



Beckett, L., & Nuttall, A. (2017). A 'usable past' of teacher education in England: history in JET's anniversary issue. *Journal of Education for Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2017.1370479>

Document version

Peer reviewed version

Copyright information

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above.

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

Takedown policy

Any individual, whether within or external to the University, has the right to request the removal of content from the Leeds Trinity University Repository, on the grounds that it breaches copyright, is in any other way unlawful, or represents research misconduct.

Complaints can be submitted via the Repository Complaints Form at <https://www.leedstrinity.ac.uk/media/site-assets/documents/key-documents/pdfs/repository-complaints-form.pdf>

A 'usable past' of teacher education in England: history in JET's anniversary issue

Lori Beckett & Amanda Nuttall

Affiliations:

Lori Beckett, Carnegie School of Education, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, United Kingdom

Amanda Nuttall, Institute of Childhood and Education, Leeds Trinity University, Leeds, United Kingdom

Correspondence address: L.Beckett@leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Full postal Address:

Professor Lori Beckett
The Winifred Mercier Professor of Teacher Education,
Carnegie School of Education,
Leeds Beckett University,
Headingley Campus,
Leeds LS63QQ
UK

History in JET's anniversary issue: drawing on a 'usable past' of teacher education in England

Abstract

The recent *JET Anniversary Virtual Special Issue*, abbreviated here to JET@40, reproduced its very first editorial (Stones, 1975) with selected articles from England and abroad published in subsequent decades. The journal first came into being as a response to damning criticism of the profession via government-sponsored reports and reviews but also to encourage informed debate with particular focus on notions of 'good teaching' and the 'good teacher'. In this paper, we engage with selected contributions in JET@40 to tease out an historical map for teacher education. The task is to glean a sense of the past which resonates with our co-developed, research-informed teacher education programme, and gives insight to a lack of institutional and political support to encourage teacher research activity that interrogates the effects of poverty and cumulative multiple deprivation on disadvantaged students' lives, learning and urban schooling experiences. Our argument is that JET@40 not only provides us with an indication of the best of what is known and practised but also a 'usable past' (Hansot & Tyack, 1982 cited by McCulloch, 2011) or history of specific professional insights to inform debate about possibilities and predicaments in our own teacher education programme.

Keywords: teacher education, history, educational change, schools policy

Introduction

Stones' (1975) very first editorial of the journal, then named *British Journal of Teacher Education* and reprinted in the *JET Anniversary Virtual Special Issue*, here abbreviated to JET@40¹, describes 'A time when politicians and bureaucrats are cutting huge swathes into teacher-training institutions in Britain [which] may not seem the most appropriate moment to launch a journal such as this' (p.1). It was said the moment of unprecedented flux provided a unique opportunity for reappraisal, which began with a 'look-back' to the then-critical debate that led to the experience of upheaval in teacher education. It cited the 1972 James Report's proposals for reform along with its 'doubtful understanding of the malaise' (p.1) but also the DES efforts at the drastic re-structuring of training institutions. Stones positioned the journal as a reply to 'help encourage debate of an informed supportive type: supportive, that is, of a continuing scrutiny of the whole process of teacher education with an eye to enhancing the growth of student teachers and thereby the growth of the children they will teach'. A central concern of these debates was to problematise and challenge assumptions underlying views of 'good teaching' and the 'good teacher'.

More than forty years later we see that that the journal, renamed *Journal of Education for Teaching* and shortened to *JET*, successfully came to reflect Stones' (1975) vision to be a journal that 'reflects the interdisciplinary nature of teacher education' (p.2). This vision for the profession led to much published quality research output in *JET* as elsewhere, exemplified by the twenty selected articles for re-publication in JET@40. But this 'look-back' of 40 years raises alarm at the way in which teacher education has had to continuously accommodate rapid policy changes which are often based more on political ideology than on empirical evidence. Now as then, we confront Stones' (1975) 'fundamental criticism' of the

¹Anniversary Virtual Special Issue, Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy, March 2015. Available at: <http://explore.tandfonline.com/page/ed/cjet-vsi>

whole approach to teacher education: there remains widespread professional anxiety about the lack of heed of research in teacher education but also concern with government insistence on ‘evidence-based teaching’ (see Furlong & Oancea, 2005; BERA-RSA, 2014; Furlong 2013; Whitty 2014), which construct dubious directions for research-informed practice (Carter, 2015; Department for Education (DfE), 2016a). Our anxieties are also raised by the former Cameron & the current May Conservative Governments’ general directions, which seemingly intends to side-line ‘the university project’ in teacher education (Furlong, 2013; Whitty, 2014) as it moves training into schools (Carter, 2015; DfE White Paper, 2016a). A sense of unease continues with the DfE’s response (DfE, 2016b), which recommends a mandatory ‘core curriculum’ for teacher education providers tied to a rigorous inspection system with punitive sanctions for institutions that do not measure up. The upshot is that teacher education in England, with its continuous assessment based on unconvincing claims about ‘what works’, has again been adjudged to require drastic restructuring.

At this juncture, we take direction from McCulloch (2011), who advised that to understand the nature of these issues and trends, and to assess the prospects for addressing them effectively, it *is* necessary to consider them historically. He noted, ‘it is true for historians, no less than for others, that to look to the future we must see where we have come from’ (p.2). In this article, we critically engage with selected papers from JET@40 to theorise the predicament in which we find ourselves: confronting barriers in this vernacular neoliberal policy regime to embed a research-informed teacher education programme that is contextually located and locally responsive in the north of England. It is our intention to draw upon these selected articles to build an historically-informed understanding of the resistance we have come across in developing teacher education which facilitates practitioners’ research activities that conjoins ideas and actions in regards poverty and cumulative multiple disadvantage. We begin with an outline of our current context, where our co-developed

‘Leading Learning’ CPD programme has been officially deemed redundant by faculty management. This is coupled with advice from McCulloch (2011), who directs us to ‘look-back’ to build a sense of a ‘usable past’ (Hansot and Tyack 1982) to critically inform how and why we came to be given this notice to quit. In order to do this, we interrogate selected articles from JET@40 to build an historical nous of teacher education policy, with particular focus on policymakers, academics and teachers inspired by a sense of equity and social justice in regards poverty and cumulative multiple disadvantage. We use this analysis of particular JET papers not only to understand the predicament in regards our own CPD programme but also to draw conclusions that ‘look to the future’ for teacher education.

The ‘Leading Learning’ CPD programme

The recent climate of Westminster politics provides a continual stream of centrally mandated policy prescriptions of teaching and teacher education based on incomplete understandings of the interconnections between political, ideological, social and cultural mechanisms (McNamara and McNicholl, 2016). It is within this context that our small network of teachers and academic partners came together, determined not to relinquish democratic professional control and to engage in critical readings of policy directions on ‘raising achievement’ and ‘closing the gap’. This cumulated in the ‘Leading Learning’ CPD programme: the focus being to support and mentor teacher partners to become self-consciously research active and to develop individual and collective teacher inquiry projects that were published (see Beckett, 2014, 2016).

This co-developed local knowledge work was favourably reviewed in JET (McNicholl, 2016). In her book review, McNicholl recognised the worth of our university partnership with local urban schools to devise local solutions for local problems and in so doing, indicates it might be possible to begin to reclaim professional control of teaching and teacher education. As she said, however, in the context of England’s hostile neoliberal landscape, this is not

going to be an easy task. Beckett (2016) showed the problem is multi-faceted: from the ways, authoritarian politicians and civil servants or officials at the local and national levels line up with business leaders and entrepreneurs intent on profit-making from schooling and education including teacher education, to the ways these non-educationalists then come to dictate the terms of teaching and teacher education.

This predicament brought us to JET@40 to glean from the stories research-active practitioners in teaching and teacher education told over four decades the reasons why there is lack of institutional and political support to engage with each other and with colleagues as teachers and academic partners in our local network. Our joint commitment to theorise the resistance to our efforts to interrogate the effects of poverty and cumulative multiple deprivation on disadvantaged students' lives, learning and urban schooling experiences also brought us to history of education.

Building an historical map

At the outset, we acknowledge McCulloch's (2011) caution on the methods and conceptualisations of an historical approach, and so we take account of history as linked to a broad tradition of critical scholarship with a remit to analyse, challenge, and improve the character of current policies in teacher education for teacher education reform in England. We see JET@40 charting the way the field should define itself and mapping a vision it has for itself, but also the ways that research-active practitioners confront the difficult choices in teacher education, highlight policy conflicts, face political controversies, and create a sense of common professional purpose. Again, taking a cue from McCulloch (2011), this is not simply a look at the history of teacher education encapsulated in the journal and narrowly defined in terms of its use for teacher educators, teachers and policymakers in the present. Rather, we aim to develop a critical understanding of the teacher education reforms that have taken place in England since Stones' (1975) launch of the journal and to engage with some

contributions from JET@40 to inform debate around the resistance we have found in developing our own programme of critical, research-informed teacher education.

This ‘look back’ into teacher education history also points towards our own starting points. The first author’s early academic career in Australia was anchored in teacher research as ‘systematic inquiry made public’ (see Stenhouse, 1975; Rudduck, 1985; Elliott, 1981; Carr and Kemmis, 1986). This developed into a role as academic partner in the Priority Action Schools Program (Groundwater-Smith and Kemmis, nd; Beveridge et al, 2005), which led to recruitment to England in 2005 as Professor of Teacher Education (see Beckett, 2013). It was in this role that the ‘Leading Learning’ CPD programme came to be developed, through efforts to co-devise an appropriate professional response to the experiences of poverty and deprivation for disadvantaged students but also teachers who confront the effects in their classrooms (see Beckett, 2012a, 2012b). The second author came to join this programme as an experienced primary school teacher who signed up to the non-accredited component to be mentored and supported as a ‘research-active teacher’ (Beckett, 2013) and the allied accredited MA ‘Achievement in City Schools’ leading to contextualized school improvement (Wrigley, 2003; Wrigley, Thompson & Lingard, 2012; Beckett & Wood, 2012). She engaged in a research model of teaching and teacher education that challenged the simplistic yet dominant notions of ‘teaching as craft’ in England (Ball, 1997; Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 2009; Hoskins and Maguire, 2013; Nuttall & Doherty, 2014; Philpott, 2014) before being subsequently recruited into teacher education at a local university as an early career researcher.

However, faced with lack of institutional support to market the programme and recruit a second cohort of teachers, Beckett discovered how little remains of the rich legacy of Stenhouse (1975) and others who historically championed teachers’ research-informed practice (see Elliott and Norris, 2012). It could be easy to conclude that promoting critical

forms of teacher education, including interrogations of policy mandates and the ways in which the effects of poverty and cumulative multiple disadvantage in the classroom are related to wider social concerns, is not valued. To articulate this predicament, we needed to acknowledge some of the history of possibilities and problems of reform in teacher education.

A ‘usable past’ in teacher education

In order to plot our response, we see that JET@40 gives us a valuable history of policy directions in teacher education reform which brings our attention to past controversies and conflicts, and raises questions around the fundamental purposes of teachers and teacher educators as they work together towards a ‘common good’. Hansot and Tyack (1982, cited by McCulloch, 2011), provide invaluable direction for an historical framework in which to locate and judge current teacher education policies. As they argued in their important article ‘A usable past: using history in educational policy’:

Present actions and plans for the future flow ineluctably from beliefs about what went before. Whether individual or collective, whether haphazard or methodical, a sense of history clearly has an impact on [teacher] education policy.

(Hansot and Tyack, 1982, 21)

Hansot and Tyack’s (1982) ‘usable past’ draws on candid talk about the ‘last generation’. One of their concerns is with fragmentation of school systems, which they associate with policy makers’ lack of a firm sense of historical common ground. During this ‘last generation’, they suggest, educational policy making became overtly politicised and therefore increasingly ideologically driven. This seemingly resonates with contributions over the past

four decades logged in JET@40 and celebrated in its anniversary special issue. The politicisation is exemplified in Gilroy's (1992) challenging article, *The Political Rape of ITE in England and Wales: a JET Rebuttal*. Here the author draws attention to conflict between politicians' and teacher educators' values in relation to a new form of the school-based pupil-teacher apprenticeship scheme. Of significant concern was that critical scholarship might be lost and teachers indoctrinated through a diet of ideologically driven training with little or no opportunity to examine underpinning values including potential conflicts of political drivers. The affront to Gilroy (1992) was that such reform in teacher education was driven by political rather than educational will, and the rationale for reform stemmed from a torrent of unjustified abuse that resulted in increased central control that was rebuked in the report of JET survey findings.

While Hansot and Tyack (1982) are critical of educators who acquiesce to every new demand and the factionalism of policy makers, we would argue that this is not really the case when we consider JET@40. This special anniversary issue demonstrates a willingness to embrace conflict and controversy, and encourages educators to engage with the historical forces that have shaped teacher education policy in order to form a common ground of thought and action. This is particularly relevant given continued fragmentation and diversification of teacher education, which relates to ideological policy reform with little or no consideration of what has gone before (Crook and McCulloch, 2013; McCulloch, 2016).

In our interrogation of selected articles from JET@40, which speak to our current predicament, we take direction from Hansot and Tyack (1982) to consider three markers in the professional insights afforded to us: the 'storehouse of experiments' and old solutions that are recycled for familiar problems; the time and psychological distance needed to explore old controversies; and meta-analyses to help us understand the underlying dynamics of reform cycles.

Old solutions

We take a cue from Hansot and Tyack (1982) on the ‘storehouse of experiments’: old solutions which are periodically reissued to address significant problems which have long and complex histories. At this juncture, we home in on ‘raising achievement’ and ‘closing the gap’: policy metaphors that purposefully misdirect attention away from the professional consciousness of social, cultural and philosophical goals of teacher education, notably teacher learning and development. Externally-driven, top-down interventions or ‘add-ons’ focused on narrow attainment targets and other indicators of ‘success’ position teachers and teacher educators in test-based accountabilities and a culture of performativity which consequently inhibits authentic practice and neglects the social purposes of education (Ball, 2008; Lingard, 2013).

The critical edge and consistent critical awareness of the wider political interests that are evident in JET@40 refute the idea of reform simplistically conceived as progress where good practices are replaced with something better in policy terms. Zeichner’s (1993) contribution to JET@40 indicates that integral to teacher development is teachers’ learning and empowerment which prioritise the improvement of schooling for *everybody’s children*. Genuine teacher development encompasses teachers’ engagement with research and reflection; empowering teachers in this way is unavoidably a political act and one which is linked to issues of equity and social justice.

It is useful to recall that educational inequality is not a new problem. There is a long history in England of policies designed to tackle inequality, yet the gap between the most and least well-off continues to be great and the relationship between school achievement and family background continues to be strong (see Reay, 2006; Wilkinson and Pickett, 2010). The continued failure of policy reforms to address these issues is assumed by politicians to be teachers’ and teacher educators’ fault, demonstrating a lack of political will to take account of

more nuanced understandings of cultural, social and historical characteristics (Crook and McCulloch, 2013; McCulloch, 2016). This challenge to teachers and teacher educators is echoed in the central pillar of our 'Leading Learning' CPD programme, fuelled by a professional will to improve disadvantaged students' participation and success in schooling. However, our predicament given the lack of institutional and political support needed to shore up teachers' critical perspectives and voices on the pernicious effects of poverty as inextricably linked to educational disadvantage is raised in the most recent *JET* special issue: 'Poverty Discourses in Teacher Education: understanding policies, effects and attitudes'. Here, there is further criticism levied at policy driven by ideology and a disheartening picture of incomplete understandings of what is actually at issue (Gilroy, 2016; McNamara and McNicholl, 2016).

Getting some distance

Hansot and Tyack (1982) assure us that the distance provided by time allows an interrogation of contentious issues which may be discomfiting for politicians. Teachers' voice, which derives from teachers' research/knowledge work, was considered controversial especially in Thatcher's era and subsequently, "too hot to handle" and glossed over for political reasons in the present. Any wonder, then, that our efforts, like others before us, to focus on the effects of poverty and cumulative multiple deprivation on disadvantaged students' lives, learning and urban schooling experiences meet with resistance.

As the first author reported elsewhere (Beckett, 2016), the task is to give voice to some of the inherent difficulties for a professionally determined 'local' solution facilitated by teachers coming together, working collaboratively and building theoretically-informed practical knowledge about poverty and cumulative multiple deprivation given support from academic partners. This is not to dwell on the negative experiences, mindful England has the dubious distinction of being 'a warning' to other systems globally (Lingard, 2009), but to look for the

positives and to the future. This more rigorously defined teacher education is readily identified in the contribution to JET@40 by Bullough & Gitlin (1994), whose concern is keeping ‘teacher education educational’. The authors express disquiet at increasing conservatism of teachers who have experienced the ‘training’ model. In doing so, they describe conflict between policymakers’ views of teacher education reform as a technical and managerial issue and their four propositions of continuous learning for teachers grounded in reflection and systematic inquiry. Bullough & Gitlin (1994), writing in the USA for a global audience, bought into the professional debate about genuine teacher education reform, but in thinking historically about their work we are taunted by their concerns with standardisation and other assumptions of training.

These likely contestations triggered by Bullough & Gitlin (1994) amongst others are indicative of a certain rupture of any shared values, hopes and interests between the profession and the controlling group of non-educationalists comprised of politicians, civil servants, business leaders and those educational entrepreneurs intent on profit making in the current global neoliberal policy climate. This neoliberal bent is evident in Wilkinson’s (2007) contribution on civic professionalism, which throws a spotlight on the intensification of commercialisation in educational settings and contexts. It could be said that the harmful consequences of consumerist perspectives identified by Wilkinson (2007) have been encouraged to flourish to date, given the context of recent educational policies (see DfE, 2016a). This commercialisation has combined to forge a paradigm of teacher education which operates in insensitive ways towards the local school-community context and teachers’ necessary professional values.

This leads us to the growing importance attached to teaching and teacher education in England, as well as internationally, and consecutive neoliberal national governments’ pre-occupation with reform. Gilroy et al’s (1994) report of JET’s symposium with politicians

grapples with the underlying dynamics of the politics of teacher education reform. These co-authors contend it is driven by agendas based on the belief that higher education is somehow firmly rooted in left-wing liberalism and subverts standards. Consistent with an orientation about politically motivated determination, policymakers insist that to break teacher education away from higher education institutions and put it back into schools addresses the issue of 'raising standards' through increased practice and a reduction of 'unimportant' theory. In response, Gilroy et al (1994) argue that compartmentalising education is dangerous ground, with the result that teacher education becomes narrowly focused. There is resonance here with current preoccupation on method over theory and the consequential 'turmoil' in teacher education policy, which describes the dysfunctional relationship between teacher educators and teacher education policy reforms (Crook and McCulloch, 2013; McCulloch, 2016).

While there is tension involved in negotiating a pathway between policy advocacy anchored in ideology in contrast to evidence, heuristically speaking, a more complete understanding of the dynamics at play in policy reform through meta-analyses is instructive.

A meta-analysis

Again, Hansot and Tyack (1982), who name an historical 'issue-attention cycle' and draw attention to the re-issue of old solutions, help us see patterns in teacher education policy response then neglect. The re-occurrence of descriptions of teaching illustrate the point: as a set of skills under Conservative governments, 1979–1997, and as a list of competences and standards under New Labour, 1997–2010. Ongoing attempts to reduce teacher education in England to the pragmatics of content delivery and policy implementation marked Cameron's Conservative led-coalition, 2010-2015, and Cameron's Conservative majority government from 2015 until 2016 when May then led the Conservative Government, which came to be a minority Coalition Government shored up by Northern Ireland's Democratic Unionist Party following the elections of 2017 (see DfE, 2010; Gove, 2010). This in turn points us towards

underlying rather than superficial causes as to why it is increasingly difficult for teachers to engage in critical knowledge building work in order to respond to increasingly complex social and pedagogical challenges (Hoskins & Maguire, 2013; BERA–RSA, 2014). It also gives us some indications of how eyes can be closed to our sound efforts to mentor and support research-active teachers through our ‘Leading Learning’ CPD programme.

Just as Gilroy et al (1994) alert us to politicians’ fears of a perceived left-wing liberalism peddled by higher education institutions, it also helps us recognise there is political motivation in the periodic rediscovery of old problems and old solutions. Harking back to Stones’ editorial (1975), which laments cures for teacher education based on ‘a doubtful understanding of the malaise’, we acknowledge the complexity and texture of history are needed for policymakers and teacher educators to inform hard choices and difficult decisions. But this does not excuse the fragmented and impoverished policies of recent years, not just in England but internationally, that prevents practising teachers and academic partners working together. There is a growing consciousness of the ways in which ‘policy-by-numbers’ (Lingard, 2009) through a punitive accountability system can lead to teachers’ reductionist understanding of the relationship between student lives, learning, and urban schooling experiences.

In our response to these agendas through the ‘Leading Learning’ CPD programme, academic partners support teachers in developing practitioner research which moves beyond the ‘numbers game’ and to identify a range of teacher inquiry foci in order to gain a more insightful understanding of the social realities they confront. In regards poverty and cumulative multiple deprivation, we centre on building teacher partners’ knowledge of, and confidence to work with, critical scholars in the literature but also in person, who then help them to challenge the ‘status quo’ presented as a ‘fait accompli’ by government diktat and Ofsted. This joint engagement in a practical-pedagogical project then enables teacher partners

to build research-informed responses that are published (see Gallagher and Beckett, 2014; Nuttall and Doherty, 2014) and permits teacher education to serve a ‘common good’ (McCulloch, 2011).

A look to the future

A consideration of Burn’s (2006) and Newman’s (1996) contributions to JET@40 provides further professional insights in favour of co-developed knowledge building programmes that are contextually sensitive and locally responsive. Burn’s (2006) article on the distinctiveness of higher education as a teacher education partner begins to conceptualise *how* higher education academics’ contributions to teacher education is of particular value. These partners draw on professionally informed and critical sources of knowledge and are committed to open and critical scrutiny. This leads to development of teachers who are well-placed to engage in genuinely open and critical evaluation of recommendations for practice against a range of criteria, including specific demands of their teaching context. She concludes that a central role for higher education institutions and academics shores up future possibilities for teacher education.

Likewise, advocacy for this approach to teachers’ professional learning and development can be mined from Newman’s (1996) paper, which tells us what is needed to effect quality teacher education is a step-change from ‘quick fixes’ tied to high-stakes testing, monitoring and accountability agendas. Unless opportunities for reflective practice and developing theoretical understanding are facilitated, teacher professional learning and development becomes:

a travesty of the term; conservative and parochial, concerned more with the continuation of the status quo, and with the implementation of externally imposed requirements without understanding or agreement.

(Newman, 1996, 308)

Engaging in reflective practice alters the meaning of accountability, evaluation and supervision (Schon, 1983) and challenges vernacular neoliberal agendas and associated notions of 'teaching as craft' driven by a peculiar form of GERM (Gove, 2010; Sahlberg, 2011). This is exemplified in our 'Leading Learning' CPD programme. In our local network of urban schools teacher inquiry projects focused, for example, on white British boys' disaffection, transition from primary to high school, student absences and school readiness, and nascent findings were published in a special edition of *Urban Review* (see Beckett, 2014; Nuttall & Doherty, 2014; Gallagher & Beckett, 2014; Gorton, Williams & Wrigley, 2014). The outcomes of these teacher inquiry projects not only direct more contextualised forms of school improvement (Lupton, 2004; Thrupp, 1999; Wrigley, Thompson, Lingard, 2012) but provide a basis for collaborative endeavours to continuously build professional knowledge bases.

Our co-developed 'Leading Learning' CPD programme is enthusiastically endorsed by teacher partners who engage an inquiry stance and who embrace knowledge generation at a local level, which can then function as public knowledge by informing practice and policy beyond the immediate context (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 2009). It might not currently attract institutional and political support, but we know from selected articles from JET@40 considered here and from Hansot and Tyack's (1982) advice that more democratic forms of educational policies cannot be taken for granted by teachers and teacher educators, but must be created anew.

The upsurge of radical conservative teacher education reforms from the 1970s onwards, explored, tested and at times rejected by the published authors in JET@40 writing in England and internationally, has been associated with a range of economic, social and political concerns. The reforms have ostensibly inaugurated assaults on established educational

institutions and systems symptomatic of a ‘New Right’ influence in teacher education policy (see Chitty, 1989; Apple, 1990). Working towards future possibilities for teacher education, then, the task is to shape a critical understanding of the aims and aspirations of these policy reforms and the issues that they are intended to address if we are to be successful (Crook and McCulloch, 2013; McCulloch, 2016), especially with regards to policy advocacy (see BERA Commission on Poverty & Policy Advocacy, 2016).

Conclusion

The *JET Anniversary Virtual Special Issue* should ordinarily provide much cause for celebration after forty years of published professional dialogue and high quality research output, but as the historical narrative described here indicates there is still work to be done to explore future possibilities for teachers and teacher educators. By interrogating selected publications from JET@40 we derive a better understanding of contemporary policy changes based on a historical awareness of ‘roots’ and ‘lessons’ which give us indispensable insights and perspectives (see Hiner, 1990; McCulloch, 2011) to help us grapple with the complex dynamics which underpin neoliberal policy dogma. This helps us to articulate our response to the redundancy of our contextually sensitive and locally responsive co-developed CPD programme to encourage practitioner research.

The prime incentive in co-devising this narrative of a ‘usable past’ is to take into account the implications of the unprecedented reforms that have taken place in England since Stones’ (1975) launch of the journal and that in effect place barriers in the way of our co-developed research-informed teacher education. This adds another dimension to academic and teacher partners’ capacity to engage a professional and politicized dialogue about their local struggle to provide more equitable and socially just schooling for students and communities marked by poverty and cumulative multiple deprivation. In turn this more expansive knowledge-building informs a more critical insistence on policy reform in teacher education to institute

the way that teachers need to be educated in contextually sensitive and locally responsive ways, now and in the future. As McCulloch (2011) reminded us, history provides a means by which to stabilize and rationalize current attitudes towards the education system and to reform it towards an enlarged sense of the 'common good'. Only then will there be cause for celebration.

References

- Apple, M. 1990. "Ideology, equality and the New Right." Paper presented at New Zealand Association for Research in Education special interest seminar, Massey University, July.
- Ball, S. J. 1997. "Policy sociology and critical social research: A personal review of recent education policy and policy research." *British Educational Research Journal*, 23(1): 257–274.
- Ball, S. J. 2008. *The education debate*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Beckett, L. 2012a. "Engaging democratic politics against school closure." In *Schools for Marginalized Youth*, edited by W. Pink. New York: Hampton Press.
- Beckett, L. 2012b. "Trust the teachers, mother! The leading learning project in Leeds." *Improving Schools*, 15(1): 10-22.
- Beckett, L., Ed. 2013. *Teacher Education through Active Engagement: Raising the Professional Voice*. London: Routledge.
- Beckett, L. 2014. "Raising teachers' voice on achievement in urban schools in England: An introduction." *Urban Review*, 46(5): 783-799.
- Beckett, L. 2016. *Teachers and Academic Partners in Urban Schools: Threats to Professional Practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Beckett, L. and Wood, J. 2012. "Talking honestly in a challenging primary school: England." In *Changing Schools: Alternative Ways to Make a World of Difference*, edited by T. Wrigley, P. Thomson and B. Lingard, 140-151. London and New York: Routledge.
- Beveridge, S., Groundwater-Smith, S., Kemmis, S. and Wasson, D. 2005. "Professional learning that makes a difference: Successful strategies implemented by priority action schools in New South Wales." *Journal of In-Service Education*, 31(4): 270-284.
- British Educational Research Association (BERA) Commission on Poverty & Policy Advocacy. 2016. <https://www.bera.ac.uk/project/bera-research-commissions/poverty-and-policy-advocacy>

British Educational Research Association (BERA) – Royal Society Action and Research Centre (RSA). 2014. *Research and the Teaching Profession: Building the Capacity for a Self-Improving Education System. Final Report of the BER-RSA Inquiry.*

<https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/BERA-RSA-Research-Teaching-Profession-FULL-REPORT-for-web.pdf>

Bullough, R. V. and Gitlin, A. D. 1994. “Challenging Teacher Education as Training: Four Propositions”. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 20(1): 67-81.

Burn, K. 2006. “Promoting critical conversations: The distinctive contribution of higher education as a partner in the professional preparation of new teachers.” *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(3): 243-258.

Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. 1986. *Becoming Critical: Educational Knowledge and Action Research*. London: Routledge.

Carter, A. 2015. *Independent Report: Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training.*

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/399957/Carter_Review.pdf

Chitty, C. 1989. *Towards a New Education System: The Victory of the New Right?* London: Falmer.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. 2009. *Inquiry as Stance: Practitioner Research in the Next Generation*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Crook, D. & McCulloch, G. 2013. “History, Policy & the Professional Lives of Teacher Educators in England”. In *Embracing the Social and the Creative. New Scenarios for Teacher Education*, edited by M. Ben-Pertez with S. Kleeman, R. Reichbenberg and S. Shimoni, 21-34. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Department for Education. 2010. *The Importance of Teaching: Schools White Paper.*

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175429/CM-7980.pdf

Department for Education. 2016a. *Educational Excellence Everywhere: White Paper.*

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/educational-excellence-everywhere>

Department for Education. 2016b. *Initial Teacher Training: Government Response to Carter Review.*

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-training-government-response-to-carter-review>

Elliott, J. 1981. *Action-Research: A Framework for Self-evaluation in Schools*. Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Education.

Elliott, J. and N. Norris. (eds) 2012. *Curriculum, Pedagogy and Educational Research: The Work of Lawrence Stenhouse*. London and New York: Routledge.

Furlong, J. 2013. *Education – an Anatomy of the Discipline: Rescuing the University Project?* London and New York: Routledge.

- Furlong, J. and Oancea, A. 2005. *Assessing Quality in Applied and Practice-Based Educational Research: A Framework for Discussion*. Oxford: Oxford Department of Educational Studies.
- Gallagher, K. and Beckett, L. 2014. "Making professional decisions about minority ethnic students' learning in a performative culture: possible or Aan u SuuraGelin? Niemozliwe? Nemoguće?" *Urban Review*, 46(5): 846-859.
- Gilroy, D. 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.
- Gilroy, P. 2016. "Editorial". *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42 (4), 373-373.
- Gilroy, P., Price, C., Stones, E. and Thornton, M. 1994. "Teacher education in Britain: A *JET* symposium with politicians." *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 20(3): 261-300.
- Gorton, J., Williams, M. and Wrigley, T. 2014. "Inspection judgements on urban schools: A case for the defence." *Urban Review*, 46(5): 891-903.
- Gove, M. 2010. Speech to the National College Annual Conference, Birmingham, 16th June.
- Groundwater-Smith, S. and Kemmis, S. n.d. *Knowing Makes the Difference: Learning from the NSW Priority Action Schools Program*. Sydney: NSW Department of Education and Training.
- Hansot, E. and Tyack, D. 1982. "A usable past: using history in education policy." In *Policy Making in Education*, edited by A. Lieberman and M. W. McLaughlin, 1-21. Chicago: National Society for Study of Education.
- Hiner, N. R. 1990. "History of education for the 1990s and beyond: The case for academic imperialism." *History of Education Quarterly*, 30(2): 245-255.
- Hoskins, K. and Maguire, M. 2013. "Teaching the teachers: Contesting the curriculum." In *Teacher Education through Active Engagement: Raising the Professional Voice*, edited by L. Beckett, 71-82. London: Routledge.
- Leat, D., Lofthouse, R., & Reid, A. 2014. "Teachers' views: Perspectives on research engagement." Paper #7 commissioned for the BERA-RSA inquiry *The Role of Research in Teacher Education: Reviewing the Evidence Interim Report*. <https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/BERA-Paper-7-Teachers-Views-Perspectives-on-research-engagement.pdf>
- Lingard, B. 2009. *Testing Times: The need for new Intelligent Accountabilities for Schooling*. Brisbane: Queensland Teachers' Union.
- Lingard, B. (2013). Foreword. In *Exemplary Teachers of Students in Poverty*, edited by G. Munns, W. Sawyer and B. Cole. Oxon: Routledge, pp x - xiv.
- McCulloch, G. 2011. *The Struggle for the History of Education*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- McCulloch, G. 2016 (in press). Politics, Ideology, and the History of Teacher Education Reform in England. In *Political Movements in Designing Teacher Education Programmes*, edited by M. Ben-Peretz and Feiman-Nemser. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

- McNicholl, J. 2016. "Teachers and academic partners in urban schools: threats to professional practice". *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42(4), 516-518.
- McNamara, O. & McNicholl, J. 2016. "Poverty discourses in teacher education: understanding policies, effects and attitudes". *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42 (4), 374-377.
- Newman, S. J. 1996. "Reflection and teacher education." *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 22(3): 297-310.
- Nuttall, A. and Doherty, J. 2014. "Disaffected boys and the achievement gap: The 'wallpaper effect' and what is hidden by a focus on school results." *Urban Review*, 46(5): 800-815.
- Philpott, C. (2014) *Theories of Professional Learning. A critical guide for teacher educators*. Northwich: Critical Publishing.
- Reay, D. 2006. "The zombie stalking English schools: Social class and educational inequality." *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54(3), 288-307.
- Rudduck, J. 1985. "Teacher research and research-based education." *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 11(3): 281-289.
- Sahlberg, P. 2011. *Finnish Lessons: What can the World Learn from Educational Change in Finland?* New York and London: Teachers College Press.
- Schon, D. A. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stenhouse, L. 1975. *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann.
- Stones, E. 1975. "Editorial." *British Journal of Teacher Education*, 1(1): 1-2.
- Thrupp, M. 1999. *Schools Making a Difference: Let's be Realistic!* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Whitty, G. 2014. "Recent developments in teacher education and their consequences for the 'university project' in education." *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(4): 466-481.
- Wilkinson, G. 2007. "Civic professionalism: Teacher education and professional ideals and values in a commercialised education world." *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 33(3): 379-395.
- Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. 2010. *The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always do better*. London: Allen Lane.
- Wrigley, T. 2003. *Schools of Hope: A New Agenda for School Improvement*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.
- Wrigley, T., Thomson, P. and Lingard, B. Eds. 2012. *Changing Schools: Alternative Ways to Make a World of Difference*. London and New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. M. 1993. "Connecting genuine teacher development to the struggle for social justice." *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 19(1): 5-20.

Word count including title, abstract & references: 6088