Research Repository UCD

Title	Initial Teacher Education in Ireland: A Philosophical Perspective
Authors(s)	O'Brien, Elizabeth Mary
Publication date	2022
Publication information	O'Brien, Elizabeth Mary. "Initial Teacher Education in Ireland: A Philosophical Perspective." University College Dublin. School of Education, 2022.
Publisher	University College Dublin. School of Education
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/12938

Downloaded 2026-10-24 21:24:30

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)

© Some rights reserved. For more information



Initial Teacher Education in Ireland: A Philosophical Perspective

By

Elizabeth M. O'Brien
UCD Student Number: 16200377

This thesis is submitted to University College Dublin in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education.

UCD School of Education

Head of School: Associate Professor William Kinsella

Principal Supervisor: Dr Áine Mahon

Doctoral Studies Panel:
Professor Judith Harford
Professor Ciaran Sugrue

November 2021

Table of Contents

Table of Contents ..... **i**

Abstract ..... **iii**

Statement of Original Authorship ..... **iv**

Acknowledgments ..... **v**

Abbreviations ..... **vi**

Section 1 Setting the Scene **1**

Chapter 1 Introduction *2*

Context 8

Overview 13

Chapter 2 Methodology *23*

Introduction 24

A Capabilities Approach 28

An Educational Philosophy Approach 32

A New Discursive Environment 43

Section 2 The Thematic Chapters **48**

Chapter 3 Voice *49*

Introduction 50

Voice 54

Relation 58

Performative Speech 62

Passionate Speech 66

Acknowledgement 72

Autobiography 81

Chapter 4 Risk *94*
Introduction 95
The Clinical Model and Teacher Education 100
Risk 105
Relation and the Subject 110
Freedom and the Subject 117
Interruption 124
Imagination 134
Chapter 5 Care *142*
Introduction 143
Care 148
Research 154
Listen 163
Displace Motivation 168
Respond 173
Attention 177
Uncertainty 187
Section 3 In Place of Conclusion, Culmination 194
Chapter 6 The Capability of The Ordinary *195*
Introduction 196
The Ordinary 199
Resisting the Ordinary 220
Becoming Capable of the Ordinary 223
Reference List 232

Abstract

This thesis embarks on a fully philosophical consideration of the in-school experience during Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in the Irish post-primary context. It holds that initial teacher education, by which I mean the postgraduate preparation of post-primary teachers, requires attention, and in particular requires philosophical consideration. Sociological, economic, and political discussions have dominated ITE development in Ireland, leading to a profound gap in the narrative. My research insists that philosophical perspectives are essential, both to highlight central normative concerns and to make explicit the more latent aspects of our educational work.

In Part I, the introduction offers an overview of post-primary initial teacher education in the Republic of Ireland. It sets the scene for an exploration of the in-school experience of student teachers and introduces the key concepts and theorists to be engaged. The second chapter, Methodology, discusses philosophy of education as a distinct and distinctively enriching 'method' in the field of educational research and describes my philosophical approach.

Part II locates the three central themes of Voice, Risk and Care in school, proceeding from recent policy development and drawing on the work of a central theorist in each chapter discussion. Firstly, in considering mentorship and the emergence of the educator's voice I turn to the writings of Stanley Cavell on speech, language, and relation. Secondly, risk and the sanitisation of school are problematised in discussion with Gert Biesta's philosophy of education. And finally, engagement in research during initial teacher education is reconfigured in light of Nel Noddings' conceptualisation of Care. Each chapter identifies two distinct capabilities of the educator to meaningfully support them as student teachers and throughout their careers

In Part III, the everyday, in its complexity and hope, is recognised as a unifying concern of Cavell, Biesta and Noddings. The Ordinary, in the Cavellian sense, emerges as a fundamental capability of the educator, drawing Voice, Risk and Care together to offer a holistic approach to philosophical analysis of initial teacher education.

Statement of Original Authorship

I hereby certify that the submitted work is my own work, was completed while registered as a candidate for the degree stated on the Title Page, and I have not obtained a degree elsewhere on the basis of the research presented in this submitted work.

Acknowledgments

At the outset of this work, I would like to acknowledge my community.

To Associate Professor William Kinsella, Sarah Conroy and the School of Education, UCD. Thank you for this opportunity and for your support, both personal and professional. Thanks you to those who have advised and those who have assessed – I appreciate in particular the counsel of Professors Judith Harford, Deirdre Raftery, and Ciaran Sugrue, Dr Conor Galvin and Dr Deirdre McGillicuddy. My unending gratitude to my supervisor Dr Áine Mahon for her support, advice, kindness and presence throughout.

The Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain supported me financially through several doctoral scholarships, as well as holistically through conferences and friendship. I am most grateful.

It has been said that we need not only all the brains we have, but all the brains we can borrow. To Victoria Jamieson and the Philosophy of Education Reading Network, Katarzyna Fleming and the monthly Writing Retreat group, the Friday morning Phil. of Ed. Zoomers, and the UCD 'PhD room' crew. Recent international events brought us together as they kept us apart, and for your good humour and great advice I will be forever grateful.

A small village supported the final stages of this thesis, and for their time and generosity I will be forever thankful. But one person read every word of every draft. One person told me that this would be a huge mountain until I climbed it. My educator, my mother and my friend. Thank you.

I was really just beginning this doctoral journey when I met the love of my life. Our relationship has been shared with Stanley, Gert and Nel. Our walls are covered in sticky notes, and the floor is routinely littered with the remnants of my old-school approach to editing. My worries have been his worries, and my progress his delight. Gracias, mi cariño.

I dedicate this work to my family, given and chosen, loved and lost along the way.

Abbreviations

CROÍ	Collaboration and Research for Ongoing Innovation Research Series. An initiative developed by The Teaching Council to provide educators with resources which would support their research-based practice https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/research-croi-/
HEI	Higher Education Institution
ITE	Initial Teacher Education
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PATH	Programme for Access to Higher Education. A fund set up and administered by the Higher Education Authority towards increasing participation by under-represented groups in Higher Education. The PATH Strand 1 is directed at participation in Initial Teacher Education. https://hea.ie/policy/access-policy/path/
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
PME	Professional Masters in Education
STER	Student Teacher Educational Research. Founded and let by Dr Aimee Brennan, Marino Institute of Education, Dublin, student teachers are supported to share their research via this Irish Higher Education partnership project. https://www.ster.ie/
T-REX	Teachers' Research Exchange A network developed though the collaboration of four HEI's, The Teaching Council and several national education bodies, to promote and facilitate the sharing of educators' research and provide opportunities for educators to learn from the research of others. https://www.t-rex.ie/

Section 1 Setting the Scene

Chapter 1 Introduction

The following advice, given by Rainer Maria Rilke to the young poet Franz Kappus, expresses both the rationale and the ambition of this endeavour:

> Depict your sorrows and desires, your passing thoughts, and beliefs in some kind of beauty – depict all that with heartfelt, quiet, humble sincerity and use to express yourself the things that surround you, the images of your dreams and the objects of your memory.
>
> (Rilke, 2014, p. 9)

Later in his letters, Rilke implores the poet to "have patience with everything that is unsolved" and "to try to cherish the questions"; to remember that they "have not even begun" (Rilke, 2014, p. 20). He begs his correspondent not to fear the inexplicable but rather to attend and give time to the questions which seem impossible to solve, and to give himself time to live. Rilke believes that if the young poet can "live the questions now. Perhaps [he] will then gradually… live right into the answer" (Ibid.).

Rilke knew that life was not all about moving forward. He wrote about the discord between life lived and life yet to come, recognising neither as life itself. Rather, he saw himself as "the rest between two notes", living in the risky, tense, contingent in-between. This work inserts itself between the push and pull of policy and practice, holding the educational space open as one of 'becoming', as a space for the student teacher to live their questions. It is sustained by a belief in the beauty of the everyday educational experience, a concern for the lived reality of school students, and the conviction that educators should be capable of interpreting the forces exerted upon the world of the school from within and without. I argue that an experience of initial teacher education informed by narratives of control and evaluation, evidence and future-proofing, overlooks essential capabilities of the educator and falls short in preparing them for the lived reality of school life.

As such, my opening claim is this: the in-school experience of student teachers is integral to their development as capable educators. They develop in relation – to their mentors, to research and to the world of the school itself. These capabilities of learning and being taught will continue to support them *as* educators.

The aim of this research is to examine contemporary developments in initial teacher education from the disciplinary perspective of Philosophy. Taking three central philosophical themes (Voice, Risk and Care) and three central philosophical thinkers (Stanley Cavell, Gert Biesta, and Nel Noddings), it proposes an innovative consideration of the initial teacher education of post-primary teachers in Ireland.

The primary impetus for this work is the conviction that initial teacher education, by which I mean the postgraduate preparation of secondary teachers, requires attention and in particular requires philosophical consideration. Initial teacher education for post-primary teachers in Ireland underwent formal structural review in 2012 and radical reinvention in 2014. The postgraduate pathway for post-primary teacher education shifted from a one-year diploma-level qualification to a two-year Professional Masters of Education (PME). As the development of the PME was considered a watershed moment for secondary schooling in Ireland, both academic researchers and educational policy-makers from sociological, economic and political fields stepped forward to interpret its importance. However, notably absent is an explicitly philosophical perspective on these reforms and their lived experience. My research insists that philosophical considerations are essential, both to highlight central normative concerns and to make explicit the more latent aspects of our educational work.

