards. This is also discussed in the Australian

Government Response to Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) (2015), which identified "considerable variation in the quality of courses" (p. 3). Classroom ready teachers need "skills" which have a "positive impact" on student learning. Given the earlier emphasis on accountability and evaluation, the direction being promoted here is not subtle. The preamble to the 2011 document is worth returning to here for contrast, "graduates have the professional knowledge and skills necessary to build highly productive professional practice and that their developing professional expertise is recognised and fostered" (p. 2).

In the 2015 text, "professional knowledge" has disappeared, as have the need for recognition and fostering of developing expertise. Instead, the emphasis is on accountability, evaluation, evidence and performance. The vision of the "good teacher" (Connell, 2009, p. 213) that these standards are conjuring is not the "activist professional" (Sachs, 2000) but an implementer, a technician (Ball, 1995).

The first mention of partnerships in the 2015 document occurs in the "Principles for national accreditation", said to be informed by the eight principles in the report from the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (2014). "Partnerships", the sixth principle, says that "national accreditation is built around partnerships involving shared responsibilities and obligations" with the aim of improving initial teacher education and to "work in partnership to positively affect student learning and graduate outcomes" (p. 3). This "affect student learning and graduate outcomes" is an addition to what was in the 2011 text. It is not clear in this statement if the positive impact on student learning is intended to be about pre-service teacher impact in the classroom or if it is a reference to student learning upon the pre-service teacher becoming a graduate teacher. This is clarified on page 9 where teacher education graduates must have "demonstrated a positive impact on student learning". So "partnerships" in the 2015 document have a clear outcome orientation towards "evidence of impact". It doesn't seem to be about *evidence of the impact of partnerships,* but rather working in partnership to ensure initial teacher education can show *evidence of impact.*

Standard 5 of the National program standards now comes under the title of "Professional Experience" and the first point, 5.1 states:

> 5.1 Formal partnerships, agreed in writing, are developed and used by providers and schools/sites/systems to facilitate the delivery of programs, particularly professional

> experience for pre-service teachers. Formal partnerships exist for every professional experience school/site and clearly specify components of placements and planned experiences, identified roles and responsibilities for both parties and responsible contacts for day-to-day administration of the arrangement. (p. 17)

The program standards outline what is meant by the term partnership and it is not planned as a collaborative intellectual project. Formal partnership here means specifying in detail the administrative procedures for the operation of professional experience. There is no mention of mutuality or trust or shared philosophy of learning. The way in which partnerships are framed differs from the vision of much of the scholarly literature. They are produced as contractual agreements between institutions.

While in the 2011 document there was some responsibility placed with schools under the "partnerships" standard, the 2015 standards do not include reference to this. Instead, the language used is that "providers work with their placement schools" and "providers support the delivery of professional experience" (p. 18). This seems more logical given the document is about accrediting initial teacher education providers and has no jurisdiction over schools. Accreditation of schools as professional experience sites was something that seemed a possibility given the expectations placed on schools in the 2011 standards. The insistence on formal partnerships that exist "for every professional experience school/site" (AITSL, 2015, p. 18) makes this a reality in a sense because initial teacher education providers cannot place their pre-service teachers anywhere that they do not have an agreement with. In Chapter 6-8 I show in my findings from the interviews conducted as part of this study some of the experiences of staff in universities and schools as part of these partnership arrangements. A participant, Deb, who worked as a school based professional experience coordinator, noted the impact of post-TEMAG changes as just "more emails". he struggled to understand the prominence of partnerships as in her experience there was less of a relationship with the university than in the past (see 6.2.9 for further discussion).

The shift from "enduring" to "formal" partnerships in the 2015 Accreditation Standards suggests that the problem being addressed is the nature of the connection between schools and universities in the provision of professional experience. Given that initial teacher education providers already had to provide evidence of their "enduring" partnerships, the shift to "formal, in writing" could be read as a distrust of teacher

educators whereby more concrete forms of evidence are required. The nature of "evidence" is a significant topic for this policy text.

While partnerships are not designated as "formal" in the 2011 document, there are several uses of the term "formal" including around "formal" assessment, "formal" evaluation of the program, and "formal" teaching practice (AITSL, 2011b, p. 15). The use of the term "formal" in reference to assessment and evaluation seem to imply "in writing". This emphasis on formal in these instances seems to be to identify casual or informal styles of assessment and evaluation such as verbal feedback as problematic and not providing sufficient evidence. In case there is any room for doubt, the 2015 Accreditation standards explicitly call for evidence of partnerships to be not just formal, but "in writing". The problem being constructed in the AITSL (2015) document, seems to be informal arrangements between schools and universities in the running of professional experience placement that do not provide "evidence of impact". The solution provided in this policy is for formal contractual agreements between schools and universities, with formal defined as detailed and in writing.

This document had minor updates in 2018 and 2019 but the reference is still AITSL (2015). These changes were mainly to the back matter of the document and included reference to the Graduate Teacher Performance Assessment. The focus on partnerships as formal and in writing as part of Program Standard 5 remain.

5.3.3 Australian Government Response to Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (2015)

In order to better understand the shifts outlined above in the Accreditation Standards for initial teacher education, the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) review, which was reported on in 2014 is important for understanding the context. TEMAG was established by the Federal government to conduct a review into teacher education, to "provide advice on changes needed to the training of our teachers" (AGR to TEMAG, 2015, p. 3). The final report "Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers" (TEMAG, 2014) had a number of key findings including "insufficient integration of teacher education providers with schools and systems" (xi) and 38 recommendations. The Australian Government Response (AGR) to the TEMAG report has been selected as the most relevant

policy for analysis as it provides an indication of the intended direction of the government in response to the review (Mockler, 2018).

The "problem" that has been constructed in the Australian Government Response to TEMAG (2015) is one of a "long history" (p. 3) of variability in the "quality" of teacher education courses. This policy document is heavy on the deficit discourse and "crisis rhetoric" around "teacher quality" (Mayer et al, 2017). The "good teacher" (Connell, 2009, p. 213) is constructed in this document as one who can "drive student outcomes" (AGR to TEMAG, 2015, p. 4).

The document constructs the problem as a long running one of poor teacher education, or "training of teachers" (p. 3) leading to a lack of "quality teachers". The solution proposed by this document to these problems is to be found in the work of the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL, 2011a) and teacher professional standards (p. 3). This shows the link between this and the previous policy document.

The major problem with teacher education courses as constructed in the Government response to TEMAG is that course accreditation "is not sufficiently rigorous or evidence-based" (p. 4). These ideas are evident in the "effective professional experience case studies" showcased by AITSL (2017) where "rigour" and "evidence" are highlighted as part of a "close and well-established partnership between a school and university". These case studies of "quality practice" rely on "data and evidence" (AITSL, 2017). The principal in one Victorian case study featured on the AITSL website argues that the partnership "has definitely made a difference to student outcomes in the school" (AITSL, 2017). The measure of effective initial teacher education as the "impact" of pre-service teachers on school students was evident in TEMAG (2014) and increased in prominence in the AITSL (2015) accreditation document.

The document suggests that good professional experience placements are delivered in partnership to "ensure universities and schools support the connection of theory and practice" (p. 7). This suggests that the problem of variable and at times poor quality teacher education is a result of a lack of connection between theory and practice, not exactly a new idea (Ord & Nuttall, 2016). It would seem that Vick's (2006) notion of "historical amnesia" in teacher education is alive and well. The idea that somehow "partnerships", which have been around as part of teacher education in Australia since at least the 1990s, are a new solution

to an apparent lack of connection between “theory and practice” is not supported by “evidence” so favoured in this policy. This is particularly the case when School-University Partnerships are primarily defined as contractual agreements between schools and universities about who does what in the process of administering professional experience placement.

In two places, once on page 4 and again on page 10, the image of the broader public or community is invoked, in particular the “confidence” and “respect” that the community has in/for teachers. This identifies another of the “problems” as public perception of teachers. The notion of “public” is invoked many times in the Australian Govgernment Response to TEMAG (2015) report, including the idea of “public” consultation in the development of the report and “publicly” available information on initial teacher education providers and programs. “Public” perceptions about particular aspects of initial teacher education are mentioned, such as Australian Tertiary Admission Rank (ATAR) cut-offs. This is of note as widespread dissatisfaction with teachers and a crisis in public opinion and confidence in the teaching profession is not evident in the TEMAG (2014) report. Yet the AGR to TEMAG (2015) is contributing to the production of discourses of negative public perception as a “truth” about teaching.

The Australian Government Response to TEMAG (2015) further clarifies the problems being produced in initial teacher education with a focus on course accreditation being “not sufficiently rigorous or evidence-based” (p.4). The solution proposed is therefore, “a revision of the accreditation of courses to make sure they are consistently of a high standard, producing graduates with the skills and knowledge to drive student outcomes” (p. 4). This description provides a vision of the “good teacher” (Connell, 2009, p. 213) as one who can produce “measurable” results. The “problem” of variability between courses is again produced through the notion of course accreditation ensuring “consistency”.

The essential skills for this new breed of teacher include “the ability to collect and analyse data to assess the learning needs of different students, to effectively engage with parents about the progress of their children, and a thorough understanding of the fundamentals of teaching literacy and numeracy” (p. 4). The Australian Government Response to TEMAG (2015) has a focus on tighter scrutiny through accreditation standards, administered by AITSL as the proposed solution to the problem of variable and at times poor quality teacher education. Cochran-Smith (2021) notes that the last two decades have seen

increased scrutiny of teachers through what she refers to as “audit-based accountability models” (p. 8).

Other solutions to poor quality initial teacher education proposed in the Government Response include getting AITSL to identify “best practice in selection” of entrants to initial teacher education and make clear “examples of tools that can be used to examine the personal attributes of teaching candidates against those important for teaching” (p. 6). This appears to be a reference to the kind of “suitability for teaching” testing that has been undertaken by institutions such as the University of Melbourne, now taken up by other universities (see Australian Catholic University, 2018).

School-University Partnerships are represented as a solution to the problems of initial teacher education where “reports of poorly delivered practical experience” are contrasted with “excellence in practical experience in many Australian schools, achieved through close partnerships between universities and schools” (p. 7). The purpose of these partnerships is identified as being ensuring that schools and universities work to “support the connection of theory and practice” (p. 7).

As an indication of the direction and emphasis of the Australian Government Response to TEMAG (2015), the final paragraph on p. 7 refers to funding arrangements and the “shared cost” of delivering practical experience. The importance of funding being used “to support effective practical experience placements” is identified (p. 7). This suggests that funding may not be being used in this way. Funding is a significant issue as the cost of professional experience placements is high (Reid, 2011). Funding for some initial teacher education arrangements identified as “partnerships” has meant money being provided to schools rather than universities (cf Furlong et al, 1996; Deakin University, 2021).

5.3.4 Discourses of partnerships in policy in the present

Drawing on Bacchi (2009) and Bacchi and Goodwin’s (2016) approach to poststructural policy analysis I have looked at the problems constructed in these three policy documents. These policies have been part of what White, Tindall-Ford, Heck & Ledger (2018) identified as the “second wave” of partnerships policy in Australia. I have found a lack of integration between schools and universities has been constructed as a problem and that School-University Partnerships have been presented as a prominent solution. I also argue that there is a shift to “evidence” as central to teaching but the “evidence” for the

effectiveness of School-University Partnerships to achieve these goals is not presented. School-University Partnerships are presented an unproblematic solution and are conceptualised as a written agreement detailing roles and responsibilities of "stakeholders".

The three policies discussed above are examples of recent teacher education policy documents with a focus on initial teacher education. School-University Partnerships are identified by each of these documents as central to improvements and to achieving the desired "quality teachers". This policy analysis looks at the way in which problems are produced and identifies the discourses of policy as a productive effect of power (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016). The discourses, or as Bacchi and Goodwin (2016) also describe them, the *knowledges* in policy are those things that are understood as "truth". Foucault (1977/1980b) utilised the concept of "regime of truth" (p. 131) which recognises the productive power in dominant ideas that get repeated and lead to the exclusion of other possibilities. These "regimes of truth" are widely accepted ideas that underlie what is considered true and false. "Regimes of truth" are the discourses which a society "accepts and makes function as true" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131). I argue that in these recent documents, Australian Government Response to TEMAG (2015), AITSL (2015) and AITSL (2011), School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are circulating as a regime of truth, whereby it is taken for granted that these partnerships are the central solution for improving initial teacher education, which is assumed to lead to improvements in student outcomes. I present evidence that this regime of truth is also evident in practice in Chapter 7.

I argue that the shift to "formal, in writing" (AITSL, 2015) as the framing of School-University Partnerships in teacher education is a "discontinuity" (Foucault, 1972/2010). This concept from Foucault, recognises the limits of conventional history that takes a teleological approach and attempts to smooth over gaps or challenges to a linear narrative. Genealogies have been described as "records of discontinuity" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, p. 46). This shift in the conception of partnerships frames them as contractual agreements between stakeholders. The language of past collaborative work remains, "partnerships", but the meaning is distinct, and I show in the findings chapters that follow that some of the work of "partnerships" in more recent time is identified by participants as something quite different, exemplified by the assessment of Deb who said that moves to compulsory partnerships in initial teacher education could be identified as "just more emails". This more recent conception of "partnerships" is with a focus on "accountability" and "evidence" and

therefore the central thrust is more surveillance of the work of teacher educators. Foucault (1975/1991) had much to say about surveillance and the effect of being watched and his writing on the panopticon has been widely used. The English example of formal inspection and accountability regimes has been noted for its impact on teachers (Hall & Noyes, 2009). Cochran-Smith (2021) argues that the past two decades have seen increasing accountability requirements for teachers and teacher education. Rather than the shift from "enduring" to "formal, in writing" being part of a linear narrative in teacher education practices being refined and reformed over time, the "prevailing logic" (Gale & Parker, 2017) post-TEMAG has shifted to "partnerships" as a tool for implementing "evidence" and "impact" for pre-service teachers, teacher educators and universities who teach teachers.

In Chapter 6 I present the findings from my interviews and show that School-University Partnerships have been discursively constructed as everything and nothing. In Chapter 7 I show that in initial teacher education, School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth. The discourses of partnership evident in initial teacher education policy also produce School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth. The "empty signifier" status of partnerships (Burgos, 2003) has created space for this shifting discursive conceptualisation.

5.4 School-University Partnerships in policy (2000-2010)

Drawing on a "gray, meticulous" (Foucault, 1984, p. 76) approach central to genealogy, in the following section I look to earlier policies impacting on teacher education in the decade prior to the introduction of the AITSL Accreditation Standards analysed in section 5.3.1 and 5.3.2. This section looks beyond the specifics of the Accreditation Standards or policy related only to teacher education to analyse the discourses of partnership evident in policy relating to education more broadly. I have selected two policy documents during the first decade of the 21st Century. These were purposively selected, with the method for selection detailed in section 4.3.1. I have examined these policies, thinking with Foucault (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012), and seeking to identify the "problem" presented (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016) and "What's the problem represented to be?" (Bacchi, 2009, p. 1).

5.4.1 Smarter Schools National Partnership: Victorian Implementation Plan (2010)

The Smarter Schools National Partnership (SSNP) was a federally funded program that involved a large sum of money delivered to the states for a whole range of initiatives. The scale of the initiative, incorporating partnerships in teacher education, make it an influential policy for this study. There were three key partnerships as part of the National Partnerships: Literacy, Numeracy and Low SES. The agreement for this plan was made by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2008 for the period 2009-2013. The document examined sets out the state-based plan for Victoria for the implementation of the SSNPs (Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD), 2010). A breadth of programs, initiatives, reforms and aims were part of the National Partnerships. While some of the reforms were clearly centred on partnerships, others incorporated more broad ranging reforms. This seems to be a classic example of "partnerships" being used as a "floating and empty signifier" (Burgos, 2003, p. 55). This shows the prominence of partnerships in policy beyond teacher education and into other aspects of education policy.

Drawing on Bacchi (2009) and Bacchi and Goodwin (2016), the problem being constructed by this policy can be understood as a lack of collaboration. If only the sectors and states and territories would be more integrated, we would have "high quality teachers" and "improved student outcomes". In the case of National Partnerships, it seems as if the push to partnerships is about consistency across sectors and jurisdictions, so partnership is about all doing the same thing. Collaboration is conceived of as agreeing to do things in the same way. The period for the National Partnerships coincides with the development of the Australian Curriculum, a plan to create consistency across the states and territories in the taught curriculum. An exploration of the impact of federal/state government relations and its impact on education are beyond the scope of this thesis. The impact of shifting federal/state government involvement in teacher education is an important background to understanding School-University Partnerships and I provide some discussion of this in Chapter 2 section 2.3.

The general tone of the SSNP Victorian Implementation Plan is upbeat with an early emphasis on positively framed notions of partnerships such as "brings together" and "maximises opportunities", "provides flexibility", "draw on support and resources from outside" (p. 1). The document goes on to talk about a focus on "collaboration and

integration across the three schooling sectors and the three National Partnerships (literacy, numeracy and low SES)" (p. 2). Further into the document there is a shift to the language of accountability with a focus on "Performance Monitoring and Evaluation". "Outputs" include "measures such as the number of new teaching positions and number of students with individual learning plans" (p. 6). These measures are combined with staff and student surveys and National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) data, with "mandated NAPLAN measures" setting out to 2 decimal points the percentage of students who need to be above minimum standard e.g. Reading, Year 3, 83.05% by 2010, 84.70% by 2011. There are a range of "problems" being constructed, in particular the need for more collaboration and sharing of resources in order to solve the "problem" of performance in NAPLAN.

Section 4 of the SSNP Victorian Implementation Plan directly addresses teacher education by identifying "Reform Priorities" for "teacher quality" as "national consistency" in teacher education course accreditation and "national consistency" in registration of graduate teachers. In this policy the notion of partnerships is again being conflated with consistency. "Partnership" here means to work together to do the same thing. "Quality professional experience (practicum) placement systems and the establishment of school centres for teacher excellence" (p. 11) are discussed as well as initiatives which focus on building leadership and teacher capacity through post-graduate study, coaches, and other forms of professional learning.

While the entire document is on the Smarter Schools National Partnerships, the Victorian Implementation Plan has its first mention of School-University Partnerships under the heading "improve school access to high quality teachers" and to "access high performing low SES schools for mentoring and professional learning activities" (p. 14). The following paragraph gives a clearer picture of the purpose of partnerships as constructed in this policy document:

> All sectors will participate in school-university partnerships to improve pre-service teacher education. These partnerships will provide a strong foundation for all sectors to develop and support selected schools as School Centres for Excellence to produce a new generation of interventionist teachers, capable of using data to address the needs of individual learners. (p. 14)

In this same section, Teach for Australia (TFA) is presented as the solution to "high quality teachers" and is the option presented for the government sector "in areas of disadvantage" (p. 14). The promotion of Teach for Australia as a "partnership" was contested by one of my participants, Esther, who worked in a university and had been involved in TFA. When she was asked whether she experienced TFA as a partnership she said, "in terms of how it operates, no". She went on to say, "the published curriculum is we're in a partnership, the hidden curriculum is different". The identification of Teach for Australia in this policy is significant as TFA represents a radically different model of teacher education that places pre-service teachers (known as Associates) into schools with very limited initial teacher education. TFA as part of the Teach for All reform has been critiqued for being focused on teaching as a short-term endeavour rather than a professional career (Ellis et al, 2016).

The problem being constructed in this section of the Smarter Schools National Partnerships Victorian Implementation Plan is of a currently flawed model of initial teacher education. While the phrase "using data" could mean multiple sorts of data, NAPLAN is the data source of choice in other sections of this document, so it seems likely that it is intended to mean NAPLAN data. The problem produced in this policy is that the current model for initial teacher education is flawed, and there is a need for new approaches such as the School Centres for Teaching Excellence and Teach for Australia to create "high quality teachers". The policy doesn't set out clearly how these programs, as exemplars of School-University Partnership will solve the problem. This document identifies a need for a "new generation of interventionist teachers" (p. 14). With partnership presented as the solution it seems that lack of collaboration or integration between school and university-based aspects of teacher education are the problem (as was identified in TEMAG, 2014). The lack of a compelling case being presented for the benefits of partnership here suggest the acceptance of their inherent "collaborative advantage" (Huxham & Vangen, 2000, p. 293). The SSNP Victorian Implementation Plan also shows evidence of the discourses of partnership evidenced in Chapter 6, where partnerships are discursively constructed in very broad ways. Within the SSNP Victorian Implementation Plan partnerships are produced as a range of things for a range of purposes including partnerships as consistency across school sectors. The acceptance of School-University Partnerships as a solution for initial teacher

education presented in SSNP Victorian Implementation Plan is also prevalent across the literature explored in Chapter 2 and in the findings presented in Chapter 7.

5.4.2 Australian Government Response to Top of the Class (2008)

Another important policy in this time period which was selected for analysis was the Australian Government Response to Top of the Class (2008). Top of the Class (2007) was the report of an inquiry into teacher education. The inquiry and report looked at the scope and suitability of teacher education in Australia. The Australian Government Response to Top of the Class (2008) incorporates the notion of partnership widely. Partnerships come in different forms including "good partnership"' (p. 13), "genuine partnerships" (p. 1), "effective partnerships" (p. 14), "vibrant partnerships" (p. 14) and at different levels of establishment from "possibly in partnership" (p. 9) to "building partnerships" (p. 13) to "working in partnership" (p. 13) and "strengthen partnerships" (p. 6).

Partnerships are also described in a range of functions from "practicum and partnerships" and those between schools and universities, to the idea of "national partnerships" and also those between Federal, State and Territory governments and the non-government sector. In the Australian Government Response to Top of the Class (2008) partnerships are discursively produced in very broad ways. I argue that this broad discursive conceptualisation of partnerships is also evident in participant interviews, outlined in section 6.2 of Chapter 6.

Relative to earlier policy documents, even those presenting a positive view of partnerships, such as the Teaching Accord and A Class Act, the government response to Top of the Class demonstrates a policy direction where partnerships are the solution to almost everything and the label partnership is applied very broadly. A working relationship between the federal, state and territory governments, necessary given Australia's governance structure established under the Constitution, is here labelled a "national partnership". This is in the same document that connects practicum and partnerships and tentatively suggests partnerships with "other bodies" for programs to promote diversity in entrants to teaching, as well as noting the importance of "partnerships between providers, state governments and other employing bodies and school stakeholders" (p. 13).

It would seem that in this document, "partnerships" are produced as any type of working relationship between any organisation or government at any level involved in

education. This fits with the broad conception of partnerships as groups who "work collaboratively to solve problems" (Franklin et al, 2003, p. 3). This kind of definition has been argued to be "excessively broad" (Clifford & Millar, 2008, p.11). If all of the examples of partnership used in this government response are included, partnership starts to sound like what Kruger et al (2009) described in their report as "contrived collaboration" (p. 46). In section 6.2 of Chapter 6 I show that the discursive construction of partnerships by interview participants is also very broad, resulting in partnerships being produced as everything and nothing.

The notion of evidence is raised in a number of places in this report, arguing that policy and teacher education should be developed on the basis of "evidence", including "empirical evidence" on effective teacher education that improves "teacher performance" (p. 8). Strategies to address teacher shortages should be "evidence based" (p. 12) according to the government response. While it is suggested in the government response that evidence should inform partnerships, there is no call for evidence of the effectiveness of partnerships themselves. The underlying assumption in this document is that partnerships are the solution, but there is some work to be done to ensure that we have "vibrant" "genuine" and "sustainable" partnerships. The angle on partnerships evident in this document has the same orientation as much of the literature, and of the report discussed as being in progress in this government response that was completed by Kruger et al (2009). That is, partnerships are essentially good and will solve our problems, it is just a matter of tinkering with the model and how we "do" them. This is an exemplar of the notion that partnerships are essentially "benevolent, neutral and pragmatic" (Cardini, 2006, p. 394).

Drawing on Bacchi and Goodwin's (2016, p. 49) poststructural policy analysis approach, the question, "which objects have been produced?" was asked of this government response policy document. There are a number of objects formed in this policy document, notably the "quality teacher" and the "world-class education system" made up of "world-class schools, principals and teachers". Teacher quality is described in this policy as "the most important school-based influence on student outcomes" (p. 1). It would seem that the major strategy for the development of these "quality teachers" for a "world-class education system" is through partnerships of varying sorts, not least collaborative working of federal, state and territory governments. Given the time frame for this policy response is the same year as the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreed to the National

Partnerships program it is not surprising that there is some alignment in terms of focus. Both documents evoke the notion of "partnership" as a "floating and empty signifier" (Burgos, 2003, p. 55).

5.5 Partnerships in policy in the 1990s

This history of the present identifies School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education as a dominant and persistent idea, which I conceptualise as a "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131) in initial teacher education policy in the present in section 5.3.4. I also show in Chapter 7 that School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth in practice. I have shown in section 5.4 how the discourses of partnership in the decade 2000-2010 in the two policies analysed, Smarter Schools National Partnerships Victorian Implementation Plan (2010) and the Australian Government Response to Top of the Class (2008), produced partnerships broadly as everything and nothing.

Using Foucauldian genealogy as the framework for the study, I now look further into the past to try to understand how we have arrived at this present situation. It is not a search for origins or a linear narrative but looking at the past to try to understand how and when School-University Partnerships have become prominent in order to show that the present is contingent. I continue to ask questions about "What's the problem represented to be?" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, p. 13).

5.5.1 Australian Government Response to A Class Act (1999)

A Class Act (1998) was a general review of the teaching profession conducted at a federal level and the Australian Government Response to A Class Act (1999) provides a good point of comparison with the Australian Government Response to TEMAG (2015) (Mockler, 2018).

The term "partnership" or "school-university partnership" does not rate a single mention in the Australian Government Response to A Class Act (1999). Other related terms such as collaboration are discussed in relation to a range of topics including implementing Information and Communication Technology (ICT) frameworks, for developing the system of teacher registration, and for developing a national campaign to "attract high quality applicants to the teaching profession" (p. 10). Collaboration is said to be needed for "the purposes of enhancing the status and quality of the teaching profession" (p. 2). The authors of this government response seem to be aware of the issue of "historical amnesia" (Vick,

2006) in teacher education and note that “the apparent decline in status is not a recent phenomenon and was evident also over a period when a number of the measures which the majority report proposes to re-introduce were in place” (p. 2). This acknowledgement aligns with Carlgren’s (1988) idea that the teachers we have are never the one’s we want. It is also a critical point with respect to School-University Partnerships, which are presented as new solutions to problems in teacher education and yet are at times defined by what are past practices of teacher education (White & Forgasz, 2016). Some of the similar terms that have also been used to describe partnerships in other policies including “close relationships” and “integration” were not used in relation to connections between schools and universities in this policy.

The main “problems” produced (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016) in the Australian Government Response to A Class Act (1999) seem to be related to the status of teaching and that we do not have the teachers we want or need. This problem is also produced in later policies such as the Australian Government Response to Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (2015) but with School-University Partnerships prominent as the proposed solution. The central “problem” produced in the policies is similar in that they both identify teacher education as inadequate. This policy provides evidence that partnerships were not identified by the Australian Government of the day as the solution to the identified problems of teacher education, even though there is some consistency in the “problem” identified.

The Senate review itself, A Class Act (1998), did contain some discussion of partnerships but it was not just about the running of professional experience placement, its adopted usage in TEMAG and AITSL (2011, 2015). Partnerships were discussed in relation to working with families and students, professional development programs such as the National Professional Development Program (NPDP) incorporating Innovative Links and the National Schools Network and in relation to initial teacher education. The problem being addressed by partnerships in initial teacher education is laid out starkly as “the lack of communication between university education departments and schools in the development and implementation of teacher training programs. As a consequence, it was suggested such programs often failed to address the concerns of schools or to meet their needs” (p. 195). The discourses of partnership evident in this quote frames partnerships as being about professional experience placement but it also links to partnerships as a bureaucratic

requirement and partnerships as relationships. These discourses of partnership were also identified in the participant interviews, with evidence of each of these three discourses in section 6.2 of Chapter 6.

In this Australian Government review from more than 20 years ago the idea of "partnerships" is identified as a possible solution to the problem of teacher education programs not addressing "the concerns of schools". The report also discusses the debate around whether teacher education should be university-based or school-based and concludes that it ought to be both, suggesting "models of integration" to "overcome the current divide between practice and theory" (p. 200) whereby pre-service teachers would work almost full time with declining supervision towards the end of their degree or spend two days a week at university and three days at school. These types of arrangements are almost universally labelled as "partnerships" in the present but do not attract this label in A Class Act (1998). The notion of "partnerships" was not taken up in the Australian Government Response to A Class Act (1999) showing that School-University Partnerships have not always been dominant in Australian teacher education.

The Australian Government Response to A Class Act (1999) was the main subject of interest for this analysis because it provides a clearer indication of the intention of the government of the day in terms of how it intends to act on the report (Mockler, 2018). The absence of "partnerships" or "School-University Partnerships" from the Australian Government Response stands in contrast to the prominence of partnerships in the Australian Government Response to Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) (2015). This analysis of the Australian Government Response to A Class Act (1999) provides evidence that School-University Partnerships have not always been produced as the solution to identified problems with schools and teachers. The concerns about a "divide" between schools and universities, "practice and theory" were there, and the suggested solutions were focused on more time in schools. In the Australian Government Response to A Class Act (1999) there is no explicit mention of partnerships but some of the proposed problems and solutions are very similar to the discourses of partnership evident in later policies and in both the scholarly literature explored in Chapter 2 and the findings in Chapter 6 and 7.

5.6 The production of truth and knowledge in partnerships policy

In this section I provide a discussion of the discourses of School-University Partnerships identified through the policy analysis conducted above with a focus on how truth and knowledge are produced. Foucault argued in his study of sexuality that the importance of the emergence of the term sexuality shouldn't be overestimated or underestimated (Foucault, 1985/1990). I draw on this idea in my examination of the discourses of partnership in education policy. I explore how the presence of discourses of partnership have shifted over time in the policies examined.

In the analysis of policy throughout sections 5.3-5.6 I have shown that discourses of School-University Partnerships are dominant in 2011-2020 policy in teacher education. I have then shown, by contrast, how partnerships have been produced in two specific policies during 2000-2010 in much broader ways. In the era of the Smarter Schools National Partnerships there were a wide range of practices produced under the banner of partnerships with what I have argued are "excessively broad" (Clifford & Millar, 2008, p.11) definitions of partnership.

In the final policy analysed, the Australian Government Response to A Class Act (1999), I identify the absence of any mention of partnerships or School-University Partnerships. I also identify evidence of similar notions of teacher education and descriptions of practices that I argue would likely attract the label "partnerships" in the present. This shows that there are some persistent discourses of teacher education that are evident in this policy from more than 20 years ago, but not attracting the label of "partnership".

5.7 Partnerships in policy over time

School-University Partnerships are prominent across a range of education and teacher education policy documents over the past three decades. Drawing on a Foucauldian genealogical approach and utilising Bacchi and Goodwin's (2016) approach to policy analysis, I have identified a range of problems and solutions related to School-University Partnerships that have been produced in policy.

I began this policy analysis with recent policies in initial teacher education and presented evidence that there has been a narrowing focus and narrowing definition of School-University Partnerships. I show how the "problems" have been constructed as a lack

of formality and a need for closer integration. School-University Partnerships have been framed as being about the arrangements for professional experience placement.

Through the policy analysis from 5.3-5.5 I show that School-University Partnerships have not always been narrowly focused on initial teacher education. Even as recently as the Smarter Schools National Partnerships (2009-2013) there were partnerships across the focus areas of literacy, numeracy and low SES contexts where the emphasis was on different levels of government working together to improve "student outcomes", measured by NAPLAN results.

In sections 5.3-5.5 I also show that while there have been persistent problems identified in teacher education, School-University Partnerships haven't always been prominent as the solution. A closer look at the Australian Government Response to A Class Act (1999) shows that they managed to escape a mention in the plans for improving the status of the teaching profession. In contrast, a more recent review of teacher education, conducted by the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group, and the government response (2015), is captivated by School-University Partnerships in teacher education as "the single most important" (p. 11) way to improve teaching and teachers. The latest review into initial teacher education, released in early 2022, continued to highlight School-University Partnerships as a central feature of teacher education. In the report, "Next Steps: Report of the Quality Initial Teacher Education Review", it is recommended that, "strong partnerships between higher education providers and schools must continue to be a priority in the delivery of ITE" (Department of Education, Skills and Employment, 2022, p. 59).

Partnerships have become increasingly seen as the solution and the way in which they are conceived has changed significantly. In the most recent document analysed, Accreditation Standards (AITSL, 2015), partnerships need to be "formal, in writing" and are framed as contractual agreements between stakeholders. Just four years earlier those same partnerships needed to be "enduring" (AITSL, 2011b) while in A Class Act (1998), "high standards of teacher education, especially initial teacher education" were identified as being promoted by working to "foster partnerships between all those involved" (p. 209).

This chapter has provided further evidence that School-University Partnerships are not new in Australian teacher education. They have been conceived more broadly in the past, and in the present, there has been a narrowing of focus to initial teacher education, and in particular the professional experience placement. Across Chapters 6 and 7 I provide

evidence that this pattern in policy is also being produced in School-University Partnerships in practice through my analysis of participant interviews.

Chapter 6

The discourses of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education

6.1 Introduction

In the previous findings chapter, I explored the discourses of partnership in teacher education policy. I showed the way knowledge and power are joined together in discourse (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016) within education policy on School-University Partnerships. As part of the genealogical approach used in this research (outlined in section 4.3), I demonstrated shifts in the discourses of partnerships over time. In policy, School-University Partnerships have narrowed from including a wide range of activities to becoming a regime of truth in initial teacher education. In this chapter, I turn to the participants to explore their perceptions of School-University Partnerships. My main finding that I present in this chapter is that School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education have been discursively constructed by participants as a widespread and varying practice. Within the discourses of partnership, there are a range of goals and purposes identified with partnerships ranging from one-off topic specific projects to long-running multi-layered programs. Partnerships were at times initiated by teachers and schools in areas of need and at other times required for administrative or bureaucratic purposes. Partnerships were described by participants in ways that demonstrate the ambiguity of the concept and it's continued functioning as a "floating and empty signifier" (Burgos, 2003, p. 55).

In this chapter I draw on the Foucauldian conception of discourse outlined in Section 3.10 of Chapter 3 and use it to interpret participant descriptions of partnership. Firstly, I present evidence from my participant interviews that demonstrate the widespread and varying discourses of School-University Partnerships. I classify these varied notions of partnership according to nine separate discursive conceptualisations. In section 6.3 I present my discussion of these discourses of partnership and I argue that the widespread and varied discourses of partnership lead to their production as everything and nothing. In my analysis in Chapter 7, I provide evidence of some resistance to School-University Partnerships.

6.2 School-University Partnerships: a widespread practice of teacher education

The findings of this research are that School-University Partnerships were discursively constructed as a widespread practice of teacher education. Participants working across a range of roles in schools and universities, as well as in policy roles and in a government department and accreditation bodies discussed a wide range of past and present School-University Partnerships that they had been involved in. Many of the participants talked at length about a significant number of different partnerships over their careers. In this chapter I outline the many and varied discursive constructions of partnership evident in the interview data.

Working within the poststructural research paradigm for this study, I have drawn on a Foucauldian conception of discourse, outlined in section 3.9 of Chapter 3. In formulating my findings, I have drawn on the research methods described in section 4.4.5 of Chapter 4.

6.2.1 Discursive conceptualization #1: Partnerships as professional experience placement

Participants were asked to describe their experiences with School-University Partnerships and Helen, a teacher education academic began her response with this example:

> I was teaching the science curriculum unit, secondary and I wanted my teachers to go out into schools so I'd sort of contacted some local primary schools so that my secondary students could go out – my secondary teacher ed students could go out into the schools to be able to you know practise so they taught a lesson three times to one group of students then another group of students then another group of students. So that was my initial touching base.

In this situation the partnership is constructed as pre-service teachers going into schools and practising their teaching. Another teacher education academic, Tara, described her involvement in School-University Partnerships by saying:

> So originally I'm a teacher in secondary schooling and I guess my first – we're tracing back to in my teaching career, I often had preservice teachers as a supervisor but it wasn't until I had a role in the [partnership program] which was a government initiative that was around bridging that divide, I guess, between theory and practice and I was employed by the Department of Education to be the [pre-service teacher supervisor].

The examples provided by Tara here are focussed on pre-service teachers spending time in schools on professional experience placements. I interpret Tara's comment here as identifying her time as a supervisor of pre-service teachers as related to School-University Partnership but she then qualifies this by saying, "but it wasn't until I had a role in" a particular partnership program which seems to suggest she sees this as her initial foray into partnerships. The first part of this response from Tara points to her understanding of partnerships as being about supervising pre-service teachers on professional experience placement. I interpret her comment as distinguishing her employment on "a government initiative" as her first "official" role in a partnership whilst saying that her work supervising pre-service teachers whilst employed as a classroom teacher was also part of her partnership experience.

Rachel, a school principal, echoes this idea that partnerships are about pre-service teachers spending time in schools, and argues that it should be more time:

> I'd like to see them back in the schools more often than they currently are. I think it's - their first year out - we've got two graduates here this year, and I see one in particular, he's here at 7:45 and he's still here at 5:30 and not - I don't think he realises just how much he has to learn, just about children and engaging with children. We might deliver content at university and my understanding is that there's less amount of placement than probably when I went through my teacher training, but learning in high quality - if we could have high quality learning and high quality schools I think our teacher education would be massively improved. But you can't just put them anywhere because they won't care what they might need. And obviously my interpretation of what high quality education is is going to be different to the next person so there's the grey there, perhaps, but I'd love to see them in schools more, again in staggered - at staggered - that our job is staggered learning.
>
> I think Valley University do - my experience with Valley University in the last couple of years, their fourth year students come three times to the school; once in February, one in June and I think the other one's around November. So they started to get a real sense of, this is what the style of the year might be like, and I think that they're for like - it's three weeks, four weeks and six weeks, or something like that.

Here Rachel is discussing the importance of pre-service teachers spending more time in schools but also highlighting the importance of the timing. From Rachel's comments above,

she wants pre-service teachers to “get a real sense of” the school year and seems to connect this to School-University Partnerships. I interpret Rachel’s response as meaning that partnerships are an avenue for pre-service teachers to be “in schools more” which is something she would “love to see”. The discourses of partnership evident in Rachel’s comments highlight a number of important ideas present in policy and literature, particularly around the centrality of professional experience to initial teacher education (Jones et al, 2016) which is framed here as what School-University Partnerships are about. Rachel’s reference to her work with Valley University relates to a specific government funded School-University Partnership program.

When asked whether School-University Partnerships are central to the future of teacher education, Helen had this response:

> I do because it’s very important to – certainly in science education, to give our students an experience of being successful at teaching science. And our students really like it and they think that there should be more of it.

This comment seems to conflate placement or time in schools with partnership. The aspect of the partnership being highlighted seems to focus on practice teaching under the supervision of a registered teacher.

The discourse of partnership as professional experience placement was also evident in the response from Brigid. She started off talking about her early partnership experiences:

> Okay, my first one was when I was a student myself in an innovative Dip Ed where I worked two days a week in a school, Waterfront Tech, and we were there as a group and the school was deliberately working with the Dip Ed – there were about 12 schools only and we all went there as interdisciplinary groups so that was a really – that was my experience as a student and –that was City University Course B. Very unusual in the early ‘70s you know – only lasted about four years.

Here Brigid draws on her own time as a pre-service teacher in the 1970s and describes a partnership program involving an interdisciplinary group spending two days a week in a school. This example, as with those above, draws on a discourse of partnerships as professional experience placement or time in schools. I interpret Brigid’s comments as meaning that because it involved pre-service teachers spending two days a week in a school it is an example of a School-University Partnership.

The discourses of partnership discussed in this section are focused on pre-service teachers in initial teacher education courses spending time in schools engaged in teaching under supervision either as part of a compulsory professional experience placement or in addition to it. In this framing partnerships are constituted as professional experience placement or time in schools.

6.2.2 Discursive conceptualization #2: Partnerships as relationships

Many participants described a range of partnerships that they had been involved in and at times distinguished between these partnerships. A central distinguishing feature was that of strong interpersonal relationships between participants in the partnerships. Helen discussed one partnership that she was involved in:

> I'm part of a program at the moment where we're – it's just finished – we've engaged with 10 schools in the [local] region and about eight of those sort of saw it through for two years, two-and-a-half years and it was a real partnership in that you know… twice a year we'd do some PD [professional development] with them for two days and they'd come back after 10 or 12 weeks and report back and we had a project officer who worked with them throughout that period of time so we did four sequences of those.
>
> And it became a real partnership, just that – oh it's very different to what I was talking about before in that it was sort of this little community of people who were sharing experiences and trying things out and that sort of thing so that was really good.

I interpret Helen's comments here to be framing as a "real partnership" that which builds relationships over time and develops into a "little community of people". I understand Helen to mean that partnerships are made up of relationships between people in schools and universities.

Both Wendy and Deb also describe a range of different partnerships and seem to separate out what they see as a partnership from some other activities that were better described using other terms. Deb describes her experiences of partnership that felt to her like "somebody sent the email and ticked that box" as a "one-way partnership" which she then acknowledged wasn't a partnership. Deb also said, "I mean it's great language, we're in partnership but what is the partnership?" She went on to suggest, "We might call them connections rather than partnerships". Wendy made a similar distinction when she described

“what we’re talking about here is resource-intensive personal partnerships ultimately that can be problematic to upscale”. Wendy talks about examples of government funded partnership programs and contrasts these with some other experiences she has had of partnership:

> they’re kind of the government’s attempt to try to upscale what are intimate partnerships, I think. And I would say like if you want to be particular networks and partnerships are two different things so partnerships are much more personal, networks are more – less personal and I would say those things are more networks than partnerships because you just can’t have those personal relationships or closer relationships.

I interpret Wendy’s comments here as highlighting the interpersonal nature of partnerships and suggesting that without these personal relationships it isn’t a partnership. When Deb talked about some of her experiences with School-University Partnerships she talked about staff from the university who visited the school briefly and noted that in the past:

> many more supervisors would come out and meet the staff who are working with the students and have quite a connection. That doesn’t happen anymore. You have your supervisor who comes out for – oh there's one coming next week and he wants to spend 20 minutes with the student not seeing him teach and five minutes with their supervising teacher. Okay so that’s just a check-in to me, that’s not building any partnership, that’s a check-in saying how are you going? Is everything okay? I’m out of here.

In the above comment from Deb she echoes Wendy’s earlier comments that without meeting with the staff and having “quite a connection” she doesn’t see it as a partnership. She went on to describe her more recent partnership experience:

> because they’re all contracted so it’s whoever you get. And often – and you don’t get the same people and so - there's only one other university where I’ve had the same person for three years and she’s wonderful and she’ll call.

In these comments Deb seems to be highlighting the role of relationships and makes reference to the employment conditions of the visiting university staff as “all contracted” leading to a situation where you do not have the opportunity to build relationships because “you don’t get the same people”. She contrasts this situation with one university where they

have had consistent contact. I interpret Deb's comments as meaning that consistent staffing leading to "a connection" are necessary precursors for what she sees as a "partnership" rather than the alternative which she frames as "a check-in" followed by a dismissive "I'm out of here". Zeichner (2021) describes the situation with professional experience placement, or clinical experience work as being "low status" in "both higher education and school settings" and "which are the most expensive and labor intensive aspect of teacher education programs, have been consistently underfunded and staffed by the least powerful and most transient staff within university programs" (p. 3).

David, a school principal, describes below the importance of relationships to the success of the partnership work he has been involved in. In this example, the discourse around relationships builds on the premise that partnerships are about pre-service teachers on professional experience placement.

> Look, the benefits are that there is a university person here for the preservice teachers. What I was finding was that there were a lot of preservice teachers that were just – would turn up on the first day, leave on the last day, we'd have no contact with their supervisor, there'd be no connection between what the supervisor was wanting for this individual preservice teacher and for – sometimes for the preservice teachers it was just a random person coming into the school they've never met before, talking to them about their teaching experience and I honestly can't see how that can be beneficial for them whatsoever. I mean teaching is – there's a whole range of things to teaching, it's a skill, it's a profession but it's also an emotionally draining sort of tear-jerking experience from day-to-day and I think if universities aren't supporting preservice teachers to understand that there are going to be challenges then when they go out of their first you know into their first real job that might be a little bit difficult for them.
>
> So I think those – I would think that the universities need to take a responsibility for building the relationship with the school so that when the preservice teacher comes in the university is confident that that environment is going to be supportive of that preservice teacher. It's a bit the sa – you know I'll use the analogy again with the work experience, it'll be the same with work experience where you know sort of quality-check the workplaces to make sure that you know the kids aren't going to be exposed to dangerous people, dangerous situations, that they're going to

be supported, all those sorts of things so you know whilst schools are generally really positive environments I think you know a preservice teacher can get gobbled up by the business of a school as well and if a university's not going to be on the front foot about building that relationship and setting that preservice teacher up to succeed in that environment then I think it does make it really difficult for them.

The way in which David describes the partnership work above suggests that the university "building the relationship with the school" is to ensure that professional experience is going to be successful for pre-service teachers. This response from David links the first discursive conceptualization with this discourse of partnerships as relationships. The framing of partnerships as being about relationship building for the success of pre-service teachers was also described by Tara, a teacher education academic, who talked about her partnership role as working across the school and the university with the pre-service teachers, "I started to feel like it was around providing a bit more of a seamless transition for our preservice teachers when we put them out into our schools to undertake placement".

Tara talked about how some of the past practices in initial teacher education had been that:

> we would send the preservice teachers – almost like popping a postage stamp on their head and off they go and we'd post them out to the school and the school does what they have to do and they kind of post them back… so it was around ensuring that there was a connectedness between someone at the school and someone at the university.

In Tara's response she makes reference to a "connectedness" which has parallels with other participant mentions of connection. I interpret her comment as being about building relationships across the school and university in order to support the pre-service teachers in their time in schools. Tara positions this as in contrast to a style of placement that resembles posting pre-service teachers "out to the school" who then "posts them back".

Rachel talked about an example of partnership with a university that she saw as positive way of organising professional experience placement:

> something like that where they have an opportunity to build some relationships and you often found that they actually still did some work with you when they actually weren't in there so they started to develop a little bit of a connection with teachers and say, oh I'd like to come on that excursion or I'd love to help you with that or

whatever it might be. But that - yeah I'd love to see more of that type of involvement for teacher education. Universities playing their part but in relationship with schools.

In this example from Rachel also mentions “connection” and that pre-service teachers get to “build some relationships” which created further opportunities to be involved with the school such as attending excursions.

Participants centred relationships in their discursive conceptualisations of School-University Partnerships, particularly in relation to professional experience placement. The importance of relationships to successful School-University Partnerships has also been noted in reports (Kruger et al, 2009: Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group, 2014) and in the teacher education literature (Jones et al, 2016). In Goodlad’s (1991) often cited definition, School-University Partnerships were characterized as a “mutually beneficial interinstitutional relationship” (p. 59). The importance of relationships continues to be identified as central to successful partnerships (Day et al, 2021).

6.2.3 Discursive conceptualization #3: Partnerships as an opportunity for schools to influence initial teacher education

David, a school principal, talked about influencing initial teacher education through his involvement in partnerships. He talked about his reasons below:

> so too has the classroom teacher experience changed a lot and now that’s something that I’ve wanted to be able to you know provide some support or influence or whatever to the universities that you know that have been open to having that sort of input from schools.

He went on to say:

> Yeah and I think it’s that old story, if you’re going to whinge about the skillset the grads come out with and you’re not going to do anything about it well you get what you get, don’t you?

David talked about what he saw as the benefits of his involvement in School-University Partnerships:

> I think also just to be able to – I think just as you know systematically just have a bit more of input into the universities of a contemporary take on learning and teaching because that you know as I just said then that’s something we’ve got modern spaces here so we have to ha – we can’t fit that square peg into the round hole, we’ve got to

> change the way that we you know that we approach the learning and teaching setup. And we've learnt a lot through that journey and it's been really positive what we've been able to learn and I think being able to support the universities to maybe put some of that into practice so that we're moving away from this sage on the stage teacher sort of setup to you know really empowering kids to take ownership of their learning and you know be more responsible for their learning and that's – there's a bit of a skill in that for teachers.

Here David is talking about his school and their experiences with "modern spaces" for learning and teaching and the opportunity for "input into the universities". I interpret his comments, including his reference to the "sage on the stage" model of teaching as a reference to wanting to make sure that graduate teachers are prepared for the model of teaching and learning that is happening at his school. For David, I interpret his point as being that School-University Partnerships provide an avenue for him to have "input" and influence initial teacher education to ensure Pre-Service Teachers have experience with the "contemporary" approach to teaching and learning in the "modern spaces" of his school.

Helen, a teacher education academic, also talked about partnerships as an opportunity for schools "to be active contributors to what we do in teacher education". She also described how as part of one of her funded partnership projects they:

> interviewed principals and teachers and I listened to what my principals and teachers were saying and so we modified things…and then as a result making sure that what we were doing was considered useful for the schools.

So for Helen partnerships were an opportunity to seek input from schools to influence the way in which initial teacher education is conducted.

There was also some discussion of universities and teacher education academics influencing schools as well as schools influencing other schools involved in partnerships together. Craig, a school principal, spoke of the influence of his partnership involvement as multi-directional. He spoke of his involvement with universities as a way to have influence but also spoke about the value he saw in working with a range of schools and universities. In talking about one of his partnerships Craig said:

> I think from my point of view part of what appeals is the fact that it is across – it's cross-sectoral and so you can become quite insular sometimes and just look within

your own sector and so it gives you an opportunity to link in with others and find out what they're doing.

Craig works in a faith-based school context and was referring to government and independent schools, as well as a university, that were involved in this partnership. Helen also made reference to this multi-directional influence when she talked about her work with schools where she was able to draw on her skills to assist schools while at the same time felt that "engaging with schools helped her".

Partnerships were identified by participants in these instances as an opportunity for schools to influence what happens in teacher education. Multi-directional influence is a feature of some of the frameworks for partnerships discussed in the literature in section 2.7 of Chapter 2. The partners influencing one another was identified as a feature of "transformative" partnerships in the framework of Kenny et al (2014).

6.2.4 Discursive conceptualization #4: Partnerships as a teacher recruitment and retention strategy

Both Craig and Brigid described examples of School-University Partnerships that worked with pre-service teachers enrolled in initial teacher education courses and schools that have difficulty with recruitment and retention of teachers. Brigid described her partnership work in a number of regional and rural areas:

> we did a lot of work developing up community-orientated placement and so the partnering there wasn't just with the schools and the region but you know the authority, whether it was Catholic or state department, but also with community agencies so it might be the local council at Mountain town or the Indigenous health group which was very active in Forestville. It might have been a big employer group that – the young professionals in town who were looking to make sure that teachers joined the young professionals network because that was a really important way to keep people in the town, to have a group of people you know multi professions.

Craig also talked about engaging with the community as central to this partnership:

> The premise behind it was essentially that there were lots of students going into education but they weren't necessarily applying for jobs in the [area] of Melbourne and so it was to try and get some of those students to visit us and have a focus and be

part of our community so – and that's been quite – oh very successful from my point of view.

In both cases pre-service teachers were invited to participate in the program and then agreed to complete their placements within a geographical area where the partnership aimed to promote teaching in those schools. In the example from Craig the schools are on the urban fringes and with communities who are socio-economically disadvantaged while in Brigid's partnership the schools were regional and rural. Both of these programs involved a cohort model for university classes with Brigid describing how "it was the class that went alongside the placement". These two programs also involved a focus on community with Brigid describing how the pre-service teachers did "in depth research on the community". Craig described the program he was involved in as trying to get pre-service teachers applying for jobs in these schools by getting "some of those students to visit us and have a focus and be part of our community".

Partnerships have been identified in these examples as a strategy to recruit and retain teachers in a particular area of need. These two programs have similarities with the type of programs reported in the teacher education literature, with the goal of contributing to a problem of recruitment and retention of teachers or meeting the needs of particular cohorts of students such as partnerships with a focus on inclusive education (Bentley-Williams et al, 2017) or science education (Hobbs et al, 2015).

6.2.5 Discursive conceptualization #5: Partnerships as informal personal connections

Craig gave an example from when he was in a deputy principal role at a school where he got involved in a range of committees at the local university in a regional area and did things like "going to speak to their final year students around employability and things that we look for in staff and things like that". This example of partnership was described in a way that sounded informal and that he connected to his relationship with the Vice Chancellor, who was a member of the school board. Craig said that the Vice Chancellor "would inevitably ask me to do a whole range of different things" that in his view were "around having a secondary education voice" involved in "strategic planning" at the university.

In this example the School-University Partnership revolved around a professional relationship between a school leader and a university leader who were involved in the

institutions of the other. While in some ways this example is similar to discursive conceptualization of partnerships as influence or to that of partnerships as relationships, in this example the partnership is based around one inter-personal relationship from which a range of activities have evolved. The discursive construction of the above situation as a School-University Partnership shows that practices which differ in scope, size and time may still fall within the realm of partnerships as understood by this participant.

6.2.6 Discursive conceptualization #6: Partnership as fee for service work

In another example provided by Craig he described a three-year program where the school has joined with 20 schools and one university. The program involves the senior leadership of the school attending lectures at the university and then choosing from different topics such as "evidence-based research" or reading or writing and then "networking" with a number of other schools. Craig describes the partnership below:

> It basically goes for three years and essentially what happens is that you get eight seminar days for the year, they have a whole range of different lecturers if you like both from within City University and externally that present seminars and lectures and after a number of those you start to try and think about how can we implement some sort of project and have a focus? And the key aspect of it I think is the networking so you're working with other schools… you know so there was – I think there's two groups with a literacy focus, one is focused on writing, the other one is focused on reading.

Craig said that the idea was to "identify from your own school data" and "school improvement plan" what to focus on. The other schools included primary and secondary, special education settings, Catholic, government and independent schools. A particular feature of this program described by Craig as a School-University Partnerships was that it involved the school paying thousands of dollars to the university to participate in the program. In the case of his school they had received sponsorship from the school system to be involved. I asked Craig whether this partnership was connected with accepting students for placement his response was, "not necessarily although there is some sort of implied yeah - and so we are". It seemed that having students from this university for professional experience placement was not part of the formal agreement but that the connection had led the school to feel like it was "implied" that they would.

Craig explained that another part of the agreement was that "the school has to agree to appoint a person into a role" and "that's an additional cost that the school wears to try and drive the change you know whatever it is that you're trying to implement". This partnership described by Craig is multi-layered but with a focus on professional learning and implementing change in an area nominated by the school.

In talking about why his school had received funding from the school sector to be involved in this program, Craig said:

> they're sort of evaluating their whole sort of professional development model and just trying to see whether or not there are you know whether we tap into existing programs like the [the one described] or whether they develop their own you know and because they've got a really strong partnership with Urban University in a whole range of different forms, you know? Particularly providing professional learning for staff you know in masters programs.

Craig is speculating here on the motivation of the sector to be involved. He identifies the school sector as looking at the ways in which they resource professional learning for teachers and sees that this kind of program might be an effective way to allocate resources for professional learning.

The example of partnership provided above by Craig more closely resembles the sort of commercial arrangement when schools pay a provider for a program of professional learning for staff. The provider is a university but this program sounds more like service provision for a fee. Craig was the only participant to offer this type of professional learning arrangement as an example of a partnership. The way Craig describes the agreement to appoint someone in the school to a role as "the school has to agree" suggests that the partnership has established clear expectations for the partners. This example provides further evidence that School-University Partnerships are discursively constructed as a varied and widespread practice of teacher education and that the boundaries of what may be considered a partnership are not clear.

6.2.7 Discursive conceptualization #7: Partnership as professional learning for teachers

Rachel, a principal, talked about the "two most prominent" examples of School-University Partnerships in her career. She identifies two partnerships in professional learning

and research as the “ones that perhaps stand out for me” and these are ones that were initiated by her, with colleagues, in response to identified needs within the staff and school. In the section above, Craig described the details of his partnerships in terms of the activities that occurred, whereas Rachel’s description below has a focus on the effect of the partnership in terms of the approach to teaching taken by staff as a result:

> some teachers took that approach to professional learning up with gusto, and have really developed some terrific skills in pushing children's thinking beyond boundaries, but also viewing themselves as quite - the view of teacher as a researcher in the context of a classroom is quite different to the view of teacher as delivery of curriculum.

She is describing what she sees as the changes that occurred as a result of being involved in a School-University Partnership project that included professional learning for staff and a research component. The outcome of this project has included presentations at education conferences and publications jointly authored by the teachers and university academics involved in the partnership.

The other example described by Rachel was also a partnership in professional learning with a focus on mathematics education. She identified mathematics as “one of the areas of the curriculum that is not necessarily well taught”. She described the problem as being that most teachers “teach from their own experience where it's quite procedural” and so this project was about “viewing the teacher as a researcher in their own practice but through the lens of mathematics”. The project involved the teacher being filmed teaching a lesson and then “she then had to take that thinking away of what she'd noticed and observed about her students. She was interviewed and then she had to teach the following lesson… and then again review what had been going on”. As part of the project the university staff “talked to her a lot about why she made the decision she made and what was going on in the classroom about what interactions she had with children and what questions she asked”. In this example, School-University Partnerships are discursively constructed as a collaborative project, framed similarly to working with a “critical friend” to review your teaching practice and work together on developing pedagogy and curriculum.

As with Brigid and Craig’s examples involving attracting and retaining teachers, partnerships here have been developed to address a perceived need at the school level in relation to the curriculum area of mathematics. This example is reminiscent of the work of

Jones and colleagues (2016) who have written about the success of their partnerships working with Pre-Service Teachers and teachers in a specific curriculum area, in their case science education.

6.2.8 Discursive conceptualization #8: Partnership as topic specific projects

Esther, a partnerships project manager, was another participant who had a lengthy history of involvement in School-University Partnership projects. The bulk of her work was in teacher professional learning, although her most recent role was in initial teacher education. Esther provided numerous examples of curriculum development projects whereby university academics, teachers and other from Departments of Education worked together to develop resources and provide professional learning for teachers. Esther was employed by a university but had worked in the Department of Education in the 1990s and early 2000s. She described two projects she had worked on as similar in their structure:

> you applied for grant funding, you had to find a partner to work with you, you were provided with materials and resources developed by academics and then your partner worked with you on your school-based project and helped you sort of refine it, develop it, implement it.

Esther also talked about another partnership project she had worked on with a mathematics emphasis. She talked about the way the project operated and then some of the limitations of the university academics involved:

> some were great and did extraordinarily hard work and really worked with schools to try and make transformative practice and to try and research thoroughly what was happening and there was a few of them who went oh it's just part of the WAM [Work Allocation Model] and they didn't do an awful lot, really.

This comment from Esther seemed to position "transformative practice" as the goal of the partnership, an idea explored in Kenny et al's (2014) framework that identified "transformative partnerships" as those leading to change in both schools and universities. Esther continued with another example of an Information and Communication Technology (ICT) focused partnership in the era of Prime Minister Kevin Rudd and the "Education Revolution" during the first decade of the 21st Century. She describes this project as being led by an academic and having some distinctive features:

> It was the first project across Australia where every academic provider in the country worked together with Australian Government money but also they had to do a schools-based project so they were doing work to improve their own understanding of ICT [information communication technology] pedagogy, they were training up their pre-service teachers but then they had to trial it in schools to make sure it worked. So it was a really, really clever project.

This example links up a large range of educational institutions and provides an example whereby the project combines initial teacher education with professional learning for current teachers with a research component. This description also suggests an explicit acknowledgement that the project was also about university academics, as teacher educators, enhancing "their own understanding of [Information and Communication Technology] ICT pedagogy". This partnership, as described by Esther, seems to have a focus on pre-service teacher, teacher and academic learning in relation to information and communication technology.

Craig, a school principal, also described a School-University Partnership involving his school and a number of other schools in externally funded research. The research project had a focus on developing resources to meet literacy demands in senior secondary classrooms which he described as "an iterative process" where teachers try to develop "a more effective way of teaching a particular topic using particular resources" and then review that and make "subsequent alterations". He described it as having "an action research aspect". This example involved a multi-year project involving professional learning for teachers working with a team of researchers.

These examples from Esther and Craig focus on a range of one-off, topic specific projects and provide further evidence of the discursive construction of School-University Partnerships as a widespread practice of teacher education. Esther's examples occur over a lengthy period and therefore also highlight the breadth and longevity of partnerships in Australian teacher education.

6.2.9 Discursive conceptualization #9: Partnerships as a bureaucratic requirement

The discourses of partnership evident in the interview data included that of partnerships as an administrative activity and a bureaucratic requirement. Wendy discussed

numerous partnerships she had been involved in. She raised her concern about the kinds of partnership work that were "increasingly being required" which she referred to as "tick and flick". Wendy talked about her concern that partnerships ended up being a case of "yes, we've got 15 schools on our list" and that "when it becomes that kind of partnership that somebody can just sign off and say that we do, I think they're the ones that we need to avoid and try to resist". Here Wendy highlights the discursive construction of partnerships as widespread and as incorporating the kinds of practices she described as "administrative" where the "university needs to show how they're doing it".

Deb invoked a similar conceptualization when she talked about her experience with School-University Partnerships, particularly in her fifteen years in the role of pre-service teacher coordinator in her school.

> We've been in partnerships with a number of universities... All of them provide us with lists of students who need placements, all of them provide us with the necessary paperwork but very few will come to visit and make a human connection. Often I feel it's very one-way, it's the university's asking and drawing – putting down on the secondary schools to basically make placement. If you have trouble certainly call us but that's where the partnership sort of ends.

I interpret Deb's comments here as framing partnership as the provision of professional experience placements by schools to meet the university and pre-service teacher requirement for course completion and registration as a teacher. She goes on further to describe her perception of these partnerships, "I have personal contact with three universities who I can call but at the same time I still believe it's still a one-way partnership".

In the interview I then posed the question, "So would you call it a partnership then if it feels one-way?" to which Deb responded:

> No, it's very much – you often dread the email that comes with [various universities]. Okay, what do they want? It's more of we've ran out of placements, we can't place our kids, please help even though you've said [no].

Deb went on to describe how the school would nominate the method areas that they were able to host pre-service teachers in but they would still frequently get asked to take them. Deb said, "for example last year we said no more English/Humanities because we get bombarded". So while Deb and her school were willing to place pre-service teachers they didn't want to place a burden on the same teachers repeatedly.

Brigid, a teacher education academic, raised the issue of paperwork requirements in initial teacher education:

> I see the role of schools as having to be much more explicit about the future of the teaching profession and therefore at the moment I think the role of schools in most places is about oh well you'll take one this year and oh god, they got this stupid form to fill out.

I interpret Brigid's comment here as meaning that she would like to see schools involved in a more meaningful way in teacher education but that "at the moment" it is limited to fulfilling bureaucratic requirements.

The conceptualization of partnerships as an administrative burden was further raised by Deb when she described how her experience with School-University Partnerships in the area of professional experience placements had changed in her 15 years in the role:

It's just more emails now, that's it. I mean you know there's more information flow and a lot of it is too much flow from them down because we're in a school, we've got to do all our day-to-day business and the information they provide sometimes you think well yeah, somebody sent the email and ticked that box. There's not much follow-up.

Deb's comments here appear to echo those of Wendy in that they describe partnerships as working from a list and the idea that they involve someone ticking off a job to be done in the way Deb said, "somebody sent the email and ticked that box" and Wendy referred to an increasing trend in partnerships as "tick and flick". In these examples School-University Partnerships are conceptualised as an administrative and bureaucratic activity, completed to satisfy institutional requirements.

6.3 School-University Partnerships: everything and nothing

In this chapter I have shown that the discourses of School-University Partnership in Australian teacher education are messy and complex. School-University Partnerships are "constituted through discourse as an effect of power" (Weatherall et al, 2003, p. 275). Throughout section 6.2 I have shown the productive power in these discourses as partnerships are produced as everything and nothing. I have shown the breadth of discursive conceptualisation of School-University Partnerships evident in the data collected. Partnerships are discursively constructed as a widespread and varied practice, providing

evidence that partnerships continue to function as what Burgos (2003, p. 55) referred to as a “floating and empty signifier”.

School-University Partnerships were produced in discourse as equivalent to or synonymous with professional experience placement. This is not a surprising finding given the prominence of partnerships in initial teacher education that I have shown in the scholarly literature (see section 2.5.1). I have also provided evidence in Chapter 5 that the discourses of School-University Partnership in recent policies in initial teacher education have a focus on professional experience placement. Discourses are where “power and knowledge are joined together” (Foucault, 1976/1998, p. 100). The production of School-University Partnerships in discourse as professional experience placement is an example of the productive effects of power. The notion that School-University Partnerships are equivalent to professional experience placement is “sayable” as a “form of truth” (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, p. 21). This was not the only discourse of partnership evident though.

The discourse of partnerships as relationships was also identified in this chapter. This discourse produces partnerships as intangible but also as made up of practices. Partnerships were identified by participants as involving repeated contact to “build[ing] the relationships” and to be “here for” (David) pre-service teachers. Relationships were a distinguishing feature of “real partnership” which involved “sharing experiences” (Helen). In this construction of School-University Partnerships, they are made up of people who do things together. This discourse of partnership sits in contrast with the discourse identified in 6.2.5 of partnerships as informal personal connections. In the discourse identified in 6.2.5 School-University Partnerships were produced as a connection which led to assisting one another. Partnerships in this example were framed not as the relationship between institutions or even the individuals but more as an arrangement whereby the two parties helped each other out because they were known to each other.

A range of other discourses of partnership were identified in the interview data. School-University Partnerships were discursively constructed as an opportunity for schools to influence initial teacher education (6.2.3) while partnerships were also produced as opportunities for professional learning for teachers (6.2.7) and as topic specific projects (6.2.8). The findings of this study show that School-University Partnerships are prolific in Australian teacher education and that they involve a broad range of activities and are for a range of purposes.

I have presented evidence in Chapter 5 in sections 5.4 and 5.5 that the discourses of partnerships in policy have produced School-University Partnerships as a wide range of practices. Across section 6.2 above I have shown that School-University Partnerships were produced in discourse as widespread in teacher education and comprising a variety of different practices with a variety of aims or espoused purposes.

I argue that the discourses of School-University Partnership identified in the data above make "true" that School-University Partnerships are everything and nothing. The discourses of partnership produce knowledge about partnerships and what participants "know" to be "true" is that partnerships include any and all activities, networks or connections between schools and universities. Partnerships can be about relationships, or they can be about bureaucratic activities and box ticking; they can be about the running of one professional experience placement, or they can be long-term projects involving collaborative work between teachers and academics. This production of School-University Partnerships in discourse as "excessively broad" (Clifford & Millar, 2008, p.11) is an effect of power. The effects of the production of School-University partnership as everything and nothing renders them theoretically and conceptually incoherent. In policy and in the interview data, School-University Partnerships are presented with confidence as "something" and yet in this chapter I show that they are so broadly conceived as to be almost meaningless.

The data presented in this chapter shows that as with the discourses of partnership in policy identified in Chapter 5, the discourses of partnership identified in interview data also show that there is considerable ambiguity about what partnerships are and what they are for. The discourses of partnership identified in both policy and interview data show that partnerships are not being produced as a cohesive whole. The discourses produce partnerships as everything and nothing. School-University Partnerships can be anything involving a school and a university. While some participant responses attempted to argue for partnerships as being *something*, such as a relationship, others framed partnerships in relation to contractual agreements that didn't have an emphasis on the personnel involved. I argue based on the empirical evidence presented in this chapter that through the discourses of School-University Partnerships they are produced as everything and therefore also as nothing. School-University Partnerships are so broadly conceived that they include almost *anything*, rendering the notion of School-University Partnerships almost meaningless.

I have shown in this chapter that School-University Partnerships are not being produced as any one thing. The discourses of School-University Partnerships constitute them as a whole range of things, actions, and practices loosely connected to teacher education. School-University Partnerships have been discursively conceptualised as everything and nothing. While in this chapter I have explored the discourses of School-University Partnerships across a range of aspects of teacher education, including for initial teacher education, research and professional learning, in the next chapter I highlight the specific discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education. As with my policy analysis in Chapter 5, as well as the broad production of School-University Partnerships in discourse, there is also evidence of an increasing prominence of partnerships in initial teacher education. I showed in Chapter 5 that while partnerships were evident in a range of teacher education policy across the first twenty years of the 21st Century, there was a narrowing of focus more recently on School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education. I explore this in my interview data in Chapter 7.

Chapter 7

School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education

7.1 Introduction

In Chapter 6 I have shown the discursive conceptualisation of partnerships to include a range of practices and to be widespread in teacher education. I have shown how School-University Partnerships are discursively produced as widespread and varied and in ways which render partnerships as everything and nothing. I have also shown in Chapter 5 how these discourses of partnership that produce partnerships as varied and widespread have been a feature of Australian teacher education policy.

In this chapter, I investigate the discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education as a particular instantiation of partnerships, with specific effects. Firstly, I conceptualise the discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education as a Foucauldian "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131) and I provide evidence from my participant interviews to support this claim. Secondly, I provide evidence of some resistance to School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth. Thirdly, I draw a link to the discourses of School-University Partnership in initial teacher education identified in Chapter 5 which also show that there has been an increasing emphasis on initial teacher education in School-University Partnerships policy in the past decade.

7.2 Discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are circulating as a regime of truth

I argue that School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are functioning as a "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131). I explore this regime of truth as discursively constructed by participants. This supports my earlier claim in Chapter 5, section 5.3.4, that in initial teacher education policy School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth. A regime of truth is best understood by Foucault's statement that it is "the type of discourse society harbours and causes to function as true" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 23). I draw on Gore's (1993) idea that "society" can be "conceived at a more local level whereby discourses and practices can contain a local politics of truth" (p. 56). In this research the local level is understood as the field of teacher education. Lorenzini (2015) said that it is

a “regime” “because truth is produced, sustained, valorized and regulated by a series of mechanisms, techniques and procedures” (p. 3). Gore, Ladwig and King (2004) argued that a regime of truth describes “the way in which truth and power operate in tandem” (p. 1). Further details around the conceptualisation of regime of truth used in this study are provided in Chapter 3, section 3.7.1. I present data from this study as evidence of the discursive construction of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education functioning as a regime of truth. In the previous chapter I explored the discursive construction of School-University Partnerships as a widespread practice of teacher education and here I focus on their particularities in relation to initial teacher education.

School-University Partnerships are prominent as a strategy for improving initial teacher education (Allen et al, 2013; Green et al, 2020; Jones et al, 2016; Zeichner, 2021). Despite the history of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education that have targeted teacher professional learning and research (Mockler, 2013; Sachs, 1997), the data for this study provide evidence that while School-University Partnerships are discursively constructed as a widespread and varying practice they are at the same time also frequently a reference to the practices of initial teacher education. The discourses of School-University Partnerships in relation to initial teacher education positioned them in ways which suggested that rather than being one way to structure teacher preparation, they were *the* way. Here I draw on data from this study to illustrate this.

7.2.1 Partnerships as inevitable

Tara, a teacher educator talks about School-University Partnerships and the future of teacher education:

> the alignment of schools and universities is probably the only way forward to really ensure our initial teach – you know our preservice teachers have an understanding of how schools operate.

Tara’s description of partnerships as “the only way forward” conveys the expectation that School-University Partnerships are *the way*, rather than *a way* of contributing positively to initial teacher education. I interpret Tara’s comment to mean that she frames pre-service teacher understanding of the operation of schools as what School-University Partnerships are for. The purpose of School-University Partnerships here is that they provide pre-service teachers with exposure to schools, commonly described as experience. Tara goes on to argue

that “we need to partner with them more strongly and vice versa, schools understanding what they do here when they’re at university”. I understand Tara to be framing partnerships as staff at schools and universities having a better understanding of the work of the other. Tara’s comments position School-University Partnerships as central to the present and future of initial teacher education.

Another participant, Christine, an education policy worker, when asked about whether there were alternatives to School-University Partnerships responded, “I haven't thought about it. Yeah, we seem to be on a trajectory of we've got them and now how do we improve them which is good”. I interpret Christine’s comments, like Tara’s, to indicate a general acceptance of School-University Partnerships in teacher education. She asks the question, “how do we improve them?” which has been explored in many studies on School-University Partnerships which have tried to identify the key features of effective partnerships (Jones et al, 2016; Kruger et al, 2009) or the best models for partnerships (Bernay et al, 2020). My interpretation of Christine’s comments above are that she admits that she hasn’t considered alternatives to partnership and that she feels they are broadly accepted. The comment from Christine, “I haven’t thought about it” is evidence of the repressive effects of power resulting from the circulation of School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education. School-University Partnerships have established themselves as normative in initial teacher education.

Christine went on to say, “we certainly haven’t been considering any options or nobody’s been talking about other alternatives”. This suggests a perception from Christine that there is broad acceptance of School-University Partnerships. I argue that this example is evidence that in initial teacher education, School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth. This has created a situation where they are not subject to substantive critique. Foucault (1984, p. 343) argued that “everything is dangerous” and that this was why critique was so important. As Gore (1993) argued in her study of critical and feminist pedagogies, that while these approaches might seem positive that rather than opening up “spaces of freedom” (Foucault, 1982/1988, p.11), they were limiting possibilities. While School-University Partnerships may appear as positive opportunities for collaborative working, the way in which they are functioning is as a dominant practice in initial teacher education that limits opportunities to think otherwise.

Carol, who works at a regulatory body, talked about what she sees as the important role for partnerships, “So while the partnership is essential for managing the professional experience component I think it’s a broader relationship that – can really add value to both sides of the fence”. For Carol partnerships are “essential” for professional experience placement but she is also identifying other potential benefits of partnerships. Carol identifies the management of professional experience as the reason why partnerships are essential. Carol describes partnerships in a way that makes them sound like a functional tool for multiple organisations to work together effectively. This is the view of partnerships as “benevolent, neutral and pragmatic” described by Cardini (2006, p. 394) and aligns with the descriptions in 6.2.9 that framed partnership as an administrative or bureaucratic requirement. For Carol, she also sees partnerships as involving a “broader relationship” and her description of the value that can be added to both sides sounds like the all-important “mutual benefits” frequently described in the partnership literature (Goodlad, 1991; Green et al, 2020; Manton et al, 2020).

Esther, had this response to the question of alternatives to School-University Partnerships:

> I mean I think the two are intertwined, it’s like a handshake or a – interlocking fingers, I mean initial teacher education preparation or teacher training is related to the knowledge that comes out of universities. And if they share it it’s going to be better for everybody. It’s a - sort of like a what else would you do?

Esther’s response suggests School-University Partnerships are an obvious solution when she says, “what else would you do?” This comment from Esther is similar to Christine’s comment that “nobody’s been talking about other alternatives”. I argue that this response from Esther is further evidence that School-University Partnerships are operating as a regime of truth. Foucault didn’t seek to find the “truth” when he identified “regimes of truth”, but to show “how norms are established within discourse, and how discourse creates a normative context for possible thought and action, which then becomes legitimised as truth” (Olssen, 2006, p. 137 in Hall & Noyes, 2009, p. 851). In the discourses of initial teacher education, School-University Partnerships are prominent and widespread. The normative context established by this regime of truth has legitimised the persistent discourses of the real and experience that I explore in Chapter 8. These are part of the “mechanisms, techniques and

procedures" that produce and valorize the truth, enabling the circulation of the regime of truth (Lorenzini, 2015, p.3).

School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are widely accepted and if any questions are asked of them, the focus is on how to improve them through doing partnerships better as in Christine's comments above. Esther raises an important issue in this response about knowledge in teacher education, a topic that is critical to the rationale for partnership yet was not explicitly discussed by other participants. Furlong (2013, 2019) has written about this lack of a clear knowledge base as a central challenge for teacher education. Foucault coupled power-knowledge and argued that "power produces knowledge" and that "power and knowledge directly imply one another" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 27). The concept of knowledge and how it is acquired in School-University Partnerships or in teacher education more broadly is explored in Chapter 8. I discuss the production of truth and knowledge in School-University Partnerships through the discourses of the real and experience that were prominent in participant interviews.

Another instance from the data that points to the circulation of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education as a regime of truth was from Helen. More than 10 minutes into the interview she says:

> It's funny, actually because you know I'm only talking about this school-based teaching but we have other sorts of partnerships with schools. I'll just continue to talk about the school-based teaching, though.

Helen realises that she is only talking about one aspect of her School-University Partnership work, but then says she will continue to focus on this. Helen uses the phrase "school-based" to refer to a program that involves the pre-service teachers teaching in schools outside of the compulsory professional experience requirements to graduate. These are additional "school-based" opportunities for learning to teach which are similar to professional experience placements in that they involve being in schools, teaching classes under supervision. I interpret Helen's comments to mean that while she might be involved in other School-University Partnership work, this "school-based teaching" is central, or more prominent or that she assumes that this is the topic of interest for this research, rather than some of the other partnership work she is involved in. When asked at the end of the interview whether School-University Partnerships are central to the future of teacher education, Helen had this response:

> I do because it's very important to – certainly in Science education, to give our students an experience of being successful at teaching Science. And our students really like it and they think that there should be more of it.

I interpret Helen's comment to mean that partnerships are needed to give students these experiences. The comment is in response to a question about partnerships and I interpret this response as meaning that the pre-service teachers spending time teaching in schools is "very important" and is presented here as the essence of partnership. Helen's response highlights the productive power in the discourses of School-University Partnerships. The widespread and varied conception of partnerships highlighted in Chapter 6 together with the assumption I interpret from Helen's comment here show that the discourses of partnership produce partnerships as everything and nothing whilst also producing partnerships as equivalent to pre-service teachers spending time in schools.

Pre-service teachers going into schools to be involved in classroom teaching as part of what is known as professional experience has been described as the "sine qua non" or essential condition of teacher education (Bullough, 2002, p. 236). In order to qualify as a teacher in Australia is it compulsory to complete a minimum number of days of professional experience (Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), 2015). Helen identifies these practices, which she refers to as "school-based teaching" as examples of School-University Partnership. Her earlier acknowledgement of her involvement in other kinds of partnerships supports my claim in section 6.2 of Chapter 6 that partnerships are a widespread practice, and also supports my claim here that in initial teacher education they are a distinctive case, dominant as a regime of truth. Helen's acknowledgement that she is involved in a range of partnership work yet chooses to focus on her work in initial teacher education supports my claim that partnerships are prominent in initial teacher education and are circulating as a regime of truth.

This genealogy is investigating the ways in which truth and knowledge are produced (Tamboukou, 1999, p. 202). Gore, Ladwig and King (2004) described a regime of truth as "how truth and power operate in tandem" (p. 1). I have shown evidence in this section that School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth in initial teacher education and that they are the type of discourse "society harbours and causes to function as true" (Foucault, 1975/1991. p. 23). I argue that the circulation of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education as a regime of truth is limiting space for critique and questioning of

partnerships. This is an effect of power. The dominance of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education, circulating as a regime of truth is producing particular forms of knowledge and is reinforcing the value of particular knowledge, namely knowledge gained through classroom teaching experience. In Chapter 8 I provide evidence of the way knowledge in and of teacher education is being produced through School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education.

7.2.2 Resistance to School-University Partnerships

In the section above I have presented evidence of the dominance of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education, which I have argued has led to their circulation as a regime of truth. In this section I present evidence from my participant interviews of a limited amount of resistance to School-University Partnerships. While the weight of participant responses presented partnerships as the obvious and only way to do initial teacher education, there were some instances where resistance to partnerships as a regime of truth was articulated.

Patricia, a project officer, responded to the question of alternatives to partnerships by saying, "is there an alternative to partnerships? I'm sure there is but I don't know what it is". Patricia had doubts about School-University Partnerships being the only way to work in initial teacher education but didn't have a specific idea about what the alternative would look like. She expresses confidence that an alternative is possible but can't identify what that alternative might be.

Jacob, an education commentator, said that the "only good that will come out of SUPs [School-University Partnerships] will be about the goodwill of individuals" and that they are prominent because "it's hard for unis to say no to them" and that the "cynic in him" says it's because they allow governments to "announce" something without a more comprehensive strategy. I interpret Jacob's comments as meaning that partnerships offer some possibilities but are ultimately not the solution. Jacob highlights the role of the individuals involved in the partnership as the critical factor to "good" outcomes. I interpret Jacob's comment about the success of partnerships as relying on the "goodwill of individuals" to mean that he doesn't see School-University Partnerships as what will lead to positive outcomes. His comment that they are an opportunity for governments to "announce" something without detail aligns with

the notion of partnerships as "floating and empty signifier" (Burgos, 2003, p. 55). Jacob's comments were the most resistant to School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth.

Despite the above comments from Jacob on School-University Partnerships, he still identified partnerships as a way forward for addressing what he saw as the problems of teacher education such as more attention to the "K-12 curriculum and pedagogical skills". I interpret Jacob's comments to mean that even though he had a cynicism towards the role of School-University Partnerships for teacher education, he still saw a role for them in the future. It wasn't clear from these comments how Jacob felt School-University Partnerships would be able to address these problems he identified. I interpret his comment as similar to the discursive conceptualisation of partnerships highlighted in 6.2.3 whereby they are an opportunity for schools to influence teacher education. Although Jacob expressed some cynicism towards School-University Partnerships he then went on to identify them as a possible vehicle for addressing problems in teacher education.

Tara also expressed some resistance to School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education. She raised questions about the practices of teacher education being discursively constructed as partnerships saying, "I think sometimes we say we are partnering but do both partners think that?" She talked about a large multi-campus amalgamated school she works with and the partnerships that they were involved in. "I'm just thinking of the school I was working at…as part of that work we looked at all the partnerships that school had" and through this process they found there were "nearly a hundred partnerships that the school would deem they had but I wonder on a closer analysis of that how many of those were real partnerships?" This comment provides further evidence of the discursive construction of partnerships as a widespread practice of teacher education but also shows some resistance. Tara questions whether all of these were "real partnerships". Similar resistance to School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth were expressed by Wendy and Helen. Along with Tara, they reflected on the authenticity of the partnerships that they were involved in. They seemed to juxtapose the bureaucratic requirement for "tick and flick" partnerships (Wendy) with other partnership work which was "real" (Helen). Yet even when Tara, Wendy and Helen question the authenticity of some partnerships, and Jacob expresses cynicism towards partnerships, these participants still expressed hope about partnerships as part of the future of teacher education. This shows that even where resistance to partnerships was identified, their circulation as a regime of truth continued to be evident.

The data presented in section 7.2 show that the discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are circulating as a regime of truth. Even where participants expressed some doubts about School-University Partnerships, they still saw them as part of the future of initial teacher education. While School-University Partnerships were discursively constructed as a widespread practice of teacher education in Chapter 6, it was in their instantiation in initial teacher education, outlined in this chapter, that they were circulating as a regime of truth. The discourses of partnerships in initial teacher education centred them as "essential" and the "only way" in ways that were not evident around other practices of School-University Partnerships. Partnerships for other purposes such as professional learning and research were presented as optional projects with varying degrees of success.

While in this section I have identified some aspects of resistance to partnerships as a regime of truth, they were limited relative to the prominence of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education identified in participant interviews. I have shown across Chapter 5 and 6 that School-University Partnerships are widespread and discursively conceptualised in a variety of ways. I have then provided evidence that in initial teacher education, School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth. In this section I have acknowledged some small pockets of resistance to partnerships but that the teacher education policy (Chapter 5) and participant interviews explored in this chapter show that School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are difficult to resist. School-University Partnerships exercise power through the production of discourses of truth and I explore this further in Chapter 8 where I show how the discourses of the real and experience circulate as an effect of power. In the section that follows I explore the alignments and tensions in the findings across Chapters 5-7 from policy and participant interviews.

7.3 Alignments and tensions between partnerships in policy and practice

I argued in my policy analysis in Chapter 5 that School-University Partnerships had become increasingly prominent in initial teacher education as a solution to ensuring the "quality" of programs (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), 2011b; Commonwealth of Australia, 2007). The expectations for universities and other providers of teacher education since the 2015 AITSL Accreditation standards were released is that they must have "formal partnerships, in writing" and now "formal partnerships, agreed in writing"

(AITSL, 2015). In my analysis in Chapter 5 I argued that School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth in initial teacher education policy.

In this chapter, I have shown evidence of this regime of truth in the interview data. School-University Partnerships were discussed by participants as dominant and relatively unquestioned as a practice of initial teacher education. The shift in the discourses of partnership in AITSL (2011b) to AITSL (2015) was also evident in participant descriptions of practice. The shift to "formal partnerships, agreed in writing" (AITSL, 2015) was evident in the way that Deb talked about emails initiating partnerships. Deb described the process as "pretty cold. It's – you get a – email, you are going to – or if I have accepted a preservice teacher we would like to now form a partnership and then you just do the paperwork and that's it. End of story." The demand for the agreement to be in writing was also evident in Brigid's comment that "they've got this stupid form to fill out" and "what I see now is the schools having more and more tight templates to fill out". In more recent policy and practice, School-University Partnerships are being produced as paperwork or a form to fill in which fits most closely with section 6.2.9, partnerships as a bureaucratic requirement.

David had a different description of being invited to participate in a partnership saying, "it's a little bit random you know there's just generally an email that's sent out asking for support to be involved". This point from David highlights that while the requirement is there for initial teacher education providers, it is still up to individual institutions to forge these partnerships. Partnerships are compulsory for accreditation of initial teacher education courses but schools have no such obligation and therefore universities still need to actively recruit schools to form partnerships with.

Another point of tension between policy and practice was the issue of resourcing for partnerships and this was raised by several participants. Wendy described partnerships as "resource intensive personal relationships" and Helen, Patricia and Esther highlighted the role of project officers in partnerships they had been involved in. The partnerships with project officers all involved professional learning for in-service teachers. In other partnerships with a professional learning focus for in-service teachers, such as those described by Rachel, resourcing was addressed by combining a contribution from the school and from the university. Rachel saw partnership as a more effective use of resources than alternatives which she discusses here:

> So someone like [guest presenter], who goes into schools with his bag of tricks of - for maths games and things like that, I don't spend - I don't think spending thousands of dollars on him for a day in your school where a teacher comes away with a game they might play for the next four weeks is good use of professional learning money. So, and we're tight for professional learning money, so how can we - because you get - with a university partnership, they bring money and you bring a little bit of money so it's not like you're spending lots of money. So you're getting quality professional learning, based in where your school improvement plan is going because you're driving it, and yeah you get quality work over time. It's not a one-off, it's a three-year project or it's a year project or something that really, you journey together in and provides opportunity for you to feed in and feed forward and feedback and so forth so it's real staged learning as opposed to sending someone and they really bring nothing back to the school and haven't really learnt anything on the journey.

In this example from Rachel partnerships offer an opportunity to pool resources for a professional learning project. This idea of pooling resources was less evident in discussions around partnerships in initial teacher education. David raised the issue of resourcing when he talked about the difficulties in achieving the goals of the partnership such as organising a meeting together with university staff and a pre-service teacher, "in a timetable when teachers have all got 20 hours face-to-face they've got to do each week is really difficult to find". As with the reference to project officers to support partnerships made by Helen, Patricia and Esther, this comment from David is about human resources in the form of time allocation. People were the central resourcing issue raised by participants. Zeichner, Payne and Brayko (2015) acknowledged these difficulties "given the labor-intensive nature" (p. 131) of developing inter-institutional collaborations.

Deb discussed how her experience in working with pre-service teachers had changed over her career in teaching and leadership:

> certainly in the early days we had – and I know it's time and money and whatever – we had – many more supervisors would come out and meet the staff who are working with the students and have quite a connection. That doesn't happen anymore. You have your supervisor who comes out for – oh there's one coming next week and he wants to spend 20 minutes with the student not seeing him teach and five minutes with their supervising teacher. Okay so that's just a check-in to me, that's not building

any partnership, that's a check-in saying how are you going? Is everything okay? I'm out of here.

The existence of additional resources in the past, especially staff time, was also raised by Brigid:

> And so they were the days where you actually had a bit of time like they could get the professor in there as part of her job in her first semester. And they only did it one semester each year so we had time to then have our committee of teachers and principals and Department and union to talk through some of the issues and then change things for the following year.

In this example Brigid talked about her work in teacher education in the late 1990s as a time when senior academic staff had "a bit of time" to go out and work with teachers and principals in schools. I interpret Brigid's comment as a reference to a reduction in time available for academic staff to visit schools more recently. Academic workload intensification has been noted as having an impact on university affiliated mentors (Gillet-Swan & Grant-Smith, 2020). Ledger and others (2020) identified that while partnerships are compulsory in policy, "not enough time allocated in workload" (p. 124) had a negative impact on the ability of academics to build and maintain partnerships.

Helen discussed the issue of fitting partnership work in with already existing workload requirements:

> We are grappling at the moment at University A because of all the work that we all do in the STEM area, we are finding a lot of schools are contacting us and wanting assistance. And so as a school actually, the whole school is being contacted and so we have to do – work out a way of dealing with that so that it doesn't become on top of because the issue is that you know you fill your allocation up at the beginning of the year and then something comes along and what do you do? So it is a contact issue, actually and at University A we have quite a lot of partnerships that are quite institutionalised, alliance schools and that sort of thing so they're institutionalised and so there's a lot of roles associated with that that can be part of your load. But it's those little things that come in that can actually be quite difficult to manage so you have to be careful what you say yes to, really. Look, there's partnership work that can – if you're talking about my professional life there's partnership work that can work for you and there's partnership work that can drain you. And so it's about being careful

about what you want to do. It all drains – should I say it all drains you, it's just some count, some don't, you know.

In this comment from Helen she is describing the institutional processes at her university and the way in which workload is calculated. She highlights that workloads are established at the beginning of the year and this means it is difficult to resource proposed partnerships that might pop up part way through the year. Helen highlights the importance of "being careful about what you do" in relation to the work that is valued by the university which she describes as "some count, some don't". This is one of the tensions between compulsory partnerships in initial teacher education policy (Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership, 2015), yet the major markers for success for teacher education academics are publications and securing research grants. This partly explains the proliferation of scholarly publications on School-University Partnerships highlighted in Chapter 2 as teacher education academics work to combine the demands of policy and course accreditation with pressure to maintain research active status through publications (Toe et al, 2020). Singh et al (2014) highlighted the way that funding for partnership projects drives research into partnerships.

The findings from Chapter 5 show the increasing focus on partnerships as a solution to the longstanding challenges of teacher education, yet resourcing is a challenge if they are to be the kind of personal relationships that Wendy argues constitute partnership rather than "networks", or what Deb referred to as "connections". Based on participant perceptions of what constitutes a "real" partnership, without resourcing to provide time School-University Partnerships will be very difficult. Ledger and others (2020) described this as the "hidden costs" of the "relational work of ITE professional experience" that is "not explicitly recognised" in workload models (p. 123). Helen's final comment from above that "it all drains you" highlights this heavy workload associated with partnerships.

The findings from my policy analysis in Chapter 5 show that partnerships have been a prominent feature of teacher education and education more broadly through the Smarter Schools National Partnerships funding since the turn of the century. I have argued in both my policy analysis in Chapter 5 and in this chapter that School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth in initial teacher education. In both policy and practice, School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education have achieved broad acceptance as a positive and pragmatic strategy. While there were some pockets of resistance to partnerships,

overwhelmingly partnerships continued to be understood as Cardini (2006) described them, as “benevolent, neutral and pragmatic” (p. 394).

7.4 Conclusion

I have shown in this chapter how the discourses of partnership circulate in particular ways in the area of initial teacher education, functioning as a regime of truth. I have shown how in initial teacher education, partnerships were discursively constructed as dominant and essential. This aligns with the findings presented in Chapter 5 through my policy analysis where partnerships have been constructed in widespread and varied ways in policy in the past but there has been a narrowing focus more recently. I showed in Chapter 5 that in the area of initial teacher education, School-University Partnerships had become more prominent and narrowly defined in ways that most closely reflect a discursive construction as a bureaucratic requirement, as described in 6.2.9. In this chapter I have presented evidence that School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth in initial teacher education.

I also presented some evidence of resistance to School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth. I provided evidence of instances where participants identified some limitations to partnerships or identified the possibility of alternatives. Within this I showed that even where participants showed this resistance, there was still evidence of School-University Partnerships circulating as a regime of truth.

In the final section of this chapter I explored some alignments and tensions across policy and practice, drawing together findings from chapters 5-7. I showed that the narrowing in focus of School-University Partnerships to initial teacher education and the dominance that is circulating as a regime of truth was an alignment across policy and practice. The major tension across policy and practice centred around compulsory School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education (AITSL, 2015) at the same time as participants highlighted the heavy workload and labour-intensive nature of partnership work.

Chapter 8

Discourses of the real and experience: the subjectification of teachers and teacher educators in School-University Partnerships

8.1 Introduction

Across the previous findings chapters 5-7, I have shown how School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education have been discursively constructed in policy and practice. I have also laid out my claim across the literature chapter and my findings in Chapter 5 and 6 that in both policy and practice there is a lack of clarity around what constitutes a partnership. I have also shown in Chapter 5, and 7 that there was evidence in policy and practice of a narrowing of focus in the 21st Century towards partnerships in initial teacher education.

In section 7.2 I showed how participants identified School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education as prominent and largely unquestioned. Partnerships were presented as an important and improved forward trajectory and yet many of the longstanding challenges for teacher education had not been addressed in a meaningful way. These discourses of partnerships are functioning as "both an instrument and an effect of power" (Foucault, 1976/1998, p. 101). Teacher education, particularly initial teacher education, is a contested space (Mayer, 2014). While partnerships are often seen as a way to address challenges, they can't circumvent important questions about the knowledge needed for teaching, the role and nature of professional experience and the roles of schools and universities in teacher preparation. I show in this chapter that it is difficult for participants to think outside of or beyond School-University Partnerships because of these persistent discourses which reinforce the status quo. For teachers, School-University Partnerships validate their knowledge and experience and affirm their place as experts on teaching. For teacher education academics, School-University Partnerships reinforce a deficit view of teacher education but in other ways they also reduce scrutiny on the work of teacher education as long as it involves partnering with schools.

In this chapter I present evidence from my participant interviews that within the discourses of partnership in initial teacher education, those of experience (section 8.2) produce partnerships in particular ways. Firstly, I show that experience in the discourses of partnership is linked to training models and narrow conceptions of what it means to learn to

teach. Secondly, I explore the discourse of the "real" and the way it subjectifies teacher educators. I also show how the discourses of the real and experience constitute knowledge and contribute to the production of "truth" in teacher education. Thirdly, I show in section 8.4 how the subjectification effects of these discourses produce teachers in schools as those with access to the "truth" about teaching. I present evidence that teacher education academics, subjectified through a "discourse of derision", have a diminished role in teacher education where knowledge and expertise gained outside of schools is not recognised or valued. In the following section I explore schools as sites of experience in School-University Partnerships.

8.2 Schools as sites of experience in School-University Partnerships

In Chapter 6, section 6.2.1 I showed that prominent in the interview data was a discursive conceptualisation of partnerships as referring to professional experience placement. I argued that the way in which participants described partnerships they were at times equated with professional experience placement. Within this discursive conceptualisation, here I focus on the discourse of experience as central to the way in which School-University Partnerships were perceived by participants. The notion of experience is prominent in teacher education literature and is generally used to refer to time spent in schools as part of professional experience placements (Le Cornu, 2015). School-University Partnerships literature has at times explored what experience might look like in "successful" teacher education (Jones & Ryan, 2014). Professional experience is widely accepted as an essential element of initial teacher education (Jones et al, 2016; Reynolds et al, 2016; Green et al, 2020) and yet what constitutes this experience is not well defined.

Participants spoke about the importance of experience as happening within partnerships. Deb described what she saw as the role of schools in initial teacher education below:

> Really important role because schools provide real life experience so if you didn't have schools to just enlighten, you know, the aspiring teacher, I don't think you'd get as many graduate teachers who sort of have an understanding so schools are integral within that whole learning system. They have to be.

I interpret Deb's comment as highlighting "real life experience" in schools so as to "enlighten" PSTs which she says helps them to "have an understanding". I interpret Deb's

comments as suggesting that without experience in the form of time in schools, graduates would not "have an understanding" of the job of teaching. I interpret Deb's comment as arguing for the centrality of experience in schools in initial teacher education. Deb doesn't discuss what she means by experience but from her comment I interpret it as meaning spending time in the school. Deb positions this "real life experience" in schools as something that is "integral within that whole system". I interpret this comment from Deb as saying that time spent in schools is critical but that she sees it as part of a system of teacher education.

Helen made a similar comment when she described schools as "a context for authentic experience". She described one of the aims of a particular partnership being that pre-service teachers:

> they just get the experience of being like a teacher, I suppose and undertaking those various roles of planning, implementing, evaluating, collaborating, working with kids you know that full-on hands-on working with children.

Helen also raises the importance of experience but goes on to provide some examples of what this might mean. She highlights some of the different roles of the teacher and "that full-on hands on working with children". Helen's comments highlight what experience might look like for the pre-service teacher but are not explicit about how School-University Partnerships are connected with experience, other than an apparent assumption that School-University Partnerships are about professional experience placement or spending time in schools.

What was absent from these responses relating to the importance of experience in teacher education was a clear sense of what constituted this experience. While there were some attempts such as Helen's above to be explicit about what experience meant, for something that was seen as critical in learning to teach, the idea was underdeveloped in participant responses. I argue it was a taken for granted concept that was equated with spending time in schools. This is similar to recent partnership policy that identifies partnership as critical and links it with professional experience (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2015; Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group, 2014) yet aside from the need for these partnerships to be "formal, agreed in writing" there is not a lot of detail about what this experience entails.

The discourse of experience was evident elsewhere in participant discussions. Brigid, a teacher education academic, also talked about what she saw as the role of schools in teacher education:

> inducting people, as inducting people through placement into a wide range of teaching practices and that it was the school's role, not just the individual teacher's role. And that they saw – this was their you know the first phase of their induction into teaching and so I didn't see any school when I started really understanding that except for the schools on the [remote First Nations community] out of all the placements that I worked in. Most of them saw their role more as trying to overcome the role of the university you know they're the eggheads in their ivory towers even though many of them were very good teachers and actually were very experienced in the school setting. Most teacher educators are. But what I see now is the schools having more and more tight templates to fill out about the kids so – students so that they get to the standards. I would like to see that talked about.

In Brigid's response she is giving some detail about what experience might look like and connects it to the idea of an initial induction into the profession. She then mentions what she sees as the view of the schools involved in professional experience and identifies a discourse of derision towards teacher education academics, best captured by her comment about "eggheads in their ivory towers" which I discuss further in 8.4. Brigid makes a specific point about experience in relation to teacher education academics that "many of them were very good teachers and actually were very experienced in the school setting. Most teacher educators are". Here again the issue of experience is raised, and Brigid's comment reaffirms the importance of experience in a school context as that which is relevant. In the context of School-University Partnerships, experience in school settings continues to be held up as critical for those learning to teach and also for teacher educators. It is clear from the way Brigid describes the experience of teacher educators that this refers to their past practice as school teachers rather than any experience they might have spending time teaching pre-service teaches or working with teachers and pre-service teachers in schools in their role as teacher educators. Experience teaching in schools is highlighted in this comment as a valued source of knowledge for teacher educators.

The above comments from Brigid also highlight the broader regimes of truth within which School-University Partnerships are operating. Brigid talks about her vision of schools in

the formation of early career teachers and what she would like to see, contrasted with what she sees as “more and more tight templates to fill out” in order to ensure “they get to the standards”. The Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (AITSL, 2011a) are part of a suite of measures, linked to the notion of “teacher quality” (Connell, 2009). This standards driven approach to teacher education has been criticised due to the risk that it narrows the definition of teaching (Santoro et al, 2012) and is an important part of the context for the past decade of School-University Partnerships.

Christine, an education department employee, referenced the notion of experience when she talked about what School-University Partnerships were for. She described the rationale for the latest program she was involved in:

> I think that was predicated on research that was coming out of - or a lot of the work that was coming out of the National Leadership Centre in London around the way in which initial teacher education was being developed, but their particular model, it also extended to areas of - well other countries, so Germany was another example where it's modelled, where schools would form supra academies and within those academies they were then being accredited for being responsible in designing initial teacher education courses. So there was an informal - or they were moving towards a bit of a formal agreement between these clusters of schools and university providers around doing school embedded teacher education and so that involved a lot of these pre-service teachers basically doing on the job training to get qualifications.

The way Christine describes the partnership as providing “on the job training” suggests she is talking about the value of experience in schools. The conceptualisation of teacher education as teacher training has been critiqued as narrowly focused on practical skills without a broader educative purpose (Stephens et al, 2007). Britzman (2003) criticised the notion of teacher training as that which “privileges routinized behaviour over critical action” (p. 46). Despite this the notion persists with David, a school principal also referring to “teacher training” in the interviews. While the phrase “on the job training” suggests a vocational learning or apprenticeship approach to teacher preparation, as with the focus on experience, it lacks specificity about what this might look like. Christine’s description of School-University Partnerships as being modelled on the English system gives an indication of where a discourse of partnerships in Australian teacher education may lead. The compulsory partnerships of the 1990s in England led to the development of modes of teacher education that are school-led

or school based (Ellis, 2010). Reforms being implemented across 2020 and 2021 to initial teacher education in England have been widely criticised and seen as promoting narrow ideas of teaching (Mutton et al, 2021).

8.2.1 The limits of experience for initial teacher education

Experience has been highlighted by participants and is also evident in policy discourses relating to School-University Partnerships. In both policy and practice experience is generally framed as meaning time in schools. The concept of experience has been critiqued in the scholarly literature, with Britzman's (2003) influential work on the valorization of experience in U.S. teacher education and Ellis' (2010) work highlighting the impoverishment of experience in the English context. In the Australian context, President of the Teacher Education Association critiqued the idea of work experience as providing "relevance and credibility" to teacher educators more than 25 years ago (Hatton, 1994, p. 19). These examples represent important critique on the notion of experience and yet participant interview data shows it persists relatively unquestioned within the discourses of School-University Partnerships.

I argue that if experience is critical to School-University Partnerships then there needs to be further critique and theorizing of experience to ensure that it isn't impoverished (Ellis, 2010). An emphasis on experience as central to initial teacher education within partnerships subjectifies participants in particular ways. As Brigid argued in defence of teacher education academics, they are often experienced in the school setting. This subjectifies teacher educators, as well as teachers and pre-service teachers, in relation to their experience. It suggests that access to the "truth" about learning to teach is via experience, but this experience is never clearly defined or is assumed to mean time in schools rather than any other experience pre-service teachers or teacher educators may have had. This suggests that experience teaching in schools is all that is needed to be an expert on teaching and teaching people how to teach and yet this argument is not being explicitly made.

The discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education rely on this notion of the centrality of experience in schools. In policy and practice the notion of experience persists but is not clarified or justified. Being an experienced classroom teacher is not sufficient to be an effective mentor or supervising teacher and there is a large body of

scholarly work on the role of the mentor and the critical attributes needed in this role in teacher education (Ambrosetti & Dekkers, 2010; Ellis, Alonzo & Nguyen, 2020).

The emphasis on experience in the discourses of partnership in initial teacher education produces teaching subjects as formed through access to this experience. Gaining experience as the pathway to learning to teach frames partnerships as not much more than providing opportunities for pre-service teachers to have this experience. If the focus of partnerships is getting those learning to teach into schools for experience this produces teacher subjectivities where simply having experience in schools counts as knowledge of the "truth" about teaching. Yet the breadth of scholarly work on teaching and dominant policy such as the Australian Teaching Professional Standards (AITSL, 2011a) frame teaching as complex work and not as something that experience alone can teach.

Simple solutions to complex problems are frequent in education, as identified in the push to "what works" in schools (Biesta, 2007) as well as the suggestion that "evidence" and "data" are the new holy grail in teaching (Mockler & Stacey, 2021). The subjectification effects of this discourse of experience are produced within the regime of truth (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131) of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education. Regimes of truth produce "those who are charged with saying what is true" (Foucault, 1980, p. 131) and the (re)production of experience in schools as central positions teachers in schools as those with access to the "truth" about teaching by virtue of their possession of this experience. I argue that the prominence of discourses of experience within School-University Partnerships produces truth and knowledge for teaching as gained by spending time in schools.

In the following section, I move my discussion on the discourses circulating within the regime of truth of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education to the discourse of the real.

8.3 The invocation of the real

Another important discourse within the regime of truth of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education was a repeated invoking of the real. I provide evidence from my interview data that a discourse of the real is central to the discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education. This discourse of the real works together with the discourse of experience to produce the truth about teaching available via

partnerships. The discourses of experience and the real help to reinforce partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education in the way they are linked to long standing assumptions about learning to teach built on a historical apprenticeship model of teaching in Australia (Aspland, 2006). Whilst universities have been involved in teacher education in various ways for more than 50 years and in all initial teacher education since the Dawkins reforms of the late 1980s, there is still a widespread reluctance to conceive of learning to teach as an intellectual endeavour and a tendency towards seeing it as a "craft" made up of skills, best learnt "on the job".

Deb's comments on the role of schools in teacher education were referenced in section 7.2 to show how a discourse of experience permeates conceptions of partnership. Deb also raised the notion of the real when she said "schools provide real life experience". In this comment Deb links what is real with experience and positions this as what schools can offer teacher education. The way in which Deb discusses this role for the school seems to set up schools as real and by implication universities as not real. This subjectifies teacher education academics in a way that only (recent) experience in schools counts as experience. Other present and past work of teacher education academics such as research, writing, university teaching and projects are diminished in value.

The notion of "reality" is also taken up by Patricia, project officer, when she talks about the importance of employing sessional academics who are former principals in partnership work because they "they get it" because they have "been in the reality of running schools and timetabling of things at schools and all that sort of stuff". For Patricia, "reality" seems to be about "running schools and timetabling". There seems to be an assumption implicit in Patricia's comments that other academics have not been involved in the running of schools. This was the assumption that Brigid was defending teacher education academics against when she claimed many of them were "very experienced" in schools. The idea that former principals understand the "reality" of schools is focussed on their knowledge of school processes and I interpret Patricia's notion of the real here to mean what happens in the day to day of schools. Britzman (2003) described the "discourses of the real" where learning to teach is defined as "learning to work within given constraints" and where "the real" is "synonymous with existing practices" (p. 198).

The notion of what is real was also raised by Wendy. She talked about why she thinks there has been a policy push to formalise partnerships:

> Well probably around the teacher quality debate is some of it. I think it is around – so some of it's from a higher ed perspective, the perspective that teacher education is very disconnected from any reality you know I often talk about how I've never worked in the real world but often feel like I'm always in it you know like I used to work in hospitality and apparently that wasn't the real world either you know being a teacher wasn't the real world so I've never ever really been in the real world so that's interesting so – but teacher – out of all the worlds that are not real teacher education or higher ed is the least real world apparently.

Wendy connected these discourses of partnership to a "teacher quality" agenda from governments. Debates about teacher quality are part of wider discourses of teacher education and education more broadly (Connell, 2009; Mayer, 2014). Hoyte et al (2020) described "teacher quality" as a "powerful construct" and argued that quality discourses formed "part of contemporary regimes of truth" (p. 159). Wendy is positioning partnerships as part of a strategy related to teacher quality. She went on to say:

> And so you know so there's a lot of criticism of teacher education and not understanding what schools do and what teachers do so I think part of the government's attempt – so it becomes formal from a government perspective but it's also – so it becomes a quality check you know so the government can say that they are doing something to ensure that teacher educators know what they're doing and they have some real experience in the real world.

In this response from Wendy she linked partnerships to the idea of teacher educators having "real experience in the real world" because of a perception that they are "disconnected from any reality". She then suggested partnerships are a way for government to "say that they are doing something" through connecting teacher educators with the "real" of schools. As with Brigid's earlier comments about the experience of teacher educators, Wendy suggested partnerships are about gaining access to the "real" through a connection with schools.

8.3.1 The connections between experience, the real and the truth in School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education

The above discourses of experience and the "discourses of the real" that are apparent in the interview data were identified in Britzman's (2003) study. She talks about the "discourses of the real" in detail here:

> Practical experience, as a guarantee of truth, is valorized because of its synchronicity with the exigencies of the real. However, supressed in this discourse is how the real became established, produced and legitimized in practice. Instead, the practical is filtered through common sense, joining conduct with affect. Supposedly, one intuits activity from experience. (Britzman, 2003, p. 198)

Britzman (2003) also quotes from Smith and Zantiotis (1989) who said:

> an important effect of discourse about the real is the differentiation between appropriate and inappropriate conceptions of teaching that seem obvious on the basis of an appeal to the 'truth' and the credibility of practicality. (p. 112)

The central issues raised by Britzman (2003) and Smith and Zantiotis (1989) above are evident in the discourses of partnerships from participant interviews. The "floating and empty signifier" (Burgos, 2003, p. 55) status of School-University Partnerships and the regime of truth in initial teacher education have created space for the (re)production of these discourses of the real from participants. Without a clear ambit, School-University Partnerships are heavily impacted by the broader discourses of teacher education. Rather than partnerships helping participants to unpack or explore the complexity in learning to teach, discourses of partnership which focus on bureaucratic activity and partnerships as equivalent to professional experience placement are reinforcing the "discourses of the real" identified by Britzman (2003). School-University Partnerships are unable to offer "spaces of freedom" (Foucault, 1982/1988, p. 11) for the field of teacher education if they are (re)producing longstanding challenges in teacher preparation. This is why identifying partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education is critical for imagining other possibilities.

I have argued in Chapter 7 that School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth in initial teacher education. This has led to a lack of critique of partnerships and created space for the proliferation of these discourses of experience and the real which relate to longstanding debates in teacher education about the best ways to prepare teachers. Foucault (1984, p. 343) argued that "everything is dangerous", and I make the claim here that

valorising experience is dangerous. An impoverished notion of experience (Ellis, 2010) as central to partnerships is not a forward trajectory for teacher education. If the foundation of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education is experience, understood as time in schools accessing the real this suggests a model of teacher education resembling apprenticeship approaches of the past (White & Forgasz, 2016) dressed up as innovations. Working with Foucault, it is not my claim that the present is a necessary improvement on the past but if past practice is the goal then clear and explicit articulation of this plan creates space for critique and improvement.

8.4 Teacher education academic subjectivity and a discourse of derision

In the above sections I have identified the discourses of experience and the real as central to School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education. I have shown how these discourses help reinforce School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth as they are long held ideas and the value of experience in schools is relatively uncontested. In this section I provide further evidence of these discourses of partnership circulating as "an instrument and effect of power" (Foucault, 1976/1998, p. 101). Foucault (1980) says we cannot "exercise power except through the production of truth" (p. 93) and the discourses of the real and experience produced within the discourses of partnership are an example of the productive effects of power. The discourses of the real and experience are produced as "forms of truth" (Bacchi & Goodwin, 2016, p. 21). The discourses of School-University Partnership are influenced by the broader regimes of truth circulating in teacher education and education generally. The discourses of School-University Partnerships are also producing teacher education in particular ways, framing the purpose, goals and aspirations of teacher education. In section 7.2 I showed how Brigid, drawing on a discourse of experience, linked this to a discourse of derision that she identified in schools where teachers "saw their role more as trying to overcome the role of the university you know they're the eggheads in their ivory tower". I interpret from Brigid's comments that in her partnership experiences with schools she had come across a discourse of derision towards teacher education. Furlong (2019) has written about the dominance of a "discourse of derision" towards universities and their role in teacher education in the English context. This "discourse of derision" was evident in other participant responses such as when Wendy, a teacher education academic, described her experience of working with schools in partnership:

so this is a region that has some of the worst statistics in terms of even getting kids to Year 10 and they felt that the higher ed sector, education particularly, had completely abandoned them so they weren't particularly interested in [someone from inter-state] who was obviously only going to stay there for two weeks coming in and doing anything with them. And they certainly didn't want to listen to anything that I had to say.

Wendy began this description of some of her experiences of partnership by highlighting the contextual factors for this rural context. The way in which Wendy described this work I interpret as her sense of the scepticism with which she and the university were treated. She went on to say:

Interestingly there was a core group of principals at the time who saw the need – they saw the importance of the university so they did actually ask me in so they included me in the – some of the core groups which was really great but I must admit that I basically had to work night and day to – and listen to a lot of awful stuff and then part of my role was to advocate back to the university for support for the schools and you know for what we could do in schools. And the problem there was that we didn't have enough students to do what the schools needed so we quickly ran into that issue of we couldn't actually do what we – what the schools wanted so then we worked together with the schools to come up with or what can we do strategically with what – the resources that we have to actually focus on some projects and what can we do? And it ended up meaning over – after a period of time is actually just identifying key schools to work with and so then our students so the university students, preservice teachers, would mostly go to those schools.

Wendy identified a "core group of principals" who "saw the importance of the university" which I interpret as meaning the importance of the university was not seen as a given by other school principals in the surrounding area. Wendy talks about how she had to "work night and day" and "listen to a lot of awful stuff" in order to progress the partnership. Wendy went on to talk more about the complexity and layers involved in this partnership work:

And it was the same with working with the community so you had strategic alliances where say the art gallery, because Sunny University had a memorandum of understanding with them, so you worked with them and the city council and – because

> they also worked with - there's the schools so you worked with the principal networks and so it became a matter of – so basically it was actually just embedding yourself in the community basically doing whatever they wanted until you kind of gained their trust and it wasn't until then that I felt that I could sort of say okay so now what are you going to do back? So how can we actually make this a real partnership? Because up until then it was you know it was me just doing whatever they wanted and them just telling me what to do. And so that to me is not a real partnership.

This description of partnership reported by Wendy highlights the resource intensive nature of this work, as discussed in Chapter 6. Wendy discusses a whole range of elements to the partnership and she also points to her perception of the need to gain the trust of the schools before the partnership can become a mutual arrangement. Wendy said she had to "do whatever they wanted until you kind of gained their trust". I interpret Wendy's comments as evidence of her experience of a discourse of derision towards the role of universities in teacher education. Ellis and McNicoll (2015, p. 61) talked about this as "unbalanced partnerships" where the universities are in a position where partnership isn't optional but the schools can opt in or out. This description from Wendy sits in contrast to Breault's (2014) research which found that partnerships frequently operated on the assumption that universities were in a dominant role.

Wendy also described her early experiences of partnership:

> So when I became a teacher educator it just became… I think when I first started in teacher education I had an opportunity where a teacher came to me and said you guys don't know anything about anything you know you're so disconnected, you're all about the theory, we know what's doing it, come out and see what we're doing in our school. And it was actually working in – suddenly actually having that opportunity to work in a school and taking that opportunity up that kind of snowballed probably my career with that stuff, it was the most rewarding work for me.

In the above response Wendy reported another experience as the target of this discourse of derision. The teacher's comments as understood by Wendy framed teacher educators as those who "don't know anything about anything" and are "so disconnected" and "all about the theory" compared with teachers and that she should "come out and see what we're doing in our school". In talking about why partnerships are prominent in teacher education, Helen, another teacher educator suggested:

> it also helps the people in the schools to see universities as not just these people who sit in their ivory towers and are disconnected. I think we've got to really work together much more and not – and to sort of dispel those ideas in schools because they become quite negative and destructive at a number of levels. One level when our students go out there and told that what they do at university's a load of crap and you'll learn everything you need to know here. Yeah, that's not helpful at all for anybody.

In this example, Helen is reporting similar experiences to Wendy and Brigid where she perceived that the contribution of the university and teacher education academics is being derided. I interpret Helen and Wendy's comments as their perception that schools see their own role in initial teacher education as central and unquestioned. This aligns with Britzman's (2003) comments about "practical experience as a guarantee of truth" (p. 198). The discourse of derision evident in participant interviews is a result of the widespread acceptance of the discourses of the real and experience discussed above.

The subjectivity of teachers in the above example is framed as a secure position, an unchallenged and assumed place as an expert on teaching. Helen and Wendy discuss their experiences with a discourse of derision and how they have tried to work around it. They haven't done this by identifying themselves as experts but rather inhabit a subject position as a "good partner" who "work[s] together" (Helen) with schools or "doing whatever they wanted in order to gain their trust" (Wendy).

Wendy, Helen and Tara all talked about partnerships as providing an opportunity for those in schools to see the value of the university and teacher education academics and that they had something to offer. They also talked about partnerships as professionally rewarding work which provides some evidence as to what else sustains School-University Partnerships. The teacher education academics interviewed in this study had all previously had experience working as teachers in schools and were positive about the opportunity to connect with colleagues in schools.

8.4.1 Time in schools is framed as inevitably good

The above comments about "ivory towers" and the "disconnection" of teacher education are linked to the long-standing debates about how to best prepare teachers and the role of time spent in schools and universities (White & Forgasz, 2016). The notion that pre-service teachers will "really learn to teach" whilst on professional experience continues

to be prominent (Mayer et al, 2017, p. 130). The framing of teaching as a "craft" best learnt "on the job" has been central to reform efforts in England since the 1990s (Ellis, 2010). Teacher education has, in the past in Australia occurred in various forms that have involved differing amounts of time spent in schools (Aspland, 2006; Vick, 2006). The tendency to assume that pre-service teachers spending time in schools is "inevitably good" (Hatton, 1994, p. 30) is persistent and the idea that more time in schools is better is also a recurring theme (Reid, 2011; Reynolds et al, 2016). Given the evidence in the discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education that there is a focus on experience and the real this helps to explain why there is such a commitment to partnerships. Partnerships are strongly associated with pre-service teachers spending time in schools gaining experience of the real and there is broad support for more "time in schools" (Reid, 2011) so this helps reinforce positivity towards partnerships in initial teacher education.

8.4.2 Partnerships and the "inadequacy of teacher education"

The most unequivocal expression of a discourse of derision from a participant directed towards teacher education came from Jacob, an education commentator, who expressed the view that the reason for a push towards School-University Partnerships was the "inadequacy of teacher education". Jacob saw the main problem of teacher education as that it is "too far removed from what happens in the classroom". Jacob was dismissive of what is often described as "too theoretical, too abstract" as missing the point and taking us in the wrong direction in terms of reform. He says that this criticism suggests we are teaching the "right theories" or "right issues" when there is not enough focus on preparing people to teach the curriculum. So for Jacob, the limitations of teacher education are central to the existence of School-University Partnerships, and he sees the problems with teacher education as more about the skills and knowledge being taught rather than a sense that teacher education is "too theoretical". I interpret from his comments that as with the partners in Wendy's examples, he saw teacher education in universities as lacking in relevance. The way in which he described teacher education as "too far removed from what happens in the classroom" demonstrated his perception that time in schools is not part of teacher education. Teacher education seems to be understood by Jacob as that which happens at the university and is separate from professional experience placement. It is this university-based element of teacher education that is that target of the discourse of derision. This is the kind of important

discussion about what constitutes School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education that needs to be happening but seems predominantly absent. I argue that it is the dominance of School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth that creates these conditions. Partnerships are so entrenched, engrained and accepted in initial teacher education that discussion and debate around what the partnership is and what it is for are not occurring enough.

8.4.3 Contemporary classrooms and teacher educator subjectivity

As well as a focus on the need for experience and the real as the rationale for partnerships, participants also highlighted the importance of this experience being recent in order to be relevant. Even if teacher educators begin a career in the academy with recent classroom teaching experience in schools, over time the value of this experience diminishes. Two of the school-based participants also seemed to identify School-University Partnerships as an opportunity for them to provide access to knowledge about teaching with a particular emphasis on the present-day context. David saw his role and that of others from schools as because "there needs to be a greater understanding of, you know, contemporary learning and teaching". Deb, a school-based pre-service teacher coordinator also identified the need for "well equipped students [PSTs] coming out, you know, 21st Century learning is very different". These school-based participants saw their role in School-University Partnerships as giving pre-service teachers an opportunity to have an experience of the "realities" of teaching. In these comments, the "realities" of teaching are presented as specific to the present time period, implying that what is real in teaching is time bound. This resonates with Britzman's (2003) discourses of the "real", where the "real" is "synonymous with existing practices" (p. 198). While the comments above are not explicit in any derision of teacher education they suggest the critical role of schools because of the way "contemporary" or "21st Century" learning is different. This emphasis on experience in contemporary classrooms frames relevant knowledge about teaching as being gained through time in schools.

Carol also discussed the idea of teaching in the present time period as part of the role of partnerships. She described partnerships as:

> it's like a feedback loop so I think it's important for schools to know what institutions are working on, what's the current best research practice etc but then also same back into the institutions so understanding what it's like current day in the classroom.

In Carol's comments she highlights this as a mutual need of schools and universities to understand the work of the other. The idea that School-University Partnerships are an opportunity for those in schools and universities to learn about the work of the other was also mentioned by Esther when she discussed why she saw partnerships as essential (see 7.2.1) but there was much greater emphasis on what schools were able to provide for universities than the other direction. Walsh and Backe (2013) argued that for a long time it was the needs of universities which drove partnerships but that there had been a dramatic shift with partnerships more focussed on the needs of schools. The idea that teacher academics should have recent classroom experience is a persistent idea (Murray, 2002). It is made more difficult by increasing expectations from university employers for higher degrees and research active status (Nuttall et al, 2013). This is the broader context for the discourse of derision that positions teacher education academics as "disconnected" which was highlighted by Helen and Wendy earlier.

There were many instances in the participant interviews where a discourse of derision towards teacher education was espoused. The connection between the discourse of derision and the previously discussed discourses of the real and experience is that if value is placed on schools as providing access to the real and to experience then teacher education academics are subjectified in relation this and then identified as lacking. This relates to broader questions about the preparation of teachers, and it is clear from the discourses of partnership evident in policy and practice that the discourse of derision towards teacher education hasn't been solved by an increasingly prominent partnerships agenda in initial teacher education. The subjectification effects of the discourses of the real and experience, (re)produced through School-University Partnerships, have led to teacher education academics "being constituted and constituting [themselves]" (Taguchi, 2005, p. 29) in relation to their classroom teaching experiences and time in schools. The prominence of the discourses of experience and the real position them as the central form of knowledge that is accepted as "true" in the discourses of partnership. The problem is that the vagaries of partnerships in policy and practice evidenced in Chapter 5 and 6 combined with the general acceptance of partnerships as positive have led to a lack of clear articulation of any theory of learning or knowledge in relation to the discourses of the real and experience produced as available through the mere presence of pre-service teachers in schools.

In the next section I explore the way that these discourses produce and are produced through the circulation of power within the regime of truth.

8.5 Experience, the real and regimes of truth in initial teacher education

In Chapter 7 I outlined the circulation of School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education. While the rationale for School-University Partnerships was not necessarily clearly articulated by participants, the persistence of the discourses of experience and the real help show how partnerships are produced and constrained by a regime of truth in initial teacher education. Ensuring that pre-service teachers have sufficient experience with the real of schools is discursively produced as the reason for partnerships, with the implication that this is critical to addressing the deficits of university teacher education with its disconnection from this "reality". These discourses operate in a mutually productive power relationship with School-University Partnerships, with the discourses producing partnerships as a regime of truth and partnerships producing these discourses of experience and the real.

The discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education, circulating as a regime of truth are "an instrument and effect of power" (Foucault, 1976/1998, p. 101). A regime of truth is a dominant and largely unquestioned "truth" and underpinning School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are these discourses of experience, the real and a discourse of derision which are both a function of and a product of the regime of truth. The largely unquestioned acceptance of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education rest on these underlying discursive conceptualisations of the purpose of initial teacher education, often framed in reference to the "most important" (Grudnoff, 2011) element, professional experience placement. In the policy and practice of School-University Partnerships there is a general lack of clarity about the aims, rationale and what constitutes a partnership which has created space for the proliferation of the key discourses presented in this chapter. The regime of truth in initial teacher education has led to a general and widespread acceptance of partnerships. The discourses are themselves an effect of power in that they are occurring within wider regimes of truth impacting teacher education and education more broadly such as standardization and the "teacher quality" agenda (Connell, 2009). Reforms including the introduction of the Literacy and Numeracy Testing in Initial Teacher Education (LANTITE) have been driven by a "logic of deficiency" (Rowe &

Skourdoumbis, 2019, p. 44) and it is within this context that School-University Partnerships are discursively constructed.

The precarity of teacher education both within the academy and in its standing in the profession has been noted (White et al, 2020). This thesis has shown that rather than shore up the position of teacher education through School-University Partnerships, they reinforce the value of time in schools and fail to recognise a particular contribution of teacher education and teacher education academics. Identification and recognition of teacher education academic expertise is critical for a secure future for university teacher education.

8.6 Who benefits? Consequences of School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth

The preparation of teachers through initial teacher education is a contested space, described as the S*truggle for the Soul of Teacher Education* (Zeichner, 2018). It is a space where the coupling of power/knowledge is evident, with competing claims about the best way to prepare teachers a struggle for the "truth" about teaching. The contemporary situation whereby partnerships are compulsory in initial teacher education has (re)produced the discourses of the real and experience as a central "truth" about learning to teach. These discourses have created space for a discourse of derision towards teacher education academics, subjectified in relation to their (recent) teaching experience in schools. Deb and David made reference to this when they highlighted that "21st Century learning is very different" (Deb) and the need for a "greater understanding of, you know, contemporary learning and teaching" (David). Meanwhile, within the discourses of partnership, teachers are subjectified as experts on teaching through their experience of the real which makes it understandable that teachers' feel positively towards partnerships. The idea that schools and classroom teachers are the holders of all relevant knowledge about teaching and learning to teach ends up being a feature of the discourses of partnership.

The subjectification effects of these discourses on teacher education academics are the virtual erasure of their expertise on the basis of research, teaching of those who are learning to teach and even through partnerships. Participation in School-University Partnerships does not accord teacher education academics with expertise, rather it subjectifies them as in proximity with teachers and schools, which is where expertise lies within these discourses. Teacher education academics are subjectified in partnerships in relation to how close they are to teachers and school classrooms.

The discourses of experience and the real function as part of the "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131) of partnerships in initial teacher education and are thereby difficult to resist. This was demonstrated in the limited alternatives to partnerships put forward by participants. While this is implicated in the discourse of derision towards teacher education academics evident in the repeated invocation of notions of "disconnection" and "ivory towers" (Helen, Brigid), it also reduces scrutiny on the practices of teacher education academics. As long as universities "partner" with schools and foster this connection as central to initial teacher education provision there is less pressure for a coherent course structure and alignment in content. Compulsory partnerships and other shifts in initial teacher education such as Graduate Teacher Portfolio Assessments take the pressure off teacher education to clearly present a rationale for knowledge building in teacher education and instead create space for teacher education to be a box-ticking exercise in developing proficiency or competency in particular tasks (Connell, 2009).

In Australian policy and practice as explored in this thesis, there is no case being made for the eradication of universities and teacher education academics from the preparation of teachers but there is also not a strong argument in policy or practice for the importance of the role of university teacher education and teacher educators. Even the teacher educators themselves didn't make a case for the contribution of teacher educators to initial teacher education, they talked more about the criticism they were aware of. Esther and Christine made reference to what universities have to offer but it was discussed in broad terms rather than specifics about what teacher education academics bring to teacher education. This was a noted absence in the data. For School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education to enrich teacher education, attention to what teacher educators bring beyond unexplored notions of "theory" would help provide direction for partnerships beyond arrangements for pre-service teachers to spend time in schools.

School-University Partnerships in their present form do not offer opportunities for teacher education academics to improve their credibility with schools. They have the appearance of offering this by allowing teacher education academics proximity with schools, classrooms and teachers in a contemporary context but the discourses of partnership identified in this research show that this doesn't count. Access to the "truth" and knowledge about teaching are only accessible through "doing" teaching in schools.

8.7 Conclusion

In this chapter I have examined two prominent discourses from the participant interviews conducted as part of this study. I have argued that the discourses of experience and the real are central to the regime of truth identified in initial teacher education in section 7.2 of Chapter 7. These discourses of experience and the real contribute to the production of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education as a regime of truth. Professional experience placements, identified in 6.2.1 as discursively conceptualised as equivalent to School-University Partnerships, are produced as opportunities for pre-service teachers to gain access to experience of the real. The discourses of experience and the real are produced as the "truth" about learning to teach.

The discourses explored in this chapter are not new and are part of the circulation of power evident in the longstanding challenges of teacher education. I make the claim that the production of School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education has led to a situation where rather than creating "spaces of freedom" (Foucault, 1982/1988, p. 11) in teacher education, discourses of partnership are limiting possibilities and reinforcing the status quo. I have shown in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 that in initial teacher education, the discourses of partnership in policy and practice have been produced as a bureaucratic requirement (see 6.2.9), with a focus on roles and responsibilities within professional experience placement that are "formal partnerships, agreed in writing" (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2015, p. 18).

The dominance of partnerships as an assumed solution creates the conditions whereby there is a lack of critique, questioning and theorizing about partnerships. Policy sets partnerships up as the solution to the challenges of teacher education and yet they are ill-defined and lack the resource allocation to achieve what Wendy described as the "resource intensive personal relationships" that were seen as central to partnership. At the same time, participants in this study all saw possibilities in the future for partnerships in teacher education.

In the spirit of Foucault, this critique of School-University Partnerships as historically contingent is "not simply to record mundane processes of ways in which we are made subject" (Ball, 2019, p. 133) but rather to "show people that they are much freer than they feel, that people accept as truth, as evidence, some themes which have been built up at a certain moment during history, and that this so-called evidence can be criticized and

destroyed" (Foucault, 1982/1988, p. 10). If partnerships are to offer possibilities or "spaces of freedom" (Foucault, 1982/1988, p.11) to teacher education there must be explicit engagement with these discourses of the real and experience that underpin much of the partnerships discourse. If these discourses, circulating as part of this regime of truth, are clearly articulated they can then be theorized and critiqued. When discourses of the real and experience remain as part of this regime of truth, unquestioned, they function to silence debate and render partnerships as nothing more than pre-service teachers spending time in schools, managed by bureaucratic and administrative processes.

It is my contention that further critical attention to School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education is needed and I make use of Foucault to understand that "the present is just as strange as the past" (Kendall & Wickham, 1998, p. 4). School-University Partnerships are not a forward trajectory, building on lessons of the past; rather they are a result of the circulation of power. In this chapter, I presented my argument that rather than leading to change, School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are creating space for the (re)production of long held ideas about learning to teach. The discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are imbued with the effects of the broader influences on teacher education while at the same time producing partnerships as equal to professional experience placement. Debates in teacher education about the role of schools and universities in the preparation of teachers are central to the work of School-University Partnerships and yet there is a lack of explicit engagement with these ideas in the discourses of partnership. In Chapter 9 I outline my claims for why partnerships persist and what a productive future for partnerships might involve.

Chapter 9

Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

In this final chapter I outline my focal theory and show how this theory makes a contribution to knowledge in the field of teacher education. I then outline the implications of this thesis and propose directions for future research. In sections 9.5 and 9.6 I offer my reflections on the research and my own development as a researcher.

This thesis has presented a "history of the present" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 31) of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education and has sought to answer the research questions:

1. How have School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education been discursively constructed in policy and practice?
2. How are truth and knowledge produced in the discourses of School-University Partnerships?
3. What are the consequences for the subjectivity of teacher educators?

In this conclusion chapter I present my theory for how and why School-University Partnerships persist and are circulating as a "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131) in initial teacher education in Australia. My key findings in response to my research questions can be summarised as four main and inter-related claims. Firstly, School-University Partnerships have been so broadly conceptualised in policy and practice as to include almost any connection between schools and universities. Secondly, in initial teacher education, School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth, dominant and broadly accepted in policy and practice. Thirdly, the regime of truth has created the conditions for a lack of critique of School-University Partnerships. My fourth and final main claim is that while School-University Partnerships purport to be a mechanism for bringing schools and universities together, the subjectification effects of the discourses of School-University Partnership are working more to promote division. The broad conceptualisation of partnerships while at the same time they are prominent in initial teacher education has helped to allow partnerships to be seen as Cardini (2006) described them, "benevolent, neutral, and pragmatic" (p. 394). This has meant that critique of the kind highlighted in my

findings in Chapter 8, that partnerships are allowing space for a discourse of derision, have been largely absent from scholarly writing on School-University Partnerships. I have shown in my findings that the limited critique of School-University Partnerships is creating space for the proliferation of unhelpful discourses for the field of teacher education. Below, I provide further detail of these four claims and show how they work together in this "history of the present" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 31) of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education.

9.1.1 Partnerships are everything and nothing

The first of my main claims is that School-University Partnerships have been discursively constructed as everything and nothing. Through my policy analysis and analysis of interview data I found a broad range of discourses of School-University Partnership. Across the policies analysed in Chapter 5 and the findings from the interview data reported in Chapter 6, there are a lack of unifying characteristics in the discourses of partnership. Across policy and practice partnerships were discursively constructed as everything from close personal relationships to fee-for-service arrangements and bureaucratic requirements. I show in this thesis that School-University Partnerships are perennially popular and yet frequently ill-defined. This thesis provides evidence that Burgos' (2003) assertion that "partnerships" is an "empty signifier" is an apt description in Australian teacher education. School-University Partnerships have been prominent in policy as a way of reforming teacher education since at least the 1990s and in Chapter 5 I highlight the presence of partnerships as a policy "solution" across a range of education policies. I show in section 5.6.1 of Chapter 5 how the discourses of partnership in the Smarter Schools National Partnership: Victorian Implementation Plan (Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD), 2010) are an exemplar for the "empty signifier" (Burgos, 2003) status of partnerships where "partnership" describes everything and nothing. In Chapter 6 I provide evidence of the breadth and depth of partnerships in Australian teacher education. In section 6.2 I provide evidence of a broad range of discursive conceptualisations of partnership where almost any connection between a school and a university attracts the label "partnership". This thesis shows, through policy and interview data, that the discourses of School-University Partnership are broad and all-encompassing and describe a range of past and present practices of teacher education.

9.1.2 School-University Partnerships are a regime of truth in initial teacher education

My second central claim is that while partnerships have been produced as everything and nothing, there has at the same time been an increasing focus on School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education where they have come to be seen as the "single most important" (Australian Government Response to Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group, 2015, p. 11) approach to the reform of teacher preparation. In Chapters 5 and 7 I make use of Foucault's concept of "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131) to conceptualise the circulation of power in School-University Partnerships. School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education have become compulsory in policy and must be "formal partnerships, agreed in writing" (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2015) involving a contractual agreement about roles and responsibilities related to professional experience placement. The prominence of partnerships in initial teacher education was also evident in practice and in Chapter 7 I show how the discursive construction of School-University Partnerships has shifted over time from a wide range of practices to a more recent narrowing in initial teacher education. In 7.2 I provide evidence from my interview data that School-University Partnerships have become a discourse which "function[s] as true" (Foucault, 1975/1991, p. 23) in initial teacher education, accepted as *the* way rather than understood as one way to do teacher education.

In Chapter 8 I go on to show how the circulation of School-University Partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education is "produced, sustained and valorized" (Lorenzini, 2015, p. 1) by discourses of experience, and the real which led to a discourse of derision. These three discourses are central to the maintenance of the regime of truth because of the way they frame problems and solutions for initial teacher education. The discourses of experience and the real reinforce time in schools as the best and only way to learn to teach. These discourses locate the problems of teacher education in the university-based elements of teacher education, highlighted in the identified discourse of derision towards teacher education discussed in Chapter 8. These discourses frame initial teacher education as in need of a closer working relationship with schools and render School-University Partnerships as a relatively unproblematic solution. This positioning of schools as the solution to initial teacher education is what leads to the point I make in 9.1.4, that School-University Partnerships are not having a unifying effect on schools and universities.

The discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education also work to create the "dangerous" (Foucault, 1983, p. 231) conditions whereby a return to past practices of teacher education is presented as innovative. The notion that learning to be a teacher is best done "on the job" through maximising experience in the real of schools is not new in teacher education debates. School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are frequently operating with the assumption that more time in schools in inherently good as if this is a new or common-sense idea. Professional experience placement is a valued element of initial teacher education (Mayer et al, 2017) but it is not unproblematic, nor is more necessarily better (Reid, 2011; Reynolds et al, 2015).

9.1.3 The regime of truth in initial teacher education leads to a lack of critique

The third of my main claims is that the way in which School-University Partnerships are circulating as a "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1977/1980b, p. 131) in initial teacher education leads to a lack of critique of partnerships. Critique is also made difficult by the broader discourses of partnership outlined in section 9.1.1, where School-University Partnerships are produced as everything and nothing. In initial teacher education, School University Partnerships are seen as difficult to argue with and generally positive and I present evidence in Chapter 7 of how the regime of truth limits the possibility for critique of partnerships. I also show that participants saw School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education as inevitable and found it difficult to identify alternatives. School-University Partnerships continue to be associated with positive notions such as collaboration (Chan, 2016) and mutual benefit (Kruger et al, 2009; Trent & Lim, 2010; Vick, 2006b). Partnerships also continue to be popular as a solution to any and all of the problems of teacher education, particularly the preparation of "classroom ready" teachers (Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group, 2014, p. 12) in initial teacher education and yet they often involve practices that have been part of teacher education in the past. Across Chapters 6 and 7 I show that rather than being evidence of "revolution or reform" (Furlong et al, 1996, p. 39), the discourses of School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education rely on assumptions about learning to teach that have been questioned, contested and debated since the beginning of mass schooling in Australia (Vick, 2006).

I have shown in Chapter 5 and 6 that School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education continue to function as an "empty signifier" and have become a regime

of truth in initial teacher education. In order to create a productive future for partnerships, they need greater scrutiny in terms of their purpose and practice. School-University Partnerships need to be subject to critique because:

> To do criticism is to make harder those acts which are now too easy. Understood in these terms, criticism is utterly indispensable for any transformation. As soon as people begin to have trouble thinking things the way they have been thought, transformation becomes at the same time very urgent, very difficult, and entirely possible. (Foucault, 1981 in Koopman, 2013, p. 16)

In Chapter 6 of this thesis, I have shown how School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth and that this has limited space for critique. I have also shown in Chapter 8 that the discourses of partnership in initial teacher education are valorising time in schools and this too is not highly scrutinised.

This limited critique of partnerships is also evident in the scholarly literature, where despite some scrutiny a utopian vision continues to dominate. A growth area for research on School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education has been the use of the concept of "third space" in relation to initial teacher education (Beck, 2020; Day et al, 2021; Daza et al, 2021; Forgasz et al, 2018; Green et al, 2020; Martin et al, 2011; Zeichner, 2010). This approach has "permeated research on ITE over the last decade" and has been used to promote the establishment of "less hierarchical spaces" (Daza et al, 2021, p. 2). This research shows that Bullough's (1999) description of School-University Partnerships as "paradise unrealized" continues to be apt. While "third space" approaches offer some scope for thinking about partnerships, they tend to rely on the kind of notions popular in the partnership literature such as "mutuality" and "trust" (Kruger et al, 2009; Jones et al, 2016). I argue that what is needed is greater critique and not unrealistic goals of levelling or eradicating hierarchies. A Foucauldian conception of power offers scope for reframing understandings of power in partnerships as "everywhere".

9.1.4 School-University Partnerships are not having a unifying effect on schools and universities

The fourth of my key findings is that School-University Partnerships in initial teacher education are not having a unifying effect on teachers and teacher educators. The main contributor to this is what I outlined in 9.1.2, that School-University Partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth. This means that partnerships are prominent to the point of

excluding other options. I show in Chapter 8 the way the subjectification effects of the discourses of partnership limit the likelihood of bringing teachers and teacher educators together. The perpetuation and valorisation of discourses of experience and the real within partnerships, contributes to a discourse of derision towards teacher education. Teachers are subjectified as operating within the real with access to the "truth" of experience while the knowledge and skills of teacher educators are defined by a lack of these. Teacher education is discursively constructed as that which happens in the university. This limits the possibilities for collaborative working by continuing to position schools and teachers as "helping" teacher education which occurs somewhere else, as a way to counter the deficits of teacher education identified in the discourse of derision. In Chapter 8 I show evidence of the continuing prevalence of the idea that professional experience placements provide access to the real and experience which is where pre-service teachers "really" learn to teach. In the discourses of School-University Partnerships, learning to teach is constructed as spending time in schools without an agreed or explicit articulation of what is involved in learning to teach beyond simply time in schools, framed as experience. I show in Chapter 5 that in policy, School-University Partnerships have shifted from recommended to compulsory (Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), 2011b; AITSL, 2015). In this shift the focus has moved to partnerships that are "formal, agreed in writing", defining partnerships as the compulsory requirement that Universities ensure that their pre-service teachers spend "time in schools". This is despite there already being a government requirement for a minimum number of days of professional experience placement for course accreditation and for registration as a teacher (AITSL, 2015).

The discourses of partnership evident in this research framed partnerships as an opportunity to address deficits in teacher education, which was identified as related to what happens in universities. The problem with assuming that what happens in universities as part of teacher education is lacking and that the involvement of schools will fix the problem is that it involves implicit assumptions about how teachers best learn. These implicit assumptions, that teaching is a "craft" best learnt "on the job" (Ellis, 2010), underlie the discourses of the real and experience, and have been explored at length in the scholarly literature and are central to the complexities of teacher education (White & Forgasz, 2016). Knowledge of the history of teacher education shows us that teacher preparation has relied more or less on exposure to the real and experience over time and that "time in schools" is

not a simple solution for teacher education. Almost 30 years ago, Hatton (1994) critiqued the notion that time in schools "practice teaching" seemed to be considered "inevitably good" and that "if we fiddle with how it is done and how much of it is done, this unquestioned good can inevitably be made better" (p. 30). The discourses of partnership explored in Chapter 8 provide evidence that these ideas have endured. School-University Partnerships haven't been a simple solution to the problems of teacher education and they won't be if mere "time in schools" remains a central premise of such partnerships in initial teacher education.

9.1.5 The dangers of School-University Partnerships

This history of the present, drawing on Foucault's genealogical framework, has found that School-University Partnerships are prolific as a practice of teacher education, particularly in initial teacher education. In other areas of teacher education, such as professional learning and research, School-University Partnerships are discursively produced as *an* option or one possible way of doing things, whilst in initial teacher education, partnerships are circulating as a regime of truth. The reasons for the persistence in the pursuit of partnerships and their prominence in the present can be at least partly explained by four key elements: in initial teacher education they are compulsory for professional experience and are broadly accepted as central (Jones et al, 2016); partnerships are linked to other positive notions such as collaboration (Chan, 2016); there is an assumed collaborative advantage connected to partnerships (Huxham & Vangen, 2000); and there are more obvious targets for critique (e.g. standardised testing, marketization of schools) leaving partnerships to be considered relatively benign (Cardini, 2006). Yet their danger lies in the way they draw heavily on limited resources and allow for the proliferation of discourses of the real and experience in teacher education and the way they circulate as a regime of truth, limiting the possibilities for alternative ways of doing and thinking about teacher education. Despite past valiant attempts to create a usable framework (Jones et al, 2016) or model (Peel, Peel & Baker, 2002) or to lay out a working definition for School-University Partnerships (Goodlad, 1991), more recent scholarship accepts the vagaries of the empty signifier and relies on a "broader definition" where "any work being carried out by members of a university and a school" (Heffernan et al, 2021, p. 683) is accepted. While this study does not seek to define the work of School-University Partnerships, within the

context of practice or research on School-University Partnerships the lack of an agreed definition or central unifying characteristics needs to be acknowledged. Given the prolific nature of partnerships identified in this thesis, further scrutiny through critical research is important for the field of teacher education.

Partnerships have been identified by participants in this research as resource-intensive but generally worthwhile and in many cases central to their work. Given the identification of partnerships as a resource-intensive method of initial teacher education (see 6.2.2), without clear benefits caution is needed if pursuing partnerships. This research shows that partnerships can be professionally rewarding and a way to enhance the experiences of teachers, pre-service teachers, school staff and academics, yet they can also be nothing more than a label to describe administrative work associated with professional experience placement. Given their compulsory nature in initial teacher education (AITSL, 2015), finding ways to work productively in partnership, or creatively resist the partnership imperative are critical for the field of teacher education. I argue that it is critique of partnerships, drawing on a Foucauldian analytic of power that will help create space for this work.

9.2 Contribution to knowledge in education

This thesis makes a contribution to knowledge in teacher education in a number of ways. In my main claims above I show how the discourses of partnership constitute them as everything and nothing. This knowledge is important to the field of teacher education in the future pursuit of partnerships or alternative ways and forms of teacher education. The ambiguity of partnerships has been identified in the past in scholarly literature (Burgos, 2003; Cardini, 2006; Mockler, 2013) and this thesis shows that this ambiguity continues to be a feature of School-University Partnerships in teacher education in Australia. While this ambiguity could be productive for the field and create "spaces of freedom" (Foucault, 1982/1988, p.11), this thesis shows that it functions to reduce the capacity of partnerships to contribute to teacher education partly by provoking cynicism from school-based participants about yet another partnership (See 7.2.2). The ambiguity of partnerships also leads to a lack of clarity of purpose in partnerships which limits what can be achieved. Participants in this study expressed both cynicism and hope about a partnership agenda, yet

the lack of limits or agreed unifying characteristics of what constitutes a School-University Partnership makes it hard to map out a future for such partnerships.

This thesis also shows that there is a general acceptance that partnerships are positive and a view that they are an important part of the future of teacher education. This is despite participants reporting negative experiences and limitations of partnership. The acceptance of partnerships as largely positive is "dangerous" (Foucault, 1984, p. 343). The danger lies in the way it makes them difficult to resist and creates an environment where it is hard to raise questions. This thesis makes a contribution to knowledge in teacher education by demonstrating empirically the difficulty with resisting a partnerships agenda and shows there is an urgent need for further critical work in this area.

This thesis also makes a contribution to knowledge on School-University Partnerships in teacher education through the way it brings a rich, theoretically informed reading of partnerships. As has been identified in the literature review in Chapter 2, many studies of School-University Partnerships are both small-scale individual case studies and without an articulated background theory. This research shows how engagement with theory can help make sense of School-University Partnerships and help to show that as with a "what works" approach to education in general (Biesta, 2007), an approach to partnerships with a focus on "what works" won't work. This thesis has used Foucault's genealogical approach to show that the dominance of School-University Partnerships is historically contingent and the result of the circulation of power. This helps to highlight that there are other possibilities in teacher education.

Another contribution of this thesis to knowledge is that it shows how in initial teacher education the discourses of partnership function as a regime of truth and therefore sideline alternative ways of being and doing in teacher education. The way School-University Partnerships circulate as a regime of truth in initial teacher education perpetuates this general acceptance. This identification of the status of partnerships as a regime of truth helps create space for questioning their dominance. This is critical for creating "spaces of freedom" (Foucault, 1982/1988, p. 11) in teacher education.

Finally, this thesis shows that School-University Partnerships are not new or generally innovations. They include a wide range of practices that have been part of teacher education for a long time, often in varying guises since the beginning of widespread formal schooling. These instances of "tinkering with the fine tuning" (Vick, 2006, p. 182) of

longstanding practices of teacher education are unlikely to address the problems of the field, particularly if the participants in the partnerships are not cognisant of the history of teacher education or the contest of ideas at play in important questions about how to learn to teach. This thesis shows that School-University Partnerships are likely to continue to perpetuate the problems of teaching teachers, where the teachers we have are never the ones we want (Carlgren, 1988), unless they articulate the framework for teacher learning that they are operating under. The "complex and contradictory process" (Williams, 2014a, p. 228-229) of partnerships must be first acknowledged if it is to be addressed. This thesis provides evidence that further work is needed to make the implicit explicit in the policy and practice of School-University Partnerships.

9.3 What are the implications of this thesis?

The implications of this thesis are that greater caution and clarity are needed around engagement in School-University Partnerships. While there is evidence that School-University Partnerships are supported and can be part of a positive contribution to teacher education, they are not a simple solution to the longstanding and complex challenges of learning to teach. The discourses evident in initial teacher education, particularly the identified discourse of derision, points to the need for caution from teacher education academics in their engagement in and with partnerships.

This thesis has shown that School-University Partnerships are a place where long-held ideas about learning to teach, such as the value of access to the real and experience, continue to circulate without significant critique. If School-University Partnerships are to make a future contribution to initial teacher education there needs to be an acknowledgement and critique of these ideas.

In initial teacher education partnerships are compulsory as part of professional experience placements. Participants to these partnerships should not assume a shared agenda and there is a need for clarity around the purpose of such partnerships. Jones et al (2016) argued as part of their framework that clear communication around expectations should form part of the planning for partnerships. Explicit articulation of the rationale for partnerships is critical if they are to make a positive contribution to the future of teacher education. This thesis has shown that School-University Partnerships continue to be discursively constructed in ways that are "excessively broad" (Clifford & Millar, 2008, p. 11).

This combined with the dominance of partnerships as a regime of truth in initial teacher education means that there is a clear need for an agreed working definition in partnership work. Not that all School-University Partnerships need be the same but that clarity around what a partnership is and what its goals are is critical for individual partnerships to work productively together.

9.4 Directions for future research

This research shows that there is widespread acceptance of School University Partnerships as positive. While there are many instances reported in the literature of "successful partnerships" (Jones et al, 2016), further critical analysis of School-University Partnerships is needed. Theoretically rich study of partnerships that draws further on Foucauldian notions of power and subjectivity would provide an opportunity to engage critically with School-University Partnerships in order understand their potential role in the present and future of teacher education. This research has drawn on a range of participants who have been involved in many different partnerships spanning from the 1970s to the present. This rich history of partnerships would benefit from comparative analysis. Mockler's (2013) research engaged in this kind of comparison in a way that highlighted a need to question the purpose of partnerships. Further comparative analysis of this kind would provide evidence of historical patterns in partnership.

Another important future direction is further research that moves beyond individual, small scale case studies of partnerships in teacher education. Small scale studies that identify strengths and weaknesses in individual School-University Partnerships make a limited contribution to the field without engagement with theory and placing the study in the context of the long history of partnerships. A stronger framework of critique is needed and cross-institutional research that builds the capacity for comparative analysis would also be beneficial.

This research attempts to challenge the regime of truth that is School-University Partnerships and to raise it as a concern for the field. The example of reforms to teacher education in England is a cautionary tale for how a partnerships agenda can be a path to sidelining or excluding higher education from involvement in the preparation of teachers (Furlong et al, 1996; Mutton et al, 2021). Teacher education as a field needs to make a

stronger case for specialised knowledge around learning to teach. Future research on partnerships that has a focus on this knowledge would be beneficial.

In the scholarly literature on partnerships, issues of power are absent or underexplored (Zeichner, 2021) and while any exploration of power goes some way to filling the gap in critiquing partnerships (Breault, 2014; Davies et al, 2007), I argue that a critical analysis of partnerships drawing on a Foucauldian conception of power offers a potential way forward. A Foucauldian exploration of power would offer space to consider partnerships beyond hierarchies of knowledge and expertise and instead consider the ways in which power circulates in partnership. A forthcoming publication by Gerrard and Holloway (2023) explores the way that teacher expertise is linked to the production of truth and knowledge. Research investigating the production of expertise in School-University Partnerships in teacher education would be an opportunity to focus on knowledge questions rather than conceptualising partnerships as bureaucratic arrangements for fulfilling policy requirements.

Foucault's power/knowledge could provide a useful analytic tool. An examination of the circulation of power in partnerships would enable a clearer understanding of the effects of partnerships and enable those investing their personal and professional energy in them to better achieve their goals. The conceptual tools afforded by a Foucauldian inspired analytic of power provide an opportunity to think partnerships differently as well as to imagine alternatives.

I argue that a conceptualisation of power as "everywhere" will make a future for partnerships or other modes of teacher education possible. This offers an alternative to unsuccessful attempts to ignore power or understand power as hierarchical and to try to shift the balance of power. Traditional notions of power as held by particular people or institutions are not able to account for the complex interconnecting relationships across institutions and roles that occur in initial teacher education. Foucault's conceptualisation of power as circulating and ever present provides greater scope for analysis of partnerships.

9.5 Reflections on the research

In this study I attempted to fill a gap in the research on School-University Partnerships by using Foucault's distinctive historical approach. I wanted to understand how the field of teacher education had ended up in the present position where School-University Partnerships are dominant as a solution to the perceived persistent problems. I could see

that School-University Partnerships had existed for a long time and yet seemed in many cases to be identified as new or innovative. I could also see that many studies of School-University Partnership were conducted by participants in the partnership, with a vested interest in highlighting the positives, and focused on single case studies. In attempting to capture the bigger picture in this research I also struggled at times to delineate the boundaries of the study. I wanted to capture the amorphous nature of partnerships, and to show empirically that the "empty signifier" status of partnerships argued by Burgos (2003) continued to be the case in Australian teacher education.

I have tried to capture the breadth of practices and views on School-University Partnerships by interviewing participants with a range of professional backgrounds, particularly long-running careers in the field. This enabled me to gain a historical perspective on School-University Partnerships. Whilst I was able to show the complexity of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education, finding a coherent line of argument through the data was a challenge. In keeping with the Foucauldian tradition which informs this research, the findings are but one interpretation, a partial telling. In my findings chapters I have laid out my argument that the discourses of partnership are varied and that partnerships are at the same time everything and nothing. In the end my inability to neatly describe partnerships based on my empirical data was a central finding of the study. School-University Partnerships in policy and practice in Australian teacher education cannot be neatly described; this would be imposing boundaries where they do not clearly exist.

It has been my intention to try to capture the richness of School-University Partnerships beyond just initial teacher education and yet both the policy and the interview data continued to point towards initial teacher education. Whilst there are points of research interest in School-University Partnerships outside of initial teacher education, it is in this highly contested space of teacher preparation where the most important stories to tell seemed to lie. I had a desire to show that whilst partnerships had a broad and rich history there was a tendency, in the present, for the discourses of partnership to centre on initial teacher education. Both the policy findings and the findings presented in Chapter 6, 7 and 8 provide evidence for this but it was difficult to analyse together. A focus on partnerships in initial teacher education in the interviews may have led to a clearer picture and provided the scope for richer analysis in this important area. Yet by looking at

partnerships beyond initial teacher education I was able to show the breadth of School-University Partnerships.

I have identified further analysis of partnerships drawing on Foucauldian notions of power as a future direction for research. While I have drawn on these ideas in my analysis, my research design placed some limits on my capacity to explore power in partnerships. My efforts to capture the breadth of School-University Partnerships meant that I kept my interview questions general and relatively open-ended. This did provide me with data on partnerships occurring in a whole range of contexts and for varying purposes but it meant that my questions didn't provide me with the data I needed for a deep analysis of power.

I also acknowledge that my interview participants were all residents of the state of Victoria at the time of the research. Some of the participants had worked in a number of other states in the past. Given that higher education is controlled by the Federal Government and the policies explored were national it is appropriate to frame this as a national study but I acknowledge that there are some state specific particularities relating to partnerships and some other aspects of teacher education, the nuances of which I was not able to capture in the scope of this study. As this research was interested in exploring how partnerships have become so prevalent it was appropriate to look nationally, especially given the role of the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership in teacher education.

An important strength of this research is that it takes a neutral stance with regard to School-University Partnerships. Much of the research into partnerships accepts them as a taken-for-granted aspect, particularly of initial teacher education whereas this study starts without assuming partnerships are good or bad or attempting to evaluate them but rather to try to understand how we arrived at this present situation where partnerships are widespread. The strengths of this research also include bringing together a range of participants with experience across a breadth of partnerships. Much of the Australian and International research on partnerships is on single case studies or a small number of case studies and often focus on partnerships in one context. This research draws on important history in teacher education to elucidate the position of teacher education in the present. This history of partnerships in teacher education is critical to the field as so often "innovations" that emerge in policy and practice are very similar to past practices (Vick, 2006).

The use of Foucauldian genealogy as a framework for this study ensured a critical approach to partnerships that is needed. The existing literature in Australia has a strong focus on highlighting the strengths of partnerships and looking for ways to improve them. Critical questions about why partnerships exist and whether they are necessarily central to the future of teacher education are needed and this thesis makes a contribution in this area.

9.6 Reflections on my learning as a researcher

My experiences as a teacher and a teacher education academic and as a participant in School-University Partnerships gave me a multi-layered "insider" researcher status which aligns well with Foucault's work. His own work was in areas he had a vested interest in. This research has shown that within School-University Partnerships there is some strong professional and institutional demarcation as evidenced by the discourse of derision towards teacher education. This meant that my own position as teacher and/or teacher education academic involved a kind of divided loyalty. My experiences in teacher education make it hard not to view the field from the perspective of a teacher education academic even though at the final stage of completion I am working in a school.

My formation as a subject, as a researcher as well as a teacher and teacher education academic have been part of this PhD project. While at times the theory can seem like an inconvenient obstacle to the concrete world of practice, I know that the false simplicity of an apparently "theory free" worldview leads to repeating the problems of the past. Research into School-University Partnerships has, for the most part, continued to focus at the surface on who does what and what is done. This leaves larger questions about the underlying purpose of partnerships and questions around what it means to learn and what it means to teach unanswered. Foucault offers a breadth of tools, utilised in a wide range of educational research, to help explore, critique, analyse and look for new ideas around School-University Partnerships.

References

Ager, W., Gow, J., & Gee, M. (2005). Grassroots Networks: A Model for Promoting the Influence of Service Users and Carers in Social Work Education. *Social Work Education, 24* (4), 467-476.

Allard, A., Mayer, D., Moss, J. (2014). Authentically assessing graduate teaching: outside and beyond neo-liberal constructs. *Australian Educational Researcher, 41*, 425-443.

Allen, J.M., Howells, K., & Radford, R. (2013). A 'Partnership in Teaching Excellence': ways in which one school-university partnership has fostered teacher development. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(1), 99-110.

Allen, J. M., & Wright, S. E. (2014). Integrating theory and practice in the pre-service teacher education practicum. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 20*(2), 136-151.

Ambrosetti, A., & Dekkers, J. (2010). The interconnectedness of the roles of mentors and mentees in pre-service teacher education mentoring relationships*. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35* (6), 42-55.

Apple, M. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Apple, M. (2001). Markets, Standards, Teaching and Teacher Education*. Journal of Teacher Education, 52* (3), 182-196.

Aspland, T. (2006). Changing patterns of teacher education in Australia. *Education Research and Perspectives, 33*(2), 140-163.

Asselin, M. (2003). Insider research: Issues to consider when doing qualitative research in your own setting. *Journal for Nurses in Staff Development*, 19 (2), 99-103.

Auerbach, S. (2012). Conceptualizing Leadership for Authentic Partnerships: A Continuum to Inspire Practice. In Auerbach, S. (Ed.) (2012). *School Leadership for Authentic Family and Community Partnerships*. New York: Routledge.

Australian Catholic University (2018). *Suitability for teaching*. Retrieved from https://www.acu.edu.au/about_acu/faculties,_institutes_and_centres/education_and_arts/schools/suitability_for_teaching

Australian Council for Educational Research. (2018). *Literacy and Numeracy Test for Initial Teacher Education Students*. Retrieved from https://teacheredtest.acer.edu.au/.

Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2011a). *Australian Professional Standards for Teachers*. Retrieved from

http://www.aitsl.edu.au/australian-professional-standards-for-teachers/standards/list.

Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2011b). *Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures*. AITSL, Melbourne.

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2015). *Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia*. AITSL, Melbourne.

Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2017). *Effective professional experience case studies*. Retrieved from https://www.aitsl.edu.au/deliver-ite-programs/learn-about-ite-accreditation-reform/improved-professional-experience-for-ite-students/effective-professional-experience-case-studies

Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2018). *Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership Corporate Plan.* Retrieved from http://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/default-document-library/aitsl-corporate-plan-2018-2019.pdf?sfvrsn=d3a3f13c_2

Bacchi, C. (2000). Policy as discourse: What does it mean? Where does it get us? *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 21*(1), 45-57. doi:10.1080/01596300050005493

Bacchi, C. (2009). *Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* French Forest, NSW: Pearson Australia

Bacchi, C. (2012). Why Study Problematizations? Making Politics Visible. *Open Journal of Political Science, 2*(1), 1-8.

Bacchi, C., & Bonham, H. (2014). Reclaiming discursive practices as an analytic focus: Political implications. *Foucault Studies, 17*, 173-192.

Bacchi, C., & Goodwin, S. (2016). *Poststructural policy analysis: A guide to practice*. New York, USA.: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bahr, N., & Mellor, S. (2016). *Building quality in teaching and teacher education*. Australian Council of Educational Research. http://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1025&context=aer

Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 13*(2), 10-17.

Ball, S. J. (1995). Intellectuals or technicians? The urgent role of theory in educational studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 43*(3), 255-271.

Ball, S. J. (2005). *Education Policy and Social Class*. London: Routledge.

Ball, S.J. (Ed.) (2013). *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (2015). What is policy? 21 years later: reflections on the possibilities of policy research. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 36*(3), 306-313.

Ball, S. J. (2016). Subjectivity as a site of struggle: refusing neoliberalism? *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 37*(8), 1129-1146.

Ball, S. J. (2019). A horizon of freedom: Using Foucault to think differently about education and learning. *Power and Education, 11* (2), 132-144.

Bartholomaeus, C. (2016). Developmental discourses as a regime of truth in research with primary school students. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 29* (7), 911-924.

Beck, J. (2020). Investigating the Third Space: A New Agenda for Teacher Education Research. *Journal of Teacher Education, 71* (4), 379-391.

Bekerman, Z., & Zembylas, M. (2017). *Psychologized Language in Education: Denaturalizing a Regime of Truth*. Springer.

Bentley-Williams, R., Grima-Farrell, C., Long, J., & Laws, C. (2017). Collaborative Partnership: Developing Pre-service Teachers as Inclusive Practitioners to Support Students with Disabilities. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 64* (3), 270-282.

Bernay, R., Stringer, R., Milne, J., & Jhagroo, J. (2020). Three models of effective school-university partnership*. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 55*, 133-148.

Bevir, M. (2008). What is genealogy? *Journal of the Philosophy of History, 2* (3), 263-275.

Biesta, G. (2007). Why 'what works' wont work: Evidence based practice and the democratic deficit in educational research. *Educational Theory, 57* (1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2006.00241.x

Biesta, G., Takayama, K., Kettle, M., & Heimans, S. (2020). Teacher education between principle, politics, and practice: A statement from the new editors of the Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 48*(5), 455-459.

Bloomfield, D. (2009). Working within and against neoliberal accreditation agendas: opportunities for Professional Experience. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 27-44.

Bloomfield, D. & Nguyen, H. (2015). Creating and Sustaining Professional Learning Partnerships: Activity Theory as an Analytic Tool. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(11), 23-44.

Bourke, T. (2011). *Teacher Professional Standards: Mirage or miracle cure. An archeology of professionalism in education.* Queensland University of Technology. Unpublished doctoral thesis.

Brady, L. (2002). School-university partnerships: What do schools want? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 27*(1), 1-9.

Breault, R. (2014). Power and perspective: the discourse of professional development school literature. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 42*(1), 22-35.

Brisard, E., Menter, I., & Smith, I. (2006). Discourses of partnership in initial teacher education in Scotland: current configurations and tensions. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 29*(1), 49-66.

Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: a critical study of learning to teach*. State University of New York Press.

Budgen, C., & Gamroth, L. (2008). An overview of practice education models. *Nurse Education Today*, 28(3), 273-283.

Bullough, R. V. & Kauchak, D. (1997). Partnerships Between Higher Education and Secondary Schools: Some Problems. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 23* (3), 215-233.

Bullough, R. V., Birrell, J., Young, J., Clark, D., Erikson, L., Earle, R., Campbell, J., Hansen, L., & Egan, M. (1999). Paradise unrealized: Teacher educators and the costs and benefits of school/university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education, 50*(5), 381-390.

Bullough, R.V. (2002). Thoughts on teacher education in the USA. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 28* (3), 233-237.

Bullough, R. V., Draper, R., Smith, L., & Birrell, J. (2004). Moving beyond collusion: clinical

faculty and university/public school partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*(5), 505-521.

Bullough, R.V. (2012). Against best practice: uncertainty, outliers and local studies in educational research. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 38* (3), 343-357.

Burgos, R. B. (2003). Partnerships as a Floating and Empty Signifier within Educational Policies. In B. Franklin, T. Popkewitz, & M. Bloch. (2003). *Educational Partnerships and the state: The paradoxes of governing schools, children and families*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Burridge, P., Hooley, N., & Neal, G. (2015). Creating frames of practice for teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*. doi: 10.1080/1359866X.2015.1041877

Burroughs, G., Lewis, A., Battery, D., Curran, M., Hyland, N., Ryan, S. (2020). From mediated fieldwork to co-constructed partnerships: A framework for guiding and reflecting on P-12 school-university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education, 71*(1), 122-134.

Bvumbwe, T. (2016). Enhancing nursing education via academic-clinical partnership: An integrative review, *National Journal of Nursing Sciences, 3*(3), 314-322.

Cardini, A. (2006). An analysis of the rhetoric and practice of educational partnerships in the UK: an arena of complexities, tensions and power. *Journal of Education Policy, 21*(4), 393-415.

Carlgren, I. (1988). Where did blackboard writing go? *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 30*(6), 613-617.

Catelli, L. A., Padovano, K., & Costello, J. (2000). Action research in the context of a school-university partnership: Its value, problems, issues, and benefits. *Educational Action Research, 8*, 225–242.

Chadbourne, R. (1996). Student reluctance to take up school-based teacher education: one university's experience, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 21(2), p. 219-226.

Chan, C. (2016). *School-University Partnerships in English Language Teacher Education*: Springer.

Chung, J. (2016). The (mis)use of the Finnish teacher education model: 'policy-based evidence-making'? *Educational Research, 58*(2), 207-219.

Clifford, M., & Millar, S. (2008). K-20 Partnerships: Literature Review and Recommendations for Research *WCER Working Paper No. 2008-3*.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: the education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(1), 5-28.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). Editorial: The problem of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(4), 295.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2021). Rethinking teacher education: the trouble with accountability. *Oxford Review of Education, 47*(1), 8-24.

Commonwealth of Australia. (1998). *A Class Act: Inquiry into the status of the teaching profession*. Canberra: Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee.

Commonwealth of Australia Senate. (1999). Government Response to the report A Class Act. *Hansard*, 11054-11066.

Commonwealth of Australia (2007). *Top of the Class: Report on the inquiry into teacher education*. Canberra: House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training.

Commonwealth of Australia. (2008). *Australian Government Response to the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training Top of the Class: Report on the Inquiry into Teacher Education.*

Connell, R. (2009). Good teachers on dangerous ground: towards a new view of teacher quality and professionalism. *Critical Studies in Education, 50*(3), 213-229.

Connell, R. (2013). The neoliberal cascade and education: an essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education, 54*(2), 99-112.

Craig, C. J., (2016). Structure of teacher education. In. J. Loughran & M. Hamilton. (2016). *International handbook of teacher education*. Springer.

Craven, G. (2014) *Letter to the Minister for Education, Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers*. Retrieved from https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/action_now_classroom_ready_teachers_accessible.pdf

Crawford-Garrett, K., Rauschenberger, E., & Thomas, M. A. (2020). Examining Teach for All: An introduction. In M. A. Thomas, E. Rauschenberger and K. Crawford-Garrett (2020). *Examining Teach for All*. Routledge.

Cresswell, J. (2005). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research.* Pearson Education.

Crowley, U. (2009). Genealogy, method. In. R. Kitchin & N. Thrift. (Ed.). *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Elsevier. Retrieved from www.search.credoreference.com.ezproxy2.acu.edu.au/content/title/esthg.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *Professional Development Schools: Schools for developing a profession*. Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 40* (3), 291-309.

Davies, B., Browne, J., Gannon, S., Honan, E., & Laws, C., Mueller-Rockstroh, B., Peterson, E. B. (2004). The Ambivalent Practices of Reflexivity. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10* (3), 360-389.

Davies, B., & Gannon, S. (2005). Feminism/Poststructuralism. In B. Somekh, & Lewin, C. (Ed.), *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. SAGE Publications.

Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. *International Journal of qualitative studies in Education, 20*(3), 247-259.

Davies, B., Edwards, J., Gannon, S., & Laws, C. (2007). Neo-liberal Subjectivities and the Limits of Social Change in University-Community Partnerships. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(1), 27-40.

Day, C. (1998). Re-thinking School-University Partnerships: a Swedish case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(8), 807-819.

Day, C., Gu, Q., Townsend, A., & Holdich, C. (2021). *School-University Partnerships in Action: The promise of change*. Routledge.

Daza, V., Gudmundsdottir, G., & Lund, A. (2021). Partnerships as third spaces for professional practice in initial teacher education: A scoping review. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 102*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103338

Deakin University. (2021). *Teaching Academies and Alliances*. www.deakin.edu.au/education/professional-experience/teaching-academies-and-alliances.

Dean, M. (1994). *Critical and effective histories: Foucault's methods and historical sociology*. Routledge.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994*). What is Philosophy?* Verso.

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Foucault*. University of Minnesota Press.

Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. (2010). *Smarter Schools National Partnerships: Victorian Implementation Plan*. Commonwealth State Relations Division for the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.

Department of Education, Skills and Employment. (2022). *Next Steps: Report of the Quality Initial Teacher Education Review*. Retrieved from www.dese.gov.au/quality-initial-teacher-education-review/resources/next-steps-report-quality-initial-teacher-education-review

Dreyfus, H. & Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. University of Chicago Press.

Edmond, C. (2001). A new paradigm for practice education. *Nurse Education Today, 21,* 251-259.

Edwards, B., Goodwin, M., Pemberton, S. & Woods, M. (2001). Partnerships, power and scale in rural governance. *Environment and Planning: Government and Policy, 19*, 289- 310. http://dx.doi.org/10.1068/c12m.

Ellis, N. J., Alonzo, D., & Nguyen, H. T. M. (2020). Elements of a quality pre-service teacher mentor: A Literature Review. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 92*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103072

Ellis, V. (2010). Impoverishing experience: the problem of teacher education in England. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 36*(1), 105-120.

Ellis, V., & McNicoll, J. (2015*). Transforming Teacher Education: Reconfiguring the academic work*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Ellis, V., Maguire, M., Trippestad, T., Liu, Y., Yang, X., Zeichner, K. (2016). Teaching other people's children elsewhere, for a while: the rhetoric of a travelling educational reform. *Journal of Education Policy, 31*(1), 60-80.

Fancourt, N., Edwards, A., Menter, I. (2015). Reimagining a School-University Partnership: The Development of the Oxford Education Deanery Narrative. *Education Inquiry, 6*(3), 353-373.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. (2008). The Interview: From Neutral Stance to Political Involvement. In. N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln. (Eds). *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials.* SAGE Publications.

Forgasz, R., Heck, D., Williams, J. & Ambrosetti, A. (2018). Theorising the third-space of professional experience partnerships. In J. Kriewaldt, Ambrosetti, A., Rorrison, D., & Capeness, R. (Ed.), *Educating Future Teachers: Innovative Perspectives in Professional Experience*. Springer.

Foucault, M. (1961/2005*). Madness and Civilisation: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972/2010). *The Archeology of Knowledge*. Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, M. (1975/1991). *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1975/1980). Prison Talk. In C. Gordon. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Random House.

Foucault, M. (1976/1980). Questions on Geography: Interview. In. C. Gordon (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Random House.

Foucault, M. (1976/1998). *The History of Sexuality I: The Will to Knowledge*. Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1977/1980a). Two Lectures. In C. Gordon. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Random House.

Foucault, M. (1977/1980b). Truth and Power: Interview. In. C. Gordon (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Random House.

Foucault, M. (1977/1980c). The History of Sexuality: Interview. In. C. Gordon (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Random House.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8 (4), pp 777-795.

Foucault, M. (1982/1988). Truth, power, self: An interview with Michel Foucault. In L. Martin, H. Gutman & P. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 9-15). Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1984). On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In. P. Rabinow. (Ed.) (1984) *The Foucault Reader*. Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1984). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. In P. Rabinow (Ed.). *The Foucault Reader*. Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1985/1990). *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality, Volume 2*. Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (2000). *Power: Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984* (Vol. III, R. Hurley, Trans. & J.D. Faubion Ed.). The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: lectures at the College de France 1977–197*8. Picador.

Franklin, B., Popkewitz, T., & Bloch, M. (2003). *Educational Partnerships and the state: The paradoxes of governing schools, children and families*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Furlong, J., Whitty, G., Whiting, C., Miles, S., Barton, L., & Barrett, E. (1996). Re-defining partnership: Revolution or reform in initial teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 22*(1), 39-55.

Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C., & Whitty, G. (2000). *Teacher education in transition: Re-forming teaching professionalism.* Open University.

Furlong, J., McNamara, O., Campbell, A., Howson, J., & Lewis, S. (2008). Partnership, policy and politics: initial teacher education in England under New Labour. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 14*(4), 307-318.

Furlong, J. (2013). *Education – an anatomy of the discipline. Rescuing the university project*. Routledge

Furlong, J. (2019). The Universities and initial teacher education; challenging the discourse of derision. The case of Wales. *Teachers and Teaching, 25* (5), 574-588.

Furlong, J., Griffiths, J., Hannigan-Davies, C., Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2021). The reform of initial teacher education in Wales: from vision to reality. *Oxford Review of Education, 47* (1), 61-78.

Gale, T., & Parker, S. (2017). The Prevailing Logic of Teacher Education: Privileging the Practical in Australia, England and Scotland. In M. Peters, B. Cowie and I. Menter (Eds). *A Companion to Research in Teacher Education*. Springer.

Garland, D. (2014). What is a "history of the present"? On Foucault's genealogies and their critical preconditions. *Punishment & Society, 16*(4), 365-384.

Gerrard, J., & Holloway, J. (forthcoming, 2023). *Expertise*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Gillet-Swan, J., & Grant-Smith, D. (2020). Addressing mentor wellbeing in practicum placement mentoring relationships in initial teacher education. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 9*(4), 393-409. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-02-2020-0007

Gilroy, P. (1992). The Political Rape of Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales: a JET rebuttal. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 18*(1), 5-22.

Goodlad, J. I. (1991). School-university partnerships. *Education Digest, 8*(56), 58.

Goodlad, J. (1993). School-University Partnerships and partner schools*. Educational Policy, 7* (1), 24-39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904893007001003

Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools*. Jossey-Bass.

Gordon, C. (1980). Afterword. In. C. Gordon (Ed.). *Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and other writings 1972-1977.* Vintage Books.

Gore, J. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth*. Routledge.

Gore, J., Ladwig, J., & King, B. (2004). *Professional Learning, Pedagogical Improvement and the Circulation of Power.* Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Melbourne.

Gore, J. M. (2016). Reform and the reconceptualisation of Teacher Education in Australia. In R. Brandenburg, McDonough, S., Burke, J., & White, S. (Ed.), *Teacher Education: Innovation, Intervention and Impact*. Singapore: Springer.

Gormley, K. (2020). Neoliberalism and the discursive construction of creativity. *Critical Studies in Education, 61* (3), 313-328.

Graham, L. J. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference, Sydney.

Graham, L. J. (2011). The Product of Text and 'Other' Statements: Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. *Education Philosophy and Theory, 43*(6), 663-674.

Green, B. (2003). Curriculum Inquiry in Australia: Towards a Local Genealogy of the Curriculum Field. In W. Pinar (Ed). *International handbook of curriculum research*. Routledge.

Green, C., Tindall-Ford, S., & Eady, M. (2020). School-University Partnerships in Australia: a systematic literature review. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 48*(4), 403-435.

Green, C., Eady, M., Burns, P., & Baker, J. (2021). Developing Innovative Practices Through Third-Space Partnerships: Reflections on Project DARE (Dementia Knowledge, Art, Research and Education). *Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 11* (1). DOI:10.5590/JERAP.2020.11.1.03.

Grima-Farrell, C., Long, J., Bentley-Williams, R., Laws, C. (2014). A School System and University Approach to Reducing the Research to Practice Gap in Teacher Education: A Collaborative Special Education Immersion Project. *Australian Journal of Teacher*

Education, 39 (5), 89-98.

Grima-Farrell, C. (2015). Mentoring pathways to enhancing the personal and professional development of pre-service teachers. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 4 (4), 255-268. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-07-2015-0020

Grudnoff, L. (2011). Rethinking the practicum: limitations and possibilities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(3), 223-234.

Grudnoff, L., Haigh, W., & Mackisack, V. (2016). Re-envisaging and reinvigorating school-university practicum partnerships. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*. doi: 10.1080/1359866X.2016.1201043

Grundy, S. (1996) Building professional research partnerships: Possibilities and perplexities. *Australian Educational Researcher, 23* (1), 1-15.

Gulson, K., Lewis, S., Lingard, B., Lubienski, C., Takayama, K., & Taylor-Webb, P. (2017). Policy mobilities and methodology: a proposition for inventive methods in education policy studies. *Critical Studies in Education, 58* (2), 224-241.

Gutierrez, A. (2016). Exploring the Becoming of Pre-Service Teachers in Paired Placement Models. In. R. Brandenburg, S. McDonough, J. Burke and S. White (Eds.). *Teacher Education: Innovation, Intervention and Impact.* Springer.

Hall, C., & Noyes, A., (2009). New regimes of truth: The impact of performative school self-evaluation systems on teachers' professional identities. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25* (6), 850-856.

Hall, G. W. (2005). *Beyond the Divide: Relations between Teachers and Academics in a Collaborative Research Partnership* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Queensland University of Technology.

Hall, S. (1992). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In. T. D. Gupta, C. E. James, C. Anderson, G. Galabuzi & R.C.A. Maaka. (Eds.) (2018). *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings* (2nd Ed). Canadian Scholars Press.

Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse. In M. Wetherall, S. Taylor, & S.J. Yates. (Eds.). *Discourse theory and practice a reader*. SAGE.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.

Hatton, E. (1994). Work Experience as a Solution to the Problems of Relevance and Credibility in Teacher Education. *Australian Journal of Education, 38* (1), 19-35.

Heffernan, A. (2018). *The principal and school improvement: Theorising discourse, policy and practice*. Springer.

Heffernan, T., Manton, C., Seddon, T., Kostogriz, A., & Barbousas, J. (2021). Examining the formation and evolution of university and school partnerships across four case studies. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*. DOI:10.1080/02607476.2021.1948798z

Heyes, C. (2010). Subjectivity and Power. In. D. Taylor. *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts*. Acumen Publishing.

Hobbs, L., Chittleborough, G., Jones, M., Kenny, J., Campbell, C., Gilbert, A., Redman, C. and King, J. (2015) *School-based pedagogies and partnerships in primary science teacher education: the Science Teacher Education Partnerships with Schools (STEPS) project*, Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching, Sydney, N.S.W.

Hogan, C., & Down, B. (1996). Interrupting the institutional, narrative on teacher training: The potential of school-based teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 21*(1), 46-65.

Hook, D. (2005). Genealogy, discourse, 'effective history': Foucault and the work of critique. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 2*(1), 3-31.

Hoyte, F., Singh, P., Heimans, S., & Exley, B. (2020). Discourses of Quality in Australian Teacher Education: Critical Policy Analysis of a Government Inquiry into the Status of the Profession. In In: Fox J., Alexander C., Aspland T. (eds) *Teacher Education in Globalised Times*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-4124-7_9.

Hunkin, E. (2018). Whose quality? The (mis)uses of quality reform in early childhood and education policy. *Journal of Education Policy, 33*(4), 443-456.

Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2000). What makes partnerships work? In. S. Osbourne. (2000). *Public-Private Partnerships: Theory and Practice in International Perspective*. Routledge

Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L.A. (2012). *Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research: viewing data across multiple perspectives.* Routledge.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2012). *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches.* SAGE Publications.

Jones, M. & Ryan, J. (Ed.), (2014). *Successful Teacher Education: Partnerships, Reflective Practice and the Place of Technology*. Sense Publishers.

Jones, M., Hobbs, L., Kenny, J., Campbell, C., Chittleborough, G., Gilbert, A., Herbert, S., & Redman, C. (2016). Successful university-school partnerships: An interpretive framework to inform partnership practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 60*, 108-120.

Keddie, A. (2013). Thriving amid the performative demands of the contemporary audit culture: a matter of school context. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 28 (6), 750-766.

Kendall, G., & Wickham, G. (1999). *Using Foucault's Methods*. SAGE Publications.

Kennedy, A., & Doherty, R. (2012). Professionalism and partnership: panaceas for teacher education in Scotland? *Journal of Education Policy, 27*(6), 835-848.

Kenny, J.D., Hobbs, L., Herbert, S., Jones, M., Chittleborough, G., Campbell, C., Gilbert, A., & Redman, C. (2014). Science Teacher Education Partnerships with Schools (STEPS): Partnerships in science teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 39* (12), 43-65.

Kertesz, J., & Downing, J. (2016). Piloting Teacher Education Practicum Partnerships: Teaching Alliances for Professional Practice (TAPP). *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41* (12), 13-24.

King, N., Horrocks, C., & Brooks, J. (2019). *Interviews in Qualitative Research* (2nd Ed.). SAGE Publications.

Knight, J., Lingard, B., Bartlett, L. (1994). Reforming Teacher Education Policy under Labor Governments in Australia 1983—93. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 15*(4), 451-466.

Koopman, C. (2013). *Genealogy as critique: Foucault and the problems of modernity*. Indiana University Press.

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2010). How Teacher Education can Make a Difference. *Journal of Education for Teaching,* 36 (4): 407–423.

Kostogriz, A., & Doecke, B. (2011). Standards-based accountability: reification, responsibility and the ethical subject. *Teaching Education, 22*(4), 397-412.

Kretchmar, K., Sondel, B., & Ferrare, J. (2018). The Power of the Network: Teach For America's Impact on the Deregulation of Teacher Education. *Educational Policy, 32* (3), 423-453.

Kruger, T., Davies, A., Eckersley, B., Newell, F., Cherednichenko, B. (2009*). Effective and Sustainable University-School Partnerships: Beyond determined efforts by inspired individuals*. Canberra: Teaching Australia.

Labaree, D. (2008). An uneasy relationship: The history of teacher education in the university. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. McIntyre & K. Demers (Eds.). *Handbook of research on teacher education.* Routledge.

Lather, P. (1992). Critical frames in educational research: Feminist and post-structural perspectives. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), p. 87-99.

Lather, P. (2012). The ruins of neo-liberalism and the construction of a new (scientific) subjectivity. *Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7*, 1021-1025.

Lather, P., & St. Pierre, E. (2013). Post-qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26* (6), 629-633.

Le Cornu, R. (2015). *Key components of effective professional experience in initial teacher education in Australia*. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership. http://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/default-document-library/aitsl_key-components-of-effective-professional-experience.pdf?sfvrsn=aec9ec3c_o

Le Cornu, R. (2016). Learning From the Past to Build the Future. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 44* (1), 80-101.

Ledger, S., Ure, C., Burgess, M., & Morrison, C. (2020). Professional Experience in Australian Initial Teacher Education: An Appraisal of Policy and Practice. *Higher Education Studies, 10*(4). DOI: https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v10n4p116

Ledoux, M., & McHenry, N. (2008). Pitfalls of School-University Partnerships. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 81*(4), 155-160.

Ling, L. M. (2017). Australian teacher education: inside-out, outside-in, backwards and forwards? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(5), 561-571.

Lingard, B., Rawolle, S., & Taylor, S., (2005). Globalizing Policy Sociology in Education: Working with Bourdieu. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(6), 759-777.

Lingard, B. (2010). Policy borrowing, policy learning: testing times in Australian schooling. *Critical Studies in Education, 51*(2), 129-147.

Lorenzini, D. (2015). What is a 'regime of truth?' *Le Foucauldien, 1* (1). https://foucaldien.net/articles/abstract/10.16995/lefou.2/.

Lorenzini, D. (2020). On possibilising genealogy. *Inquiry.* DOI: 10.1080/0020174X.2020.1712227

Louden, W. (2008). 101 Damnations: the persistence of criticism and the absence of evidence about teacher education in Australia. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 14*(4), 357-368.

Loughran, J. (2016). Teaching and Teacher Education: The Need to Go Beyond Rhetoric. In R. Brandenburg, McDonough, S., Burke, J., & White, S. (Ed.), *Teacher Education: Innovation, Intervention and Impact*. Springer.

Luke, A. (1997). Introduction: Theory and Practice in Critical Discourse Analysis. In. L. Saha (Ed.). *International Encyclopedia of the sociology of education*. Pergamon.

Lynch, R. A. (2013). Reading *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*. In C. Falzon., T. O' Leary & Sawicki, J. (Eds.) (2013) *A Companion to Foucault*. Blackwell Publishing Limited.

Maclure, M. (2013). Classification or Wonder? Coding as an Analytic Practice in Qualitative Research. In. Coleman, R (Ed). *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh University Press.

Maguire, M., Braun, A., & Ball, S. (2015). 'Where you stand depends on where you sit': the social construction of policy enactments in the (English) secondary school. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36*(4), 485-499

Mahon, M. (1992). *Foucault's Nietzschean Genealogy: Truth, Power and the Subject*. State University of New York Press.

Malinen, O., Vaisanen, P., & Savolainen, H. (2012). Teacher education in Finland: a review of a national effort for preparing teachers for the future. *The Curriculum Journal, 23* (4), 567-584.

Marsh, D., & Sharman, J.C. (2009). Policy diffusion and policy transfer. *Policy Studies, 30* (3), 269-288.

Marshall, J.D. (1996). *Michel Foucault: Personal autonomy and education.* Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Manton, C., Heffernan, T., Kostogriz, A., & Seddon, T. (2020). Australian school-university partnerships: the (dis)integrated work of teacher educators. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, DOI: 10.1080/1359866X.2020.1780563.

Martin, L., Gutman, L., & Hutton. P. (1988*). Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. University of Massachusetts Press.

Martin, S., Snow, J., & Franklin-Torrez, C. (2011). Navigating the terrain of third space: Tensions with/in relationships in school-university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(3), 299-311. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110396096

Mayer, D. (2014). Forty years of teacher education in Australia: 1974-2014. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 40*(5), 461-473.

Mayer, D., Dixon, M., Kline, J., Kostogriz, A., Moss, J., Rowan, L., Walker-Gibbs, B., White, S. (2017). *Studying the Effectiveness of Teacher Education: Early Career Teachers in Diverse Settings*. Springer.

Mayes, E. (2016). *The lines of voice: An ethnography of the ambivalent affects of student voice [unpublished doctoral thesis]*. University of Sydney.

McDonald, B. J. (2002). Marx, Foucault, Genealogy. *Polity, 34*(3), 259-284.

McLachlan, F. (2016). Gender Politics, the Olympic Games, and Road Cycling: A Case for Critical History. *The International Journal of the History of Sport, 33*(4), 469-483.

McLaughlin, C., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2004). A Schools-University Research Partnership: understandings, models and complexities. *Journal of In-Service Education, 30*(2), 265-284.

McLeod, J. (2017). Reframing responsibility in an era of responsibilisation: education, feminist ethics. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 38*(1), 43-56.

Mockler, N. (2013). The slippery slope to efficiency: An Australian perspective on school-university partnerships for professional learning. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 43*(3), 273-289.

Mockler, N. (2018). Early career teachers in Australia: a critical policy historiography. *Journal of Education Policy, 33* (2), 262-278.

Mockler, N., & Stacey, M. (2021). Evidence of teaching practice in an age of accountability: what can be counted isn't all that counts. *Oxford Review of Education, 47* (2), 170-188.

Mockler, N. (2022). *Constructing Teaching Identities: How the Print Media Defines and Represents Teachers and Their Work*. Bloomsbury.

Moss, J. (2008). Leading professional learning in an Australian secondary school through school-university partnerships. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(4), 345-

357.

Mueller, M. (2008). Reconsidering the concept of discourse for the field of critical geopolitics: towards discourse as language and practice. *Political Geography, 27*(3), 322-338.

Murray, J. (2002). *Between the chalkface and the ivory towers? a study of the professionalism of teacher educators working on primary initial teacher education courses in the English university sector* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of East London.

Murray, S., Nuttall, J., & Mitchell, J. (2008). Research into initial teacher education in Australia: A survey of the literature 1995-2004. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(1), 225-239.

Mutton, T., Burn, K., & Menter, I. (2017). Deconstructing the Carter Review: competing conceptions of quality in England's 'school-led' system of initial teacher education. *Journal of Education Policy, 32*(1), 14-33.

Mutton, T., Burn, K., Thomson, I., & Childs, A. (2021). The Complex Policy Landscape of Initial Teacher Education in England: What's the Problem Represented to be? In D. Mayer (Ed.). *Teacher Education Policy and Research: Global Perspectives*. Springer.

Nuttall, J., & Brennan, M. (2016). Teacher education as academic work: the affordances of a materialist analysis. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2016.1144712

Neal, G., & Eckersley, B. (2015). Immersing Pre-Service Teachers in Site-based Teacher School University Partnerships. In M. Jones, & Ryan, J. (Ed.), *Successful Teacher Education: Partnerships, Reflective Practice and the Place of Technology*. Springer.

Niesche, R. (2008). *"Disciplining the Principal": Exploring Two White Female Principals' Subjectivities in Indigenous Schools [unpublished doctoral thesis].* University of Queensland.

Niesche, R. (2011). *Foucault and educational leadership: Disciplining the principal*. Routledge.

Nuttall, J., Brennan, M., Zipin, L., Tuinamuana, K., & Cameron, L. (2013). Lost in production: the erasure of the teacher educator in Australian university job advertisements. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 39*(3), 329-343.

O'Farrell, C. (2005). *Michel Foucault.* Retrieved from

doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446218808.n4.

O'Neill, G. (June 22, 2021). Unpacking the Research and Philosophy Behind the Finnish Education System. *The University Times.* https://universitytimes.ie/2021/06/

Olssen, M. (2004). Foucault and Marxism: Rewriting the theory of historical materialism. *Policy futures in education, 2* (3-4), 454-482.

Olssen, M. (2016). *Michel Foucault: Materialism and education*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315633459

Ord, K., & Nuttall, J. (2016). Bodies of knowledge: The concept of embodiment as an alternative to theory/practice debates in the preparation of teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 60*, 355-362.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2005). *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers.* https://www.oecd.org/edu/school/34990905.pdf

Peel, H., Peel, B., & Baker, M. (2002). School/University Partnerships: A viable model. *International Journal of Education Management, 16* (7), 319-325. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540210448077

Peters, J. (2002). *The Complexity of School/University Partnerships: Participants' Perceptions of the Innovative Links Project in South Australia [Unpublished doctoral thesis].* University of South Australia, Adelaide.

Peters, M.A. (2001). *Poststructuralism, Marxism, and Neoliberalism: Between Theory and Politics.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Peters, M. (2003). Truth-telling as an Educational Practice of the Self: Foucault, Parrhesia and the ethics of subjectivity. *Oxford Review of Education, 29*(2), 207-224.

Peters, M., & Besley, T. (2007). *Subjectivity and truth: Foucault, Education and the care of the self*. Peter Lang Publishing.

Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction*. SAGE Publications.

Pillow, W. S. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure: Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of qualitative studies in Education, 16*, 175-196.

Pillow, W.S. (2015). Reflexivity as Interpretation and Genealogy in Research. *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies*, 15 (6), 419-434.

Popkewitz & Brennan, M. (1998). *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, power and knowledge in education.* Teachers College Press.

Popkewitz, T. (2004). Is the National Research Council Committee's Report on Scientifica Research in Education Scientific? On Trusting the Manifesto. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10* (1), 62-78.

Powley, K. (Nov 30 2015). 'Ten per cent of Australian trainee teachers failed pilot maths and literacy test', The Herald Sun.

PTR Consulting. (2018). *Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group Evaluation: School University Partnerships*. Prepared for Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership.

Prado, C. J. (2000). *Starting with Foucault: An introduction to genealogy*. Routledge.

Rabinow, P. (1984). *The Foucault Reader*. Pantheon Books.

Reid, J. (2011). Doing it by the numbers? Educational research and teacher education. *Australian Educational Researcher, 38*, 383-400.

Reid, J., & Hall, G. (2022). Looking back, looking forward: taking stock of teacher education at (another) crossroad. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 50* (1), 8-22. Doi: 10.1080/1359866X.2021.2019676

Reynolds, R., Howley, P., Southgate, E., & Brown, J. (2016). Just add hours? An assessment of pre-service teachers' perception of the value of professional experience in attaining teacher competencies. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(5), 455-469.

Rickinson, M., Sebba, J., & Edwards, A. (2011). *Improving Research through User Engagement.* Routledge

Rosenberg, A., & Westfall, J. (Eds.) (2018). *Foucault and Nietzsche: A critical encounter*. Bloomsbury.

Rowan, L., Mayer, D., Kline, J., Kostogriz, A., & Walker-Gibbs, B. (2015). Investigating the effectiveness of teacher education for early career teachers in diverse settings: the longitudinal research we have to have. *Australian Educational Researcher, 42*, 273-298.

Rowan, M., & Shore, S. (2019). Foucault's toolkit: Resources for 'thinking' work in times of continual change. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning, 49*(1), 57-74.

Rowe, E., & Skourdoumbis, A. (2019). Calling for 'urgent national action to improve the quality of initial teacher education': the reification of evidence and accountability in reform agendas. *Journal of Education Policy, 34*(1), 44-60.

Ryan, J. (2014) Introduction. In M. Jones & J. Ryan. (Eds.). *Successful Teacher Education: Partnerships, Reflective Practice and the Place of Technology.* Sense Publishers.

Ryan, J., & Jones, M. (2014). Communication in the Practicum. In M. Jones & J. Ryan (Eds.). *Successful Teacher Education: Partnerships, Reflective Practice and the Place of Technology.* Sense Publishers.

Ryan, J., Butler, H., Kostogriz, A., & Nailer, S. (2016). Advancing Partnership Research: A Spatial Analysis of a Jointly-Planned Teacher Education Partnership. In. R. Brandenburg, S. McDonough, J. Burke and S. White (Eds.). *Teacher Education: Innovation, Intervention and Impact.* Springer.

Sachs, J. (1997). Renewing teacher professionalism through Innovative Links. *Educational Action Research, 5*(3), 449-462.

Sachs, J. (2000). The Activist Professional. *Journal of Educational Change,* 1 (1), 77-94.

Santoro, N., Reid, J., Mayer, D. & Singh, M. (2012). (Editorial) Producing 'quality' teachers: the role of teacher professional standards. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 40* (1), 1-3.

Savage, G. C., & Lewis, S. (2018). The phantom national? Assembling national teaching standards in Australia's federal system. *Journal of Education Policy, 33* (1), 118-142.

Savage, G.C. (2020). What is policy assemblage? *Territory, Politics, Governance, 8*(3), 319-335.

Scheurich, J. McKenzie. K. (Ed.). (2008). Foucault's Methodologies. In N.K. Denzin. & Y.S. Lincoln. (Eds.). *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials (3rd ed)*. SAGE.

Scott, J. (1991). The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry, 17* (4), 773-797. https://doi.org/10.1086/448612

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences.* Teachers College Press.

Sewell, A., Cody, T., Weir, K., & Hansen, S. (2017). Innovations at the boundary: an explanatory case study of a New Zealand school-university partnership in initial

teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*. doi:10.1080/1359866X.2017.1402294

Shamir, R. (2008). The age of responsibilization: on market-embedded morality. *Economy and Society, 37*(1), 1-19.

Sidhu, R. K. (2003). *Selling futures: Globalisation and international education* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. University of Queensland.

Singh, P., Heimans, S., & Glasswell, K. (2014). Policy enactment, context and performativity: ontological politics and researching Australian National Partnership policies*. Journal of Education Policy, 29*(6), 826-844.

Smedley, L. (2001). Impediments to partnership: A literature review of school-university links. *Teachers and Teaching, 7*(2), 189-209.

Smith, I., Brisard, E., & Menter, I. (2006). Models of partnership developments in initial teacher education in the four components of the United Kingdom: recent trends and current challenges. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 32*(2), 147-164.

Smith, K. (2010) Fostering regimes of truth: understanding and reflecting on the Freedom School way. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 18* (2), 191-209, DOI:10.1080/14681366.2010.488044.

Smith, K. (2016). Partnerships in Teacher Education-Going Beyond the Rhetoric, with Reference to the Norwegian Context. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal,* 6 (3), 17–36.

Smith, R., & Zantoitis, A. (1989). Practical teacher education and the avant-garde. In Giroux, H., and McLaren, P. (Eds). (1989). *Critical Pedagogy, the State and Cultural Struggle*. State University of New York Press.

Smith, W. (2016). An Introduction to the Global Testing Culture. In W.C. Smith (2016). *The Global Testing Culture: Shaping education policy, perceptions and practice*. Symposium Books.

Somekh, B. (2010). The Collaborative Action Research Network: 30 years of agency in developing educational action research. *Educational Action Research*, 18 (1), 103-121.

Stephens, N., Tonnessen, F., & Kyriacou, C. (2007). Teacher *training* and teacher *education* in England and Norway: a comparative study of policy goals. *Comparative Education, 40* (1), 109-130.

St. Pierre, E. (2011). Post qualitative research: The critique and the coming after. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Sage handbook of qualitative inquiry* (4th ed.) (pp. 611-635). SAGE.

St. Pierre, E. (2013). The Appearance of Data. *Cultural Studies-Critical Methodologies, 13*(4), 223-227.

St. Pierre, E. (2014). A Brief and Personal History of Post Qualitative Research: Toward "Post Inquiry". *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 30(2), 2-19.

St. Pierre, E. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2014). Qualitative Data Analysis After Coding, *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(6), 715-719.

Saldana, J. (2009). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. SAGE.

Stronach, I., & McNamara, O. (2002). Working together: The long spoons and short straws of collaboration. In O. McNamara (Ed.), *Becoming an evidence-based practitioner: A framework for teacher-researchers.* Routledge.

Taylor, I., & Le Richte, P. (2006). What do we know about partnership with service users and carers in social work education and how robust is the evidence base? *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 14(5), 418-425.

Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group. (2014). *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers*. Retrieved from www.studentsfirst.gov.au/teacher-education-ministerial-advisory-group.

Tamboukou, M. (1999). Writing Geneologies: an exploration of Foucault's strategies for doing research. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 20*(9), 201-207.

Thomson, P., Hall, C., & Jones, K. (2013). Towards educational change leadership as a discursive practice—or should all school leaders read Foucault? *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 16*(2), 155-172.

Thomson, G., & Mockler, N. (2016). Principals of audit: testing, data and 'implicated advocacy'. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 48*(1), 1-18.

Thomson, G. (2020). *The education assemblage*. Routledge.

Thorne, C. (2015). *A genealogy of policy, programs and practices for the child with challenging behavior in Prince Edward Island, Canada [*Unpublished doctoral thesis*]*. University of South Australia.

Toe, D., Ure, C., & Blake, D. (2020). Final year preservice teachers' views of professional

experience in partnership schools. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 45*(2), 104-127.

Tosun, J., & Lang, A. (2017). Policy integration: mapping the different concepts. *Policy Studies, 38*(6), 553-570.

Towndrow, P. (2015). Book Review, *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 10(4), 375-378.

Trent, J., & Lim, J. (2010). Teacher identity construction in school-university partnerships: Discourse and practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(8), 1609-1618.

Vick, M. (2006). "It's a Difficult Matter" 1: Historical perspectives on the enduring problem of the practicum in teacher preparation. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(2), 181-198.

Vick, M (2006b). *Partnership in teacher education: historical perspectives on recent rhetoric*. Paper presented at Australian Association for Research in Education conference, 26-30 November 2006, Adelaide, SA, Australia. Retrieved from www.aare.edu.au/data/pub.

Walkerdine, V. (1984) Developmental Psychology and the Child-centred Pedagogy: The insertion of Piaget into early education. In Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C. & Walkerdine, V. (Eds) *Changing the Subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*. Methuen.

Walsh, M. E., & Backe, S. (2013). School-University Partnerships: Reflections and Opportunities. *Peabody Journal of Education, 88*(5), 594-607.

Watts, R. (2006). The Politics of Discourse: Academic responses to the Dawkins reforms of higher education, 1945–1991. *Melbourne Studies in Education, 47*(1-2), 235-267.

Welch, A. (August 31st, 2022). Teacher shortages are a global problem- 'prioritising' Australian visas won't solve ours. *The Conversation*. http://theconversation.com/teacher-shortages-are-a-global-problem-prioritising-australian-visas-wont-solve-ours.

Wetherall, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. (2003). *Discourse theory and practice: A reader*. SAGE Publications.

White, S. (2016) Teacher education research and education policy-makers: an Australian perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 42*(2), 252-264.

White, S. (2019). Once were teachers? Australian teacher education policy and shifting boundaries for teacher educators. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 42*(4), 447-458.

White, S. (2019). Teacher educators for new times? Redefining an important occupational group. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 45*(2), 200-213.

White, S., & Forgasz, R. (2016). The practicum: the place of experience? In. J. Loughran & M. Hamilton. (2016). *International Handbook of Teacher Education*. Springer.

White, S., Murray, J., Goodwin, A.L., Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2020). On the shoulder of giants: advice for beginning teacher educators. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 49*(5), 566-579.

White, S., Tindall-Ford, S., Heck, D., & Ledger, S. (2018). Exploring the Australian Teacher Education 'Partnership' Policy Landscape: Four Case Studies. In J. Kriewaldt, Ambrosetti, A., Rorrison, D., & Capeness, R. (Ed.), *Educating Future Teachers: Innovative Perspectives in Professional Experience*. Singapore: Springer.

Williams, J. (2014a). *Critical perspectives on educational partnerships in the era of neoliberalism* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Victoria University.

Williams, J. (2014b). *Understanding Poststructuralism*. Taylor & Francis.

Young, K. (2020). Innovation in initial teacher education through a school-university partnerships. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, 9*(1), 15-29

Zeichner, K. (2010). University-Based Teacher Education: Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 89-99.

Zeichner, K., Payne, K., & Brayko, K. (2015). Democratizing Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(2), 122-135.

Zeichner, K. (2018). *The struggle for the soul of teacher education*. Routledge.

Zeichner, K. (2021). Critical unresolved and understudied issues in clinical teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 96*(1), 1-7.

Appendix A. Participant Information Letter

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION LETTER

PROJECT TITLE: School-University Partnerships in Australian Teacher Education
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS: Professor Joce Nuttall and Dr. Amy McPherson
STUDENT RESEARCHER: Sarah Nailer
STUDENT'S DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in the research project described below.

What is the project about?
The research project investigates the place and purpose of School-University Partnerships in Australian teacher education. While School-University Partnerships have been a feature of teacher education for some time, they have become more dominant with teacher education courses requiring evidence of 'formal partnerships' as part of their accreditation (AITSL, 2015). This project seeks to understand how and why School-University Partnerships have become such a central feature of teacher education in Australia. The project also seeks to understand the effects of this emphasis on partnerships on the working lives of those involved including teachers, teacher educators and policy makers. Given the significant time, money and energy being invested in School-University Partnerships this research is designed to think critically about these partnerships in order to better understand them and to ensure that Australian teacher education achieves its potential.

Who is undertaking the project?
This project is being conducted by Sarah Nailer and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Australian Catholic University under the supervision of Professor Joce Nuttall.

Are there any risks associated with participating in this project?
While the risk is minor, reflection and discussion of participant experiences of partnerships may elicit memories of negative experiences participants have had. Participants can terminate the interview at any time or decline to comment on any questions.

What will I be asked to do?
- Participants will be involved in a semi-structured interview of up to one hour in length. These interviews will be recorded using a digital recording device.
- The questions will relate to the participants' involvement in School-University Partnerships including their perception of the role played by School-University Partnerships in the broader teacher education landscape. Questions will also

relate to participants' past or current experiences working in School-University Partnerships.

- The interviews will be conducted at a mutually convenient location such as the participants place of employment or at Australian Catholic University. If it is not possible to arrange a face-to-face interview, a phone interview may be arranged.
- Participants will be given an opportunity to check the transcript of their interview for accuracy prior to the data analysis phase of the research

What are the benefits of the research project?

This research project will give you the opportunity to contribute to the field in developing an understanding of the place and purpose of School-University Partnerships.

Can I withdraw from the study?

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are not under any obligation to participate. If you agree to participate, you can withdraw from the study until the end of the data collection phase without adverse consequences. At your request, any data collected from you will be destroyed and not included in the data analysis for the project.

Will anyone else know the results of the project?

The results of this project will be included in the thesis to be submitted for a degree in a form that does not identify participants in any way. In addition the research will be submitted to refereed journals and for book chapters as well as presented at relevant seminars and conferences on education and related fields in a form that does not identify participants in any way. All data will be stored in electronic files on the password protected computer of the researcher.

Will I be able to find out the results of the project?

A summary of the results of the research will be emailed to participants at the conclusion of the study.

Who do I contact if I have questions about the project?

If you have any questions please contact:
Sarah Nailer, sarah.nailer@acu.edu.au or my supervisors:
Professor Joce Nuttall, joce.nuttall@acu.edu.au
Dr. Amy McPherson, amy.mcpherson@acu.edu.au

What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

The study has been reviewed by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University (2017-229E). If you have any complaints or concerns about the conduct of the project, you may write to the Manager of the Human Research Ethics Committee care of the Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research).

Manager, Ethics
c/o Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research)
Australian Catholic University
North Sydney Campus
PO Box 968
NORTH SYDNEY, NSW 2059
Ph.: 02 9739 2519
Fax: 02 9739 2870
Email: resethics.manager@acu.edu.au

Any complaint or concern will be treated in confidence and fully investigated. You will be informed of the outcome.

I want to participate! How do I sign up?

If you are happy to be involved in this study into School-University Partnerships please sign the consent form attached to this email and return via email to Sarah Nailer: sarah.nailer@acu.edu.au or marked 'confidential' to Sarah Nailer, Level 1, 250 Victoria Pde, East Melbourne, 3065 .

Yours sincerely,

Professor Joce Nuttall

Dr. Amy McPherson

Sarah Nailer

Appendix B. Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

TITLE OF PROJECT: School-University Partnerships in Australian Teacher Education
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS: Professor Joce Nuttall and Dr. Amy McPherson
STUDENT RESEARCHER: Sarah Nailer
STUDENT'S DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

I ..... have read and understood the information provided in the Letter to Participants. Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research project, which will include voice recordings of one individual interview of up to one hour in length. I realise that I can withdraw my consent at any time during the data collection phase of this research (without adverse consequences). I agree that research data collected for the study may be published or may be provided to other researchers in a form that does not identify me in any way.

NAME OF PARTICIPANT: .....

SIGNATURE: .....

DATE.....

SIGNATURE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:.....[redacted].....DATE: 27/11/17

SIGNATURE OF CO-SUPERVISOR: [redacted] DATE: 01/11/17

SIGNATURE OF STUDENT RESEARCHER:....[redacted].....DATE: 01/11/17

Please return this form via email to the Sarah Nailer: sarah.nailer@acu.edu.au
If returning in hard copy, please mark 'Confidential' and address to Sarah Nailer, Level 1, 250 Victoria Pde, East Melbourne, VIC 3065

Appendix C. Interview Questions

Interview questions for participants

1. Tell me about your experiences with School-University Partnerships in teacher education.
   - Who were you working with?
   - What do you think were the aims of this/these partnership/s?
   - Based on these experiences, what do you feel were the benefits and limitations?
   - What do you think the other partners would say about their experiences?

1. Describe the way in which the School-University Partnerships you have been involved in have been established.
   - Who or what initiated the partnership?
   - How were the various partners involved?
   - If there were differences, what do you think is the impact of this?

2. How has your partnership work fitted in with other aspects of your roles?
   - Has it complemented your other work?
   - Has it changed the way you go about your job in significant ways?

3. Why do you think School-University Partnerships have become so prominent in teacher education?
   - Do you feel all partners value them?
   - Are there alternatives?
   -

4. How can School-University Partnerships contribute to teacher education?
   - Do you think this vision is being realised?
   - What barriers might exist?

5. What do you see as the role of schools in teacher education?
   - Is this what is happening currently? If not, what are the barriers?

6. Do you see School-University Partnerships as central to the future of teacher education?
   -Why/Why not? Please elaborate

Appendix D: Ethics Application Approval

2017-229E Ethics application approved

Dear Applicant,

Principal Investigator: Prof Jocelyn Nuttall, Dr Amy McPherson
Student Researcher: Ms Sarah Nailer (HDR Student)
Ethics Register Number: 2017-229E
Project Title: School-University Partnerships in Australian Teacher Education: A Genealogical Study
Date Approved: 24/10/2017
Ethics Clearance End Date: 31/12/2018

This is to certify that the above application has been reviewed by the Australian Catholic University Human Research Ethics Committee (ACU HREC). The application has been approved for the period given above.

Researchers are responsible for ensuring that all conditions of approval are adhered to, that they seek prior approval for any modifications and that they notify the HREC of any incidents or unexpected issues impacting on participants that arise in the course of their research. Researchers are also responsible for ensuring that they adhere to the requirements of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research and the University's Code of Conduct.

Any queries relating to this application should be directed to the Ethics Secretariat (res.ethics@acu.edu.au). It is helpful if you quote your ethics approval number in all communications with us.

If you require a formal approval certificate in addition to this email, please respond via reply email and one will be issued.

We wish you every success with your research.

Kind regards,

Kylie Pashley
on behalf of ACU HREC Chair, Dr Nadia Crittenden

Senior Research Ethics Officer | Research Services Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) Australian Catholic University

Appendix E: Email Script for Participants

Email script for Participants

Dear Participant,

As part of my doctoral study, *School-University Partnerships in Australian Teacher Education*, I am recruiting participants to be involved in individual interviews. Given the current expectation that universities are involved in "formal partnerships" (Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership, 2015) with schools as part of their accreditation, this research seeks to generate knowledge about School-University Partnerships and their impact on the working lives of participants.

I am seeking participants who have been and/or are currently involved in School-University Partnerships from a range of institutions and roles including but not limited to: principals, supervising teachers, school-based pre-service teacher coordinators, teacher educators, professional experience administration staff, faculty of education leaders such as heads of schools or deans of education, policy makers or bureaucrats in education departments or teacher accreditation bodies.

If you are interested in contributing to the research project, further information is contained in the Participant Information Letter attached. If you would like to participate, please sign the consent form attached and return it to sarah.nailer@acu.edu.au at your earliest convenience.

Kind regards,

Sarah Nailer (PhD Candidate)

Professor Joce Nuttall (Principal Supervisor) and Dr. Amy McPherson (Co-Supervisor)