I propose that these aspects are most usefully captured under the key thematic headings of Voice, Risk and Care. Aiming to address this need for philosophical consideration, my research engages with these three central themes through the innovative work of three contemporary philosophers of education: Stanley Cavell, Gert Biesta, and Nel Noddings, respectively. Over the past thirty years, these scholars have developed a highly original set of claims to illuminate the emancipative potential of education.

In *The Claim of Reason*, Cavell considers to what extent the conventions of the educator, culture, and society are in service. He suggests that in philosophising we bring our own language and life into imagination – to own them as they are and consider them anew. To that point, this work inserts itself into the existing literature on initial teacher education providing a novel philosophical perspective. Philosophy of education as a research technique proposes a "counter-sense of learning or understanding" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 112) to contrast

with and come alongside the generation of data (Standish, 2001). It seeks to see and understand that which is, that which persists, and that which emerges. In this way the theoretical richness of philosophy of education will be drawn upon to inform the practical and systemic dimensions of initial teacher education.

Voice, Risk and Care are not concepts so far from the norm as to be revolutionary or controversial. Rather, they persist without sufficient engagement or respect to their breadth and possibility. I echo Anne Pirrie in asking "what happens when… the language of the everyday reaches its boundaries and poses a question?" (Pirrie, 2015, p. 526). These questions arose when the language I used as an educator, and the language used by government and regulatory bodies to describe my profession and practice, began to develop differently. In considering practitioner research, Paul Standish paints a picture of "the thinking teacher" who has come to realise that the practical questions they have "lead to big questions about the nature of knowledge and the nature of the good life" (Standish, 2010, p. 8). In my experience as a second-level educator, I found myself confused and exasperated with the direction of educational reform in ways I had difficulty expressing. As with Standish's educator, the empirical did not resolve my unease or give me the language to describe it. I came to realise that the questions I had could not be approached in that way; they resisted research models of investigation and conclusion. These resistant questions, I discovered, are the ones that philosophy characteristically addresses.

Philosophy is undertaken to "raise questions about premises, the need for clarification, apparent contradictions and the like" (Noddings, 2007, p. 166). It was this potential to see and think anew, to challenge the heavy discourses of initial teacher education, which drew me to philosophy of education as a lens for understanding. Successful engagement means "to shift a concept or text into a new linguistic or discursive environment where it raises new questions" (Ruitenberg, 2009b, p. 321). In this instance, it is to take initial teacher education policy and practice and respond to it through novel readings of its central normative concerns. In other words, beyond practical concerns of qualification and professionalisation, this thesis attends to the pressing and all-too-often *private* concerns of those starting out as post-primary educators: What is it to care for the students we teach? What is it to develop both our voice and theirs? And to what extent can we educate in beautifully risky ways? This

collective process of reading and writing in relation allows new patterns to come to light and new approaches to unfold. Questions which are not central to the work of Cavell, Noddings and Biesta are shared with them in a spirit of creative endeavour. It is to push back against the notion that what is written is given.

Part of engaging philosophically is thinking of new possibilities for philosophical thinking, of committing to a methodology which would further "both the aim and the communicability of philosophy of education" (Ruitenberg, 2009b, p. 321). Engaging with philosophers concerned both explicitly and implicitly with the educational realm introduced immense richness and newness to my educational thinking. Central concerns of education include what graduates have to draw on *beyond* skills and competencies, and how our priorities and values as a culture are reconciled within and through the ethos of our systems of education. This work considers philosophically where initial teacher education addresses core teacher capabilities within the themes of Voice, Risk and Care. The focus on these three themes is in line with the so-called "ontological turn" in Higher Education as developed in the work of Gloria Dall'Alba and others (Dall'Alba, 2009). In this context, focus is placed increasingly on teacher identity rather than technique, on who teachers *are* and are becoming rather than on what teachers know. Although sociological, economic, and political treatments of the systems of education have their role to play, I insist that there is a profound gap in the narrative. Philosophical consideration is essential in order to deeply understand the normative issues at play in preparing teachers to educate. As Fulford and Hodgson capture this point, philosophy sets out "with a sense of puzzlement" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016a, p. 166). Philosophy is inclined away from answers and "what works" and inclined towards an "expression of something more open" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016a, p. 167). Philosophy is an invitation to engage.

Philosophy of education takes its cue from just such questions arising from our social and educational reality. Taking a philosophical perspective allowed me to think differently about initial teacher education, by virtue of the type of questions it engages with, and the sources used to inform its enquiries. It allowed me to discover new ways to engage with and express my educational concerns. As Mary Midgley wrote, philosophical thoughts "do not compete with the sciences" rather they try "to work out the ways of thinking that will best connect these various visions… with each other and with the rest of life" (Midgley, 2019, p. 6). As such,

there is the potential to influence how we live and how we treat each other. Choosing educational philosophy as a research approach is committing to philosophy as dialogue where listening (as reading) is on a par with speaking (as writing), and where the culmination of research "is not only a contribution to knowledge but to a public conversation" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 162).

Mindful of Smeyers' invitation to consider "the kind of educational research we need" as inter-methodological discourse, where appropriate in this thesis empirical research and case studies inform the philosophical discussion (Smeyers, 2007, p. 346). The impact and significance of the sociological and economic research currently underpinning ITE is considered in the context of contemporary philosophy of education. Offering a manifestly philosophical exploration of contemporary issues and concerns, the ambition of this research is to enrich theoretical as well as practical discussion.

A philosophical perspective allows me to highlight central normative concerns, to dwell on them, to open them up. As I said, Voice, Risk and Care are not revolutionary ideas or hot buzzwords. We talk about them all the time in school and in teacher education. But in using these terms do we really think about what we mean and what we might mean? How might these ideas be put to work? In dwelling thoughtfully with these ideas, I propose that the more latent aspects of our educational work – the everyday, almost intuitive practices by which we engage with our peers and students – might be made visible. There is so much that is valuable and slightly peripheral, that resists measurement and is not being counted. Similarly, in ITE discourse in particular, there seems to me an avoidance of the educational self, of who the student *is* as an educator and what their capabilities might be. It is in this orientation of appreciation, of drawing attention *back* to that which we have always already known and thinking about it anew, that I embarked on this course of study.

Context

Initial teacher education programmes in Ireland are provided by Higher Education Institutes (HEIs), regulated by the statutory body of the Teaching Council and overseen at a governmental level by the Department of Education. The education of primary and second level educators is conducted separately, though in both cases qualification is possible via concurrent undergraduate degree or subsequent postgraduate routes. While the HEIs had long worked independently with minimal oversight by the Department of Education, these "high levels of institutional autonomy in relation to the content and nature of teacher education programmes" (O'Doherty & Harford, 2017, p. 168) ended with the establishment of a national council in 2006.

This restructuring can be viewed as part of a wider international reform of education towards professionalisation of teaching and the centralisation of teacher education (O'Doherty & Harford, 2017). Irish teacher education researchers drew on a wide range of nations to inform policy shifts at home. Reference is made to change undergone or in progress in the EU, particularly in Poland and Finland, as well as in the OECD and wider international contexts of Australia, Canada, Singapore, New Zealand and the UK (For example Hall et al., 2018; O'Doherty & Harford, 2017; Sahlberg, 2012; Conway et al., 2009). In each of these cases initial teacher education programme accreditation and individual teacher qualification or registration are in some way centralised, thus in establishing the Teaching Council Ireland followed suit.

Tasked with the promotion of teaching as a profession (Government of Ireland, 2001), the Council is directed under statutory legislation of the Teaching Council Act "to regulate the teaching profession and the professional conduct of teachers" under standards determined by the Council themselves (Ibid., p. 8). These standards determine the accreditation of teacher education programmes and the qualification of teachers themselves (Ibid.). In fact, a teacher is defined in numerous policy document glossaries as "a teacher registered with the Teaching Council" (see for example The Teaching Council, 2013, p. 6, 2016a, p. 3, 2020, p. 6). Since its launch in 2006, regulation of the nature and quality of teacher education in Ireland shifted away from individual programmes to the Teaching Council. Thus, the professionalism

of educators became a concern of standards and standardisation, which shifted the nature and the tone of conversations regarding what initial teacher education is and should be.

Over the past decade, in response to these foundational shifts, initial teacher education has undergone far-reaching reform, "from its content, thrust and purpose, to its duration and configuration, and from its funding and structure, to its physical location" (O'Donoghue et al., 2017, p. 179). Every aspect of the education of educators in Ireland has been scrutinised on foot of European and National teacher education publications (For example, Department of Education, 1992, 1995; European Commission, 2010) and international initiatives such as the OECD's Programme of International Student Assessment (PISA) (OECD, 2000). Through Teaching Council directives in particular, narratives of professionalism, qualification, and metrics came to the fore and began to drive and shape initial teacher education.

At the request of the Minister for Education and Skills and on foot of two national reports on the future of Higher Education, in Ireland (Department of Education and Skills, 2011; Higher Education Authority, 2012) an International Review Panel was convened to undertake an independent review of the provisions in place to educate student teachers in Ireland. Specifically, their brief was to consider a restructuring, "a reconfiguration of existing programmes in order to strengthen the quality of teacher education" (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 9). The Panel recognised however that no element of educational reform proceeds in isolation and took this opportunity to be "part of the larger whole when analysing current structures, policies and funding of the Irish higher education system" (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 5).

While this set of recommendations and considerations could be taken as just that – ideas for those engaged and interested in initial teacher education in Ireland to consider – the tone of the Panel's intervention is made clear in the report following their second visit, entitled *The Structure of Teacher Education in Ireland: Review of Progress in Implementing Reform* (Sahlberg, 2018). In his introduction to the 2018 report, the then Minister for Education and Skills described the original 2012 review as "a critical moment for initial teacher education in Ireland" (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 3). He welcomed the 2018 review of progress in its consideration of the progress made since 2012 and described it as a key contributor towards shaping and articulating Irish initial teacher education into the future. There is a notable sense of

momentum attributed to these reports, which is significant in this context when considering those proposals which have been adopted, or adopted and abandoned, and those which have yet to be acted upon.

In the 2012 report the Review Panel include a chapter on "Current Trends in Initial Teacher Education". Here the Panel communicate what they consider to be the "key features of internationally renowned teacher education systems", the systems they "looked to as models for improvement" in the Irish case (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 14). They note that "school placements are giving way to clinical learning in special teacher training schools" and link this trend to a drive for "practical learning" through "a more systematic focus on linking theory and practice during the initial preparation of teachers" (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 15). The panel looked beyond their brief and included a section in the report entitled "General Observations" (Sahlberg, 2012, pp. 18–24). Here the notion of 'the clinical' is introduced to Irish initial teacher education policy for the first time, mentorship is reimagined as co-operative, and the challenges presented by research imperatives are addressed head on.

Returning in 2018 to evaluate the progress made, the structural elements of the original brief are interwoven with what were previously general observations. For example, there is a shift from clinical as a descriptor of practice or learning in 2012, to clinical as a descriptor of schools in 2018. The report recommends the establishment of clinical teacher training or teacher education schools "to provide teacher training similar to how bedside training occurs in modern medical schools" (Sahlberg, 2018, pp. 7, 27). Three reasons are offered for the Panel's rationale in making this suggestion: to ensure more consistent experience of school placement for students, to overcome difficulties in procuring placements by students, and because this is what "more advanced ITE providers" do (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 27). It is suggested that in clinical schools all student teachers would have a superior experience due to the "clinically supervised setting" they believe is possible in "university-operated clinical training schools" (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 33). The Panel moved to integrate the clinical, as well as research and co-operative relations, into the model of initial teacher education they envisage for Ireland.

While the focus of this work is the Irish case, I draw on other countries' experience where appropriate. Some, such as Finland, have had a direct influence on initial teacher education in Ireland through shared expertise and the adoption of initiatives developed elsewhere. Others, such as Norway or The United States of America, present interesting perspectives on common challenges. My interest lies in the questions they are asking and the connections they are making, rather than the applicability of their answers or solutions. In short, I turn towards those systems of initial teacher education to draw them into conversation with my own.

In the years since the two reports of the International Review Panel there have been a plethora of publications from a variety of bodies concerning initial teacher education in Ireland. The Teaching Council's 'Droichead' and 'Cosán' initiatives begin to bring the idea of teacher education as a career-long continuum to reality (The Teaching Council, 2016b, 2017a). *Droichead* translates from the Irish language as bridge, and lays out a program of transition into the teaching profession for newly-qualified teachers (The Teaching Council, 2017a). *Cosán*, meaning path, describes the Council's vision for teachers' continuous professional development (The Teaching Council, 2016b). On foot of the 2012 review, Professor Kathy Hall and colleagues in University College Cork were commissioned by the Teaching Council to undertake a review of the school placement element of initial teacher education in Ireland (Hall et al., 2018). Their 2018 report is a uniquely powerful contribution to the conversation on student teachers' in-school experience, taking in the perspective of students themselves, their school and university-based mentors, as well as presenting models of what they consider to be best practice. In 2020, 'Céim: Standards for Initial Teacher Education' was published by the Teaching Council, followed in 2021 by 'The School Placement Innovation Report' (The Teaching Council, 2020, 2021).

While the pace of publication has been unprecedented, the pace of adoption is less so. Regarding school placement, certain changes recommended by the Panel have been adopted; for example, student teachers now "experience teaching practice in at least two different types of schools", the programme runs over two years and is of Professional Masters level (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 22). However, many recommendations have yet to be acted on, including suggestions that post-primary ITE providers source school placements or that school teachers

become involved in the assessment of student teachers (Ibid.). The term 'clinical' has been conspicuously absent, although it is heavily emphasised in the second report, comprising one of the eight general recommendations (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 33), while 'research' has been pushed at every opportunity. 'Co-operation' was dropped as the nature of the in-school mentorship relation in the Céim report (The Teaching Council, 2020) but featured prominently in the School Placement Innovation Report the following year (The Teaching Council, 2021). As such, initial teacher education reform in Ireland over the past decade is a highly complex sphere of interest.

In general terms, these reforms emphasise the significance of the school and promote school-HEI partnerships, while pursuing centralised control of the content and management of initial teacher education at the level of the regulatory Teaching Council (O'Doherty & Harford, 2017). They seek more from the educator, emphasising professionalisation and the importance of embedding value commitments as well as standards of practice.

Overview

I hope this introduction has offered a useful insight into my work and the motivations for its undertaking, as well as an idea of what is to come. This section offers an overview of the thesis by chapter, beginning with the methodology, progressing through three thematic chapters of Voice, Risk and Care, and culminating in a chapter on the unifying capability of The Ordinary. The three thematic chapters follow a particular logic. In each there are key terms to be understood, as well as central concepts of a given philosopher to bring into conversation with initial teacher education. Finally, capabilities of the educator are proposed and described. The final chapter essentially follows this structure, although the capability of The Ordinary is present throughout.

Chapter 2 comprises an exploration of my research method. The concept of methodology in philosophy of education circles is fraught, as the formal structures of empirical research are not relevant in the absence of data-gathering in the qualitative or quantitative sense, and there are a wide variety of approaches taken. My methodological approach has three interwoven strands - a capabilities approach, a philosophical approach and a dialogic approach. Taking a capabilities approach foregrounds the student teacher and their development as central to my research orientation. In this way, part of my methodology is to consistently consider who the educator is beyond what skills they have. The philosophical approach I take centres on reading as research and writing as research, as conceived by Amanda Fulford and Naomi Hodgson (2016). Finally, Voice, Risk and Care as the central normative themes of this thesis inform my discursive or dialogic approach. This approach recognises that through iterative engagement with these themes my own philosophy of education emerged. In reading educational policy and works of philosophy I attend to themes of Voice, Risk and Care and foreground their presence. The discursive approach of looking anew, of re-considering and re-examining in dialogue with theory as well as policy, pervades and guides this doctoral work.

In Section 2 I explore the three themes of Voice, Risk and Care which develop through engagement with philosophical thinking and initial teacher education policy to suggest key capabilities of the educator.

In Chapter 3 I turn to the promotion and care of the educator's voice. This chapter considers mentorship in initial teacher education as an orientation towards (the) appreciation of the other. I invoke both senses of appreciation – to be glad of and to grow. To do so I engage with the philosophy of Stanley Cavell which, I believe, offers a singular contribution to any exploration of voice and the education of adults in relation to each other. Perhaps due to his background as a musician, Cavell's philosophy weaves complex considerations. Certain key themes are introduced and re-introduced throughout his comprehensive body of work, with idiosyncratic and often challenging exploration of texts as diverse as Frank Capra's *It Happened One Night* (1934) and Samuel Beckett's *Endgame* (1957). As he plays with both hands already, so to speak, care is required in attuning Cavellian philosophy to the world of the school. I begin by considering what is meant when, during initial teacher education, we speak of 'Voice' and 'Relation' by engaging with Cavell's particular understanding of these concepts. In describing the mentorship relation as co-operative, growth of student and co-operating teachers is recognised as being at stake. In orienting the student and co-operating teachers as co-operative I propose that there is a moment of possibility and opportunity here. These figures have been brought closer together but not burdened with a functional relationship. There is no judgement or assessment underlying their time together. Rather, a possibility is opened up to make the most of each other, to appreciate and to see an appreciation in each other. Where recent interventions have focused on changing how teachers behave, I would argue that change in how teachers talk and listen to each other is vital. This change can be addressed sensitively in the mentorship engagement during ITE.

During school placement the student and the co-operative teacher observe each other's practice and come together to talk about their experience. Cavell's writing on performative and passionate utterance is helpful here in thinking about how educators develop and use their educational voice in relation. Performative words act. For example, a groom who says "I do" in the presence of appropriate witnesses and their would-be spouse makes a commitment through their speech. Passionate utterance connects and awakens both the speaker and the one addressed. While the presence of witnesses at a wedding is essential, it does not matter who they are. On the contrary, in speaking passionately a particular individual is addressed in their significance. There are instances of both the performative and the passionate during the engagement between a student teacher and their in-school

mentor. In the encounter after class, for example, each tells their story of observing or being observed. Their own school biographies play a part in colouring these accounts, as does the nature of the mentorship relation. Cavell's account of performative and passionate utterance usefully describe the modes of expression which arise in telling one's story, and the potential such engagements hold for promoting the development of the educator's voice.

In Cavell's reading of Wittgenstein there is a back and forth, an engagement between voices which does not move to finality but rather oscillates between uncertainty and rest (Standish, 2004), presenting a parallel between the student teacher moving between the classroom and the mentorship spaces. It is possible to encourage the value of becoming less sure in real time and real life; this is because mentorship presents the opportunity to move away and rest with uncertainty in a supported way. I will argue that keeping assessment out of the mentorship relationship affords this rest. The co-operating teacher is uniquely positioned to assure the student that although there are no answers, no fixed criteria or fool-proof approaches, an educator's life is meaningful and derives strength from living with the uncertain. In doing so they support the student teacher, and are themselves co-operatively supported, in becoming capable of Acknowledgement and Autobiography.

Finding one's voice as an educator is not easy, and it is harder still to be vulnerable and open in the pursuit of a sincere and authentic tone. The work of Stanley Cavell reminds us that this finding of voice is an endeavour rather than an achievement. The opportunity for this voice to falter, tremor and ring true in a supported space is staked on whether the one addressed is capable of fulfilling their ordinary commitments, of listening and relating in a meaningful way. Such voices are capable, I suggest, of Acknowledgment and Autobiography. So conceived, the development of the educator's voice is staked on genuine moments of unsurity and passionate utterance. Mentorship succeeds when individuals come to a sense of value in their essential insufficiency, a hesitancy to claim authority and an instinct to habitually reconsider the limits of language and of the self mark this shift. This is a Cavellian insight, where genuine relationship is closer to attentive silence than straightforward assertion. Co-operation in this sense lies in taking our own words and the words of the other seriously, and foregrounding the effort to understand each other, together.

In Chapter 4 'Risk' is considered as a normative concern of initial teacher education, focusing again on the relationship between the student teacher and the school. I argue that the university's presence in school ought to be carefully considered. A closer relationship has implications for the breadth and possibility of the in-school experience, and as such the development of the educator's sense of their own significance and the significance of others. I do so by engaging with the philosophy of Gert Biesta, who terms such significance 'subject-ness' to denote why an individual as subject matters in the world. Perhaps due to his background as a science teacher, Biesta approaches philosophical consideration systematically, with a broad lens, a sense of openness, and considerable respect for all that we cannot know. However, his suggestion that risk in education is beautiful, as well as the idea that education might be clinical, call for consideration at the outset of this chapter.

I argue in this chapter that a clinical approach fundamentally changes the relationship between the student teacher and the school. In the current immersive model, the student teacher is fully in the world of the school with moments of intervention by the university towards their qualification. They are orientated outwards from themselves, called upon to pay attention to the lived reality of the school they have been invited into and now take part in as an educator for the first time. This immersive experience of extended teaching practice is emphasised by student teachers as a formative and transformative moment in their initial teacher education (Biesta, 2013). Clinical teacher training, on the other hand, shifts the orientation of the student teacher inwards, putting the school at their disposal towards purposes which have been externally defined by the university. Initial teacher education programmes would then position the student teacher in the school and draw on the school to provide training and prescribed experiences.

Biesta developed a tripartite model of educational domains, whereby "*qualification*, *socialisation* and *subjectification*" are envisaged to both communicate educational experience and priorities, and to facilitate their examination (Biesta, 2013, p. ix). While qualification dominates and socialisation goes on as long as humans spend time together, ensuring that the subjectification domain of education is addressed is a normative concern. Its neglect undermines the educational nature of what goes on in schools or universities.

Here I address two central tenets of subjectification: relation and freedom. Both are essential for an individual to come to know their significance in the world. Subjectivity is an event (i.e., it is something that may or may not happen), and as such it is always at risk. It relies on connection to significant others and suitable space to flourish. It is also a choice; no individual can be required to come into the world and recognise themselves as unique and irreplaceable. The in-school experience has the potential to encourage the student teacher to desire to be a subject of significance in the world if they have the opportunity to *come into relation* with the world of the school slowly and meaningfully, and the freedom to *live in* the world of the school as an educator. Biesta maintains that education should always have an interest in human freedom, as well as those preparatory or qualifying and socialising aspects. There are elements of the development and promotion of relation and freedom in all educational domains, for example dispositions for learning in qualification and the acceptance or rejection of established social orders in socialisation, but it is subjectification that brings freedom to the fore in a complex, relational way.

The suggestion that Ireland shift to a version of the clinical school model is considered in light of the question: How can we think about the in-school experience of student teachers in terms of those capabilities which promote subjectivity? I suggest that Imagination and Interruption are the educational capabilities which support the student teacher in becoming capable of freedom and relation, of educational risk. We can be interrupted from outside, interrupt another person or a moment, or interrupt ourselves from within. The educator capable of Interruption values pause and consideration, foregrounding resistance and taking their place as a subject in the world. To become a subject in the world of the school takes imagination, not in the dreamy, abstract sense but as a capability which helps the educator develop a sense of their world as they live in it. It calls for a slowing down, for listening and the capability of Attention which I will discuss further in Chapter 5. Interruption and Imagination are both recurring. They are capabilities that develop through relation and freedom. They are the capability to try, and, through weak, hesitant, career-long iteration, to become capable of educational risk.

Chapter 5 is the final thematic chapter. Here I call upon ‘Care’ as a central normative theme of initial teacher education through the philosophy of Nel Noddings, and the relation between

student teachers and research. As it is currently envisaged, research is something that student teachers are required to do through data-driven projects, and it is an external source generated by educational researchers which they are encouraged to draw upon throughout their career. While this is a positive and valid way to think about using and doing educational research, I believe a missed opportunity exists here to engage with student teachers in a deeper way, to discuss in a real and practical sense who they are as an educator and their sense of a research-based educational self.

To say teachers research to become better teachers is reductive, and settles for a diminished idea of educational knowledge and thinking. If we agree that student teachers should become research-based educators, we need a better way of thinking about why. I argue that the philosophy of Nel Noddings is uniquely helpful in thinking about research in the life of the educator. Noddings puts forth a philosophy of Care and a model for caring. I am suggesting in my reading of her work that there are commonalities between the practice of theory and the practice of care. Both call for a setting aside of oneself to enter the receptive mode; "we must settle ourselves, clear our minds, reduce the racket around us" (Noddings, 2013, p. 34) to transition from assimilating bundles of siloed information to making sense of what we learn in relation. Care is the primary reason for a turn to research in any form, I argue, and the act of research is itself an act of care.

The chapter opens with a consideration of what we mean when we say 'Care' and 'Research', with a view to opening the concepts up to each other. I propose that those engaged and interested in initial teacher education consider why research is valuable in the everyday lives of educators and how it is lived in their reality. I suggest that the answer lies in patterns of Care, and that research during ITE be approached as learning to care, capably. If we Care, as Noddings describes it at its most fundamental, we listen, our motivation is displaced and we respond (Noddings, 2013). If Care has indeed been the relation, then the one-cared for acknowledges these three (Ibid.).

I then consider how and why student teachers currently engage in research during initial teacher education. Considering first the understanding of educational research student teachers acquire during initial teacher education, I turn to the suggestion that student

teachers undertake research projects during their time in school in order to develop as research-based educators. Their focus is predominantly asking and answering answerable questions. It is worth stepping back and considering whether this approach cares for the education of student teachers. Of particular concern in this context is the recognition that student teachers are undertaking research projects during their time in school without a clear, educational understanding of why (Sahlberg, 2018).

Noddings' Care provides a model for the educator of how to engage in research. The first phase of Care is to listen. It is the "characteristic and appropriate mode of consciousness in caring" (Noddings, 2013, p. 33). When the educator cares they "really hear, see or feel what the other is trying to convey" (Noddings, 2005, p. 16). In listening the educator commits to receive what is said, explore rationally and plan, and in doing so commits to support the other. It incorporates a fundamental respect for the other, be that a person or a world. The second phase is one of motivational displacement, where the one-caring imagines their resources in service of the desires of the one cared-for. They imagine what it might mean to be motivated to pursue those ends, and what it might take. Finally, the one-caring, and ultimately the one cared-for, are moved to respond. A subtle but a purposeful encounter, the one-caring communicates in some way that they care by showing that they listened and that they engaged with what they heard. The one cared-for likewise shows that they understand that the nature of the encounter has been care. These moments of response proceed whether or not any action has been taken, and may only transpire years later. As such caring and being cared for are an essentially risky form of relation.

Finally, Attention and Uncertainty are proposed as capabilities of the educator which support research as care and research towards care. Commitment to an ethic of care can exercise our attention, stretch it in new ways and excite a new appreciation for those questions which are resistant to being driven out into the empirical light. In considering Attention as a capability of the educator I stop a moment with Simone Weil's philosophy of attention, which was of interest to Noddings in her writing on care. This attention-as-looking without attachment is Simone Weil's attentive light (Weil, 2002). It resists a sense of knowingness that would turn care, as effort to understand the other better, into an illuminative pursuit. Weil instead asks

that educators attend to difficult questions, allow their emergence from lived reality and resist the urge to interrogate or dismiss the complex and the human.

Her entreaty to look but not search resonates with Noddings' conceptualisation of listening and runs counter to the data-gathering mode of research. In so attending the carer moves away from the notion that questions have or need to have answers, that shadows call for light. Uncertainty can be appreciated as a defining characteristic of the educational terrain, rather than something to be minimised or eliminated. The student's school biography is rich in uncertainty, replete with what they think they know, or remember, or feel about school. As an experience of being and becoming, the student teacher in school is in a "state of ontological uncertainty", which they are better able to tolerate if they feel supported by the educational community (Green & Gary, 2016, p. 59). To be capable of Uncertainty is to be capable of care and to appreciate the role research plays in lived educational realities.

Which brings us to Chapter 6. In this final, cumulative chapter I step back and consider the possibility of a unifying capability. Chapter 6 moves to look at the educator for whom Voice, Risk and Care are living educational themes and asks, what, above all else, must the student teacher become capable of? My tentative response is that the world of the school – the lived reality of the educator – calls on the student teacher to, fundamentally, be capable of The Ordinary. I borrow the phrase from the philosophy of Stanley Cavell, but I suggest that the everyday and real-life are very much alive in the work of Gert Biesta and Nel Noddings too.

In considering Care as to be engrossed, to incline towards and to be burdened by that which one would willingly invest in, Noddings holds that caring is to hope nothing gets in the way of the life cared for. This view is similar to Biesta's assertion that as educators we should make every effort to ensure that "our educational practices… [do not] preclude any encounters or experiences that have the potential for singularization" (Biesta, 2013, p. 170). In other words, to care is to protect the space for risk. There is an interesting overlap also between Noddings' consideration of Care and Cavell's conception of Voice. Specifically, Noddings' account of Care (imagined at certain points as "not acting") speaks directly to Cavell's insight that a proper appreciation of Voice requires we "show a reason for speaking at all" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 115). In this instance, both figures illuminate the value of *response* over assertion, to "see the

other's reality as a possibility for our own" (Noddings, 2013, p. 14). In the context of initial teacher education, they speak to mentorship, modelling and being available to be seen as requiring, as well as exemplifying, Care, Risk and Voice.

Life in the world of the school is unsettled and Cavell calls on the educator, nascent and experienced, to meet this life openly and learn to trust. He refers to the achievement of the everyday, *becoming capable of The Ordinary* as I frame it, as "the achievement of the human" (Cavell, 1979, p. 466). In coming to live in the ordinary world of the school it is essential for the student teacher to realise that they do not understand, can never come to understand, the educational world in a comprehensive or definitive way. Their expertise is hesitant, contingent, and alive. What does the student teacher draw on to support themselves in achieving the human? I suggest it is a thorough appreciation of the everyday, particularly the elements of hope and complexity entailed.

In considering complexity I look to the relational and the systemic. The relationship between the school student and the student teacher is a prime example of relational complexity. It spans all three themes of Voice, Risk and Care, and can be thought of as the motivation to become capable of The Ordinary. Cavell holds that we cannot gain a perspective on our lives alone; we need to converse with a friend (Cavell, 2005a). The school student can be this figure for the student teacher, drawing out their capabilities of Interruption, Attention and Autobiography. In this way the student teacher recognises their dual aspect of carer and cared-for, better to care. They are called into the world, better to appreciate their significance. In fact it is this intersection of voices, this sincere asking whether they are indeed 'the teacher', that calls the student teacher to claim their educator's voice.

The narrative of complexity resists the either-or, the idea that educators have to choose between openness and control. This is not to say control is absent. Rather, in a system respected for its complexity, control is dispersed and appears in myriad forms. There is the opportunity for disruption, interpretation and newness. Relation is paramount and as such "it is not centralised direction that furnishes the system with any level of coherence, but the competition and co-operation among the economy's constituent agents" (Mason, 2008, p. 42), which encourage research, acknowledgement and imagination. Nel Noddings writes

extensively on faith and happiness as the elements which sustain a teacher (Noddings, 2003, 2013). I call upon Paolo Freire's writing to suggest hope as the sustaining force when faith wavers and happiness is hard to come by.

Programmes of initial teacher education move to simplify the in-school experience of student teachers, to mitigate risk and unpredictability. To a certain point complexity reduction is good, giving student teachers a fair chance at a smooth beginning. However, the complex reality of life in the world of the school should be made available to them. I discuss a selection of moments when the everyday is resisted, before considering moments where there is potential for student teachers to become capable of The Ordinary. These are difficult, complex encounters which call on all the capabilities I have emphasised to date. It can feel like our language itself "continually misrecognizes or (mis)understands itself" but Cavell encourages us: "instead of saying we are full of mistakes about what is closest to us, we might say of ourselves that we are filled… with misgiving" (Cavell, 2010, p. 145). The unsure educator is attentive, research-based, open to interruption and aware of all they do not know. These moments wherein student teachers may be "filled… with misgiving", serve to remind that education is open, weak and usefully disruptive to the thinking of teachers and students alike. Instead of despairing of their mistakes, listening to Cavell might encourage those engaged in initial teacher education to pause with their misgivings and think about them, autobiographically. When pause, listening, and adaptation are appreciated educators become capable of The Ordinary and come to new agreements in life and in language.

Chapter 2 Methodology

Introduction

Recognising the centrality of initial teacher education to Irish education more broadly, this doctoral research approaches the issue from a novel disciplinary perspective. It proposes a fully *philosophical* consideration of initial teacher education in the Irish post-primary context, in order to augment historical and sociological accounts. This chapter will explore my approach to research in philosophy of education, and in doing so elucidate why this thesis has been conducted philosophically.

Underpinning practical attempts to reform teacher education and educational practice are fundamental concepts, or normative considerations, which have gone unconsidered on a philosophical level. I propose that these normative considerations capture deeply urgent yet deeply neglected aspects of teacher education in Ireland. I propose further that these aspects are most usefully captured under the key thematic headings of *Voice*, *Risk* and *Care*. Taking guidance from the philosophy of Martha Nussbaum and Amartya Sen, I consider the development of the teacher to be a matter not of competencies but of capabilities.

The innovative work of three contemporary philosophers of education is foregrounded: Gert Biesta, Nel Noddings, and Stanley Cavell. Over the past thirty years, these scholars have developed a highly original set of claims to illuminate the emancipative potential of education. My ambition is to develop a truly novel account of post-primary teacher education in Ireland by bringing their work to this very particular professional context. Sociological, economic and political discussions have dominated ITE development in Ireland, leaving a profound gap in the narrative. I argue that philosophical consideration is essential both to highlight central normative concerns and to make explicit the more latent aspects of our educational work.

In documenting the approach taken, it is important to note the significance of my own subjectivity as an educator, teacher educator and researcher towards both the emergence and the evolution of this research. The origins of this research are very personal to me. It begins in my classroom. I am a teacher at second-level of Mathematics and Science, originally in the psychiatric sector, which very much influences my way of thinking about what

education is and what education can be, and then in mainstream, where I taught for ten years. Over time there was natural change in practice and policy but at a point, quite suddenly, quite noticeably, the conversations around being an educator shifted. The kind of conversations we were having at staff meetings, the kind of preparation we were doing before visits from the inspectorate, or in preparing to welcome student teachers, those conversations were changing, and they weren't making sense to me anymore. I wasn't seeing myself and who I had been educated to be as an educator in those conversations. After almost twelve years in the profession, I began to feel a little bit lost, a little bit confronted. I struggled to make sense of this version of the educator I was being presented with. Further, I did a lot of mentorship with student teachers over the years, and it started to become a concern to me that if I was having these struggles reconciling the language and the life that I was living, then how on earth was somebody starting out coping with this? How are they to make sense of a life in this world as an educator?

Which brought me to a second classroom. I returned to the university, choosing a taught course of study as intuitively I knew the empirical approaches familiar to me would help me in asking the type of questions I felt needed to be asked. As a student of Philosophy of Education I found the language to make sense of the words and identify the concepts which troubled me in school. Through reading and discussion I came to a deeper understanding of the sense of constriction I experienced as the policy changes towards increased professionalisation became changes in practice. Voice, Risk and Care emerged as both routes to approach the educator's experience and themes of initial teacher education both commonplace and overlooked. These themes are valuable for their potential in developing a holistic ambitions of this research, but focused by the figure of the educator through

The capabilities approach as described by Martha Nussbaum helped me keep the educator at the centre in a holistic, gentle way. It allowed me to approach the educator as a whole person rather than a list of skills or competences. Holding the educator in my mind as capable brought clarity to my understanding of Voice, Risk and Care. Themes which began as unwieldly came together in their unique potential to form a holistic approach to the educator's development. Focusing on the capable educator, I began to recognise central tenets of Cavell, Biesta and Noddings' philosophies in my everyday life as an educator and to

appreciate them as capabilities which support the educator in school. Simultaneously, while reading the relevant policy documents on initial teacher education in Ireland, I recognised mentorship, the clinical and research as evolving concerns which are particularly pertinent during the in-school experience. Through holding this dual aspect of teacher and researcher, standing in classrooms where I taught and was taught, it became clear that the in-school experience was paramount. While initially I had thought to look at initial teacher education in its entirety, my focus came to rest on the student teacher's time in school as the locus and the moment where nascent educators come to the edge of their experience and education, and capabilities come to life. In school student teachers are ordinarily called to acknowledge, attend, and imagine, faced with uncertainty, interruption and their own biography. Throughout the research I emphasise both the complexity of the world of the school and the sense of hope which sustains educational endeavour on an everyday basis. Thus, becoming capable of The Ordinary emerged over time as the culmination of this work.

In shifting the focus from competence to capability, foregrounding the overlooked themes of Voice, Risk and Care and culminating in an appreciation of the capability of The Ordinary, this research considers philosophically how initial teacher education might come to value the existing intuitions of teachers. Research in philosophy of education proceeds from a concern or a question about education which "inspires or provokes independent thought" (Bailey, 2010, p. 2). It is a move from considering how things are to how they ought to be, addressing the normative/philosophical as distinct from the descriptive/sociological (Standish, 2010). Characterised by open enquiry "good philosophy helps us to pursue these questions and pursue them where they lead" (Standish, 2010, p. 9). Philosophical research is a distinctive approach in a number of ways. A philosophical approach allows the researcher to test and experiment with their thinking, as distinct from hypothesis testing which tests the culmination of thought. Data, in the sense of raw information generated via experimentation or observation, is not sought. As Standish develops this point, philosophical research is concerned with bringing clarity to what we already have rather than seeking to gather further:

> Philosophy *does not* involve doing experiments or collecting data empirically; it *does* involve exploring how we think and the assumptions lying behind our thinking, and becoming clear about the concepts we use; it is concerned with the nature of knowledge (and the grounds for

> knowledge claims); it is concerned especially with reasons or justifications for thoughts and opinions; and it is concerned with questions of value.
>
> (Standish, 2010, p. 7).

In addressing these concepts and the questions of value they generate, the researcher seeks "modes of describing or presenting life [as significant]" (Diamond, 1983, p. 167). These "ways and modes in which philosophers of education think, read, write, speak and listen… make their work systematic, purposeful and responsive to past and present philosophical and educational concerns and conversations" (Ruitenberg, 2009b, p. 316). Engagement with educational policy conceived as a forum of philosophical research invites focused attention and imaginative response. The educator taking a philosophical approach to policy analysis chooses to "stand back from [one's own] practice and to scrutinize the details of the document – its language, its policy context and background, and especially its assumptions and reasoning" (Standish, 2010, p. 14). Stepping back in this way, becoming involved in reading slowly and paying careful attention to detail, affords a valuable vantage point from which to suggest new and imaginative ways of thinking.

In offering a manifestly philosophical exploration of contemporary issues and concerns, the ambition of this research is to enrich theoretical as well as practical discussion. I will discuss here the three methodological elements, namely capability, educational philosophy and thematic approaches, and how together they are suited to the concerns under consideration in this work.

A Capabilities Approach

As outlined in the work of Martha Nussbaum and Amartya Sen, a "capabilities approach" addresses the question of what a person is able to do and be (Nussbaum, 2011, p. 25); they represent a turn from equating high, quantitatively-measurable success with high quality of life. In Sen's original work this skewed relationship was economic (Sen, 1985) but is a distortion familiar to educationalists and students alike. Fundamental to my research is the importance of the educator as an individual, who they are and who they are free to be. A capabilities approach takes each person as an end and focuses on choice and freedom, holding that the crucial good societies should be promoting for their people is a set of opportunities (Nussbaum, 2011). It is a mindset committed to respect for people's powers of self-definition and is pluralist about value (Ibid.). A capabilities approach asks "What is each person able to do and be?" (Nussbaum, 2011, p. 25) as distinct from what skills they currently have.

On the capabilities model, and freed of the finitude "capacity" would imply, the educator's development is not comparable, for example, to the charging of a battery or that beleaguered image of the pail to be filled. Nel Noddings is an example of a philosopher of education who uses the term 'capacity' and speaks to the importance of increasing it (for example Noddings, 2013, p. 102), but perhaps capability frees Voice, Risk and Care from any intrinsic limit, so that we can concentrate on their existence rather than how much there is. Furthermore, capability breaks free of the measurable, minimal 'competence'; of being enough. If I am capable the capability describes me as well as what I do. Rather than having capacity or achieving competence, I am capable.

Nussbaum enumerates ten central capabilities of a human life worthy of dignity. Rather than follow a similar rubric, I see the value of taking a capabilities approach in the focus on human development it affords. Adopting a capabilities approach when considering teacher education and professional development espouses each person as an end (Nussbaum, 2011). The question of what it means to take a capabilities approach is distinct in each of the thematic areas I have chosen to focus on.

What does it mean to take a capabilities approach to Voice? A capabilities approach recognises certain areas of freedom as both difficult to directly measure and as a central contributor to high quality of life. The educator's voice is an example of just such a capability for student teachers, as it develops both personally and in relation. This consideration of Voice as a central theme of initial teacher education takes as its starting point the reimagination of the in-school experience of student teachers as a co-operative one. While established expectations persist, the student and co-operating teachers will now observe and discuss each other's teaching, as well as coming together around the ITE programme's research requirements.

These reforms re-place the education of the educator in the school environment, bringing a fresh mutuality to the fore of everyday life, where teachers teach each other and learn from their students. They raise questions of listening, conversation, speech and silence – of the voice as capability, so part of who the educator is rather than a tool or a skill. This research explores the potential for understanding and fostering this new tenor to the educator's voice. It asks: what is the role of relationship, particularly mentorship, in the development of the educator's voice?

What does it mean to take a capabilities approach to Care? As I consider Care, I return to the essential point of the capabilities approach, what people are able to do and be. I am considering how people are educated to become capable of educational care. Care when considered as capability comes alive. If we Care, as Noddings describes it at its most fundamental, we listen, our motivation is displaced and we respond (Noddings, 2013). If Care has indeed been the relation then the one-cared for acknowledges these three facets (Ibid.). Where does the Care in initial teacher education lie and how is it directed? Considering Care from a capabilities approach, thinking of Care as a sphere of choice, illuminates education itself as the locus of Care. The educator, in caring for their student, cares about their education. And the student cares about their own education. As such both teacher and student listen to, adapt their motivation towards, and respond to the educational engagement. In the case of initial teacher education, the student teacher becomes capable of caring for the education of their own students. They move beyond the instrumental and the measurable to the meaningful. Caring capably is a research-based mindset, ahead of a

solution oriented one. To reiterate, to care is to listen, displace motivation and respond (Ibid.). To listen is to seek something outside of ourselves. To understand the world of another (the migrant child, the student requiring additional support, the difficult colleague) calls for displaced motivation at least in its initiation. To return with something more than you yourself could offer is to meaningfully respond. Thus, in promoting the model of a research-based educator, initial teacher education policy suggests that student teachers develop the capability of Care in their educational mindset.

What does it mean to take a capabilities approach to Risk? Risk is a different conceptual case to Voice or Care. To be risky is not intuitively a capability to be promoted in the educator, as it might communicate a level of freedom suggestive of an unhealthy disregard for the student. The recognition in Biesta's philosophy is that education proceeds in openness so an understanding of educational risk is essential to the capable educator (Biesta, 2013). Without this dimension to their mindset, the educator is impeded in their efforts to choose what is best for their students. The openness called for in the educational relation is shut down, impacting upon multiple areas of freedom, or capabilities. Ideas of risk and openness permeate the capabilities approach in the same way they permeate education itself. Space and weakness are valued, and choice is foregrounded. Choice, like weakness, is riven through with risk and is similarly an essential condition of the event of subjectivity whereby the educator comes to understand why they matter in the world. Put another way, if an individual lacks the freedom to choose for themselves they will struggle to come to understand their own significance. Choice is risky and risk can lead to irresponsibility in the absence of a developed awareness of context and choice. Context and choice ground Risk and bring circumspection. Taking a capabilities approach to Risk in the educator's mindset protects its essential weakness and focuses on its imaginative and creative potential (Ibid.).

In taking a capabilities approach to research, we consider who educators are rather than what educators do. We ask "Who is the self that teaches?" a question Parker Palmer held to be fundamental (Palmer, 2007, p. 21). Palmer places our identity in language as a central concern of initial teacher education, particularly when considered in the manner of capability. He emphasises that "to educate is to guide students on an inner journey", acknowledging that developing as an educator is developing as a person, and in order to do so students need to

be guided towards “more truthful ways of seeing and being in the world” (Palmer, 2007, p. 19). For Palmer the good teacher can “weave a complex web of connections among themselves, their subjects and their students so that students can learn to weave a world for themselves” (Palmer, 2007, p. 23). The teacher capable of connecting and teaching towards connectivity draws not on their methods but on a convergence of their intellect, emotion and spirit. They have the courage to resist “methodological reductionism” and keep the educational sphere open so that the student becomes capable both personally and professionally.

In attending to the voice of the teacher within, Palmer’s educator is awake to their identity as “a moving intersection of the inner and outer forces” (Palmer, 2007, p. 24). They gain integrity by finding ways to relate to these forces and striving for a wholeness defined by knowledge and acknowledgement of self. Palmer returns the educator to their origin, the personal significance of education and its power to illuminate. He encourages the educator to attend to the voice within themselves in order to cultivate a sense of identity and integrity through which they will achieve authority “which has author at its core. Authority is granted to people who are perceived as authoring their own words, their own actions, their own lives, rather than playing a scripted role at great remove from their own hearts” (Palmer, 2007, p. 40). Through communicating with and being true to their educational self, forces within and forces without, the student teacher gains the educator’s narrative voice.

An Educational Philosophy Approach

> It is no plain business finding how to write illuminatingly about human experience – and no plain business reading about it either.
>
> (Diamond, 1983, p. 167)

In the introduction to this work I drew on Paul Standish's picture of "the thinking teacher" (Standish, 2010, p. 8). Such a figure embodies the practitioner-researcher who has come to realise that the practical questions they have "lead to big questions about the nature of knowledge and the nature of the good life" (Ibid.). I see myself clearly in this figure, beginning my own search, some years ago now, to find the language to express my concerns, and a way to explore them meaningfully. The questions I had led me to philosophy of education, as a field, and educational philosophy, as a mode of address and research.

Philosophy as a method stands at a distance in educational research circles, and methodology as a concept is much contested within philosophical ones. If the 'gold standard' for educational research is a structure clearly delineated from the outset, then philosophy, as an iterative, evolving and personal approach, is outside the orthodoxies of educational research in a practical sense (Biesta, 2020a). Within the field itself, the notion of a philosophical method is "vexed" (Standish, 2010, p. 9). The idea that if a method could be acquired it could be applied is "strange", and there is an "awkwardness" to thinking of doing philosophy in terms of applying "an -ology" (Smith, 2009, p. 437).

Application implies that the "-ology" has been selected in advance of the research beginning. However, as Claudia Ruitenberg points out, "'selecting' a method or set of methods prior to actually using them in philosophical research is problematic" as proceeding through iterative motions of reading and writing requires openness to be fruitful: "the intentions of the author—methodological or otherwise—cannot contain the effects of the text." (Ruitenberg, 2009b, p. 317). Nancy Vansieleghem describes the account she gives of her research as "a story" in order to convey the imaginative possibility story suggests, to bring out the imaginative nature of research which relies on and commits to "the promise that there are other possible ways of thinking and seeing" (Vansieleghem, 2016, p. 97). This otherness has

been unhelpfully characterised, creating a "false dualism" between the empirical and non-empirical of educational research approaches (Pring, 2000, p. 247). Thinking in terms of such a dualism does not make sense. Fulford and Hodgson emphasise the philosophical in all research and educational philosophy originating from the practical (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c). Indeed the divergence is to be found in this moment of emergence – the kind of question posed determines the direction the researcher will take.

Work in the philosophy of education typically broadens out from rather than hones in on the original concern. Educational philosophy "takes its cue from questions arising from our social and educational reality" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016d, p. 28), and is distinctive from other modes of research by virtue of the questions it engages with and the sources used to inform its enquiries. Furthermore, the modes of reading and writing by which educational philosophy proceeds differ in their depth and their place in the research process. These "modes of thought and discursive operations" are of particular "value for the elucidation or critique of educational questions" (Ruitenberg, 2009b, p. 317). In other words, the educational philosopher has a unique understanding of what reading and writing are for. It is these particular and "various ways and modes in which philosophers of education think, read, write, speak and listen, that make their work systematic, purposeful and responsive' (Ruitenberg, 2009b, p. 316).

Through these iterative practices of reading and writing the researcher comes to see and to understand difference. It was this potential to see and think anew, to challenge the language and life of initial teacher education discourse which drew me to philosophy of education. The philosophical approach I take centres on reading as research and writing as research, as conceived by Amanda Fulford and Naomi Hodgson (2016).

In general, researchers read to inform their research and write to communicate it. These are the functional processes which surround the research itself. In an educational philosophy approach, processes of reading and writing *constitute* research rather than scaffold it. These texts are engaged within iterative processes of thought as the locus of both experimentation and observation. As such, writing as research goes hand in hand with reading as research. In educational philosophy, writing is a creative, exploratory endeavour. The educational

philosopher writes *through* their research, thinking and expressing their thought. Thus, choosing educational philosophy as a research approach is committing to philosophy as dialogue where listening (as reading) is on a par with speaking (as writing), and where the culmination of research "is not only a contribution to knowledge but to a public conversation' (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 162). It is opening oneself up to learn through dialogue, "a process in which two or more people toss ideas back and forward in a more focused version of ordinary conversation" (Smith, 2010, p. 159), and to following where that conversation between their reading and writing goes (Smith, 2009). These modes are what Fulford and Hodgson term "reading as research" and "writing as research" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016e, p. 5).

Fulford and Hodgson differentiate reading *for* research and reading *as* research based on when they take place and what role they play in the research. Reading *for* research happens in the main prior to undertaking the research project. When reading *for* research the scholar seeks support as they set out on a project. They read to gain perspective, an overview of the field and a scaffold for their own work. This reading places the reader in a lineage and gives them a foundation to set their work upon. Reading *as* research, on the other hand, is an unsettling. The researcher reads on an ongoing and iterative basis; the reading *constitutes* the research (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c). Reading serves to interrupt their own thinking, to dig into ideas and deepen the consideration. The researcher will read into their topic, rather than about it, and through their reading break new ground. A limited number of thinkers are engaged so that their contribution is clear and is deeply considered. Both reading *for* and reading *as* research are incredibly important, playing invaluable roles in distinct conceptualisations of research.

Thinking of reading as research highlights the significance of the text and the significance of when it is read, as well as how the reading proceeds. In proceeding philosophically, reading is key. The texts and their authors are engaged with throughout, condensing significant milestones such as establishing the context of a research project, selecting a sample, seeking results in the data gathered and interpreting conclusions into one phenomenon. Reading philosophically, on the other hand, is something quite different. There are two significant

aspects which I will address here. The first is choosing one's thinkers and texts, the second is the role of reading (in other words, what to read and what reading is for).

Both collecting data and drawing on a text are acts of research. In choosing experimental subjects or philosophical thinkers we intervene in reality. One of the important decisions in formulating a philosophical approach is to decide which authors, schools of thought and thinkers to engage with. This is not a simple task. Rather, it is akin to deciding upon the participants in an empirical study. Who do I wish to spend time with and hear from? Which voices are to be privileged and which engaged with secondarily? To whom do I address my research question/s? In another sense, it is akin to choosing one's field of study. The thinkers come with history and may be associated with particular schools of thought. In recognising the "very particular and very specific history" given theorists carry "one of the questions [raised] is whether we want to identify ourselves with and take a certain responsibility for this history or not" (Biesta, 2009, p. 401). The alternative would be to set the history or context aside and view only their philosophical work. My position is to take this history seriously and only invite those to the table with whom I wish to converse educationally.

Engaging with a particular thinker has a double effect, constituting the "adoption of a particular philosophical stance in one's activities as a philosopher of education" while simultaneously the engagement "undoes and unsettles a little what philosophy of education is or might be" (Biesta, 2009, p. 401). What Biesta means here is that a key concern in embarking on philosophical research is identifying the voices who are significant in the particular field, and resonant with the research at hand. Typically there are not many sources and those engaged with are read deeply, so the choice of thinkers is a significant one. To choose who one engages with is also to choose a certain language or contextual comprehensibility. There are history and lineages of thought to consider, as well as the context of the texts and their authors. Bearing in mind Vlieghe's observation that reading in philosophy is akin to having a conversation with oneself (Vlieghe, 2016), it is essential to consider the voices invited into these internal cogitations.

Agreement is not the aim; rather, seeking a community who draw out and elevate one's thought is the ambition. Choosing sources in philosophical work brings contributing voices

into the research. Their tone and mindset colour not only the contribution their work makes but the type of philosophical engagement possible. It is not a matter of subject or genre, what these thinkers turn their attention to, so much as how. What is implicit in their work? What possibilities are gestured to and what questions are asked? As such, selecting thinkers to engage with is not about looking for the likeminded, but rather those who will enrich and enliven, pose a challenge to the normative concerns under consideration, approaching them "almost obliquely in order to gain a different perspective" (Fulford, 2016, p. 47).

With a view to creating a rich and novel account of initial teacher education reform, I engage with empirical sources as well as philosophers of education. Scholars in philosophy of education often draw on non-philosophical or non-theoretical sources, including those not explicitly connected with education such as art, literature and film. Anne Pirrie refers to these as "relevant conceptual resources" (Pirrie, 2016, p. 90), sources which serve to ventilate dense ideas or illustrate complex trains of thought. In this work I turn to such educational theorists as Deborah Britzman, educators such as Vivian Gornick and philosophers quite apart from education such as Simone Weil. These thinkers play a different role to my central trio of Cavell, Biesta, and Noddings. I do not foreground or highlight their work as strongly, nor do I associate their work with any central concept (Voice, Risk, or Care). However, I do suggest that their writings are in important senses complementary to this central conversation. In drawing on these sources, I am in agreement with Morwena Griffiths when she writes of the necessity to read widely as a necessity but a pleasure particular to the field of education. According to Griffiths, "philosophers of education need to engage with other educational theorists and with particular areas of practice" (Griffiths, 2016, p. 118) to experience this joy arising from the defining complexity of educational research. An educational philosophy approach to reading is open to all those sources which contribute to thinking. Such an approach is nourishing and challenging in equal measure.

In considering what reading is for, the manner in which the chosen sources are engaged with matters. The sources are read in terms of an idea or a question and "in educational philosophy, the nature of the question, and so the potential literature to inform it, entail a greater depth of reading" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 146). The nature of philosophical questions, such as 'What is Care?', prohibit comprehensive literature reviews. To call the

reading philosophical is to imply a depth of consideration and form of reference driven by the sources being structurally integral to the research itself. The source and the research converse; they engage with rather than refer to each other. This is the case for all sources read in this way, be they a piece of art, a piece of policy or a philosophical work. In this instance the policy documents engaged with are read philosophically as their reading "is set in the context of a philosophical discussion" allowing "further ways of seeing a phenomenon" to emerge giving them "new significance" (Johansson, 2016, p. 81). The texts are read iteratively, returned to both for what they say *and* for their mode of thought. To read philosophically is to think with the text and the author, rather than refer to them. It is a particular way of reading which privileges depth of consideration and time spent. In Andrea English's work she reads with her questions in mind and towards their exploration, asking to what extent a text can "contribute to the exploration of questions she is trying to answer" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 144) and using her questions to frame what she will pay attention to in the text (English, 2016). She describes reading to explore and to enrich, adopting a view of the entirety and the particulars. In a sense, the significance of the texts she is reading emerges and works on her questions, rather than her seeking significant points out explicitly and putting them to work.

The attitude of the reader to the text is key. Research in philosophy of education typically approaches a text seeking something. It may be that the reader comes to learn, or to be taught. When reading in philosophy of education "an educational truth or principle" is sought "in its content that can then be applied to education" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016d, p. 28). The reader is oriented toward the normative value of the content to education. In this way they learn from the text. Reading should "help us make sense of our own thoughts" (Gingell, 2010, p. 147) which may well mean showing us our thoughts don't actually make sense. We may discover that the ideas we considered instinctive contain assumptions, and that these assumptions emanate from our experience in school, be that as student or teacher.

Reading in philosophy asks us to "engage with and think *through* what is being said", paying careful attention to every word as it contributes to the particular point and the text as a whole (Gingell, 2010, p. 147). For example, a text which speaks of punishment, or classroom management, or restorative practice strikes a particular tone. The choice of words is

important in considering the context of the writer as well as their writing. Where thinking *about* would keep the text at a distance from the reader, in thinking *through* the reader brings the author and their writing into conversation with their own thinking in order to "re-examine our own thoughts" as we read (Gingell, 2010, p. 147). This act of thinking *through* reading is quintessentially philosophical, asking the reader to listen to the text, to think *through* this lens as distinct from thinking *about* what they have read.

Another approach to the text is to consider its potential to teach, and in this way acknowledge the openness required of an educational philosopher towards their sources. In "taking the language seriously, relishing the words" the reader listens, noticing the ideas grasped and missed as they attend to a text and to other people (Smith, 2009, p. 448). They recognise that in reading, the text asks questions, that the issues which confront us interrogate us (Pirrie, 2015). This is a very Cavellian idea indeed, where any meaningful encounter (be that with a piece of philosophy, literature, or even film) involves *being read by* that particular text –in the sense at least that the text in questions calls us forward to new versions of ourselves (This idea is captured most compellingly in Cavell's idea of 'perfectionism' and is outlined in greatest detail in *Cities of Words,* 2005a). In attending to each other with the care of close reading, Smith suggests we may better notice "what's being said and what might be said", the material and the potential (Smith, 2009, p. 448). Adopting "a different orientation to the notion of education, that is, as transformative and relational" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 28) the reader reads without presumption. Educational philosophy values reading and the emergent nature of the text as educational to the reader.

Where there is something creative and exploratory in the standard engagement with reading for research, writing to report research takes a functional tone. The practices of writing generally described in research textbooks are the abstract, literature review and discussion sections of scholarly work, be these a thesis or an academic paper. The early writing style of a literature review is akin to designing and assembling a jigsaw puzzle which accurately displays the field. It is comprehensive and clearly accounts for the areas which are incomplete. In writing a discussion or conclusion the researcher makes clear where in the puzzle their work fits, what it is they have added to the field. This is a necessary and sensible approach where research addresses a specific concern.

In contrast, taking a philosophical approach to educational research is to write *as* research. The craft of writing in educational philosophy is one of weaving and unpicking, akin to a freeform tapestry or sculpting in clay, where close attention and broad perspective are essential. Gaps are not necessarily possible to address from the outset or open to being filled. Writing philosophically is cyclical in nature, an iterative engagement with the page. Taking a philosophical approach can be understood as writing and editing in tandem. As such, writing is imbued with reading and nothing is linear. This non-linear, ruminative, or *philosophical* approach stands in stark contrast to the typical models of research in education. Here, in the later 'writing-up' stages, the challenge lies in communicating well what has already been achieved. There is a security, even as the task is challenging, in knowing that the research is complete. Where writing is an adjunct to the research itself, the challenge lies in doing the research justice in the reporting.

I would suggest that this attitude to writing has an impact on the researcher's reading too. If the aim of writing up is to communicate well, then part of reading is learning the skills and the conventions of good communication. The researcher's style, for better or worse, becomes conventional. This is true to a certain extent across all disciplines, and definitive practices and standards are valuable where they help to maintain the rich variety of educational research. Over-standardisation is to be resisted for the same reason, and this thesis holds that approaches such as writing *as* research are important contributors to the field. Valuing writing as research affords time and space in a uniquely valuable way.

Taking a philosophical approach is to write throughout, both temporally and in practice. There are conventions, some going back to ancient traditions such as Socratic questioning, some dictated by modern publishing requirements such as neat packages of "6000 words" (Smith, 2010, p. 158, 2016a, p. 129) and the requirements of "peer and public scrutiny" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 160). The approach taken here is somewhat dialogic, aiming to address the questions which emerge as research proceeds. I write about them and through them, staying true to the quieter ambitions of philosophy of education. When philosophy of education takes the form of a written text, as Richard Smith sensitively captures, it promises "a gentler conversation" than in-person argument (Smith, 2010, p. 166). "And if it draws on a

wide range of textual sources", as Smith continues, "[…] it may help us to imagine human life, and the learning and education that go on in it, more fully and more richly" (Ibid.).
Philosophical questions are deserving of engagement respectful of their essential inconclusivity. As such, I follow the example of many educational philosophers referred to here, who hold that "[you have to find the voice] that allows you to write and, in writing, find out what you want to write" (Smith, 2020, p. 11). In claiming their own voice, the educational philosopher writes personally as a professional.

The ideas engaged with call for fair and careful treatment before the researcher joins the conversation. Writing is a faithfulness prior to assertion. In writing towards this doctoral thesis, I wrote to explore and enquire. As such the central chapters of Voice, Risk and Care are in the essay form and mindset, where to essay is to try, to test or to attempt (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c). This trying is necessarily iterative, a writing which does not settle easily on the page. To draft and redraft is a craft where the aim is deeper iterations of thought, grown from a word, phrase or idea in the original writing. In essaying, my writing afforded me time to engage with the written sources and my own writing. Slowing down gives the researcher a chance to think for themselves, to come to appreciate their own thoughts, both in the sense of valuing and of growing. This writing as thinking proceeds in relation to the thinking of others (Fulford, 2016). The process of writing proceeds in this way as an iterative engagement with the sources and the researcher's ideas.

Writing as research takes time. Choosing to write as research demands and affords time to think, through slow, detailed engagement with sources. In philosophical research every word is valued and composition is the essence of the research itself. Paraphrasing or using clipped quotations can have a similar effect to mislabelling data in an empirical study – the results become skewed and the tone of the research produced is altered. In order to be respectful of sources, long quotations are occasionally engaged within a process of close reading, where the researcher takes time thinking, and so writing, through the source in its own words. Fulford and Hodgson's text itself takes this approach (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016b). They ask their contributors to choose an extended quotation from their own work and engage with it in order to describe their philosophical methodology. The brief was "to reflect on their chosen extract of research and… make explicit their practices of reading-as-research and writing-as-

research" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 157) Through engaging with what they have written, on widely varied educational topics, the researchers respect and describe their approach to educational philosophy.

One approach to slowing thinking down is the writing-in of aspects which would not usually be given time. For example, in this work the meaning of words such as 'relation' is approached from educational, philosophical and etymological standpoints. In this way, lines of thought are clarified and brought together, distinctions in understanding are dwelt on. It is writing which encourages the reader to dwell, to take time to really understand. Finding the language to allow the systemic and the theoretical make sense to each other and to the reader calls for time. Inter-weaving policy and philosophy introduces a useful friction, slowing down the research and insisting it take care.

Writing as research takes space. Choosing to write as research demands and affords space for ideas to emerge. On returning to the research process with a view to writing it up, new ideas can emerge. This is attributed to the research rather than the writing of it, as in undertaking writing it is assumed traditionally that everything has been worked out and the researcher is "writing to report" (Punch & Oancea, 2014, p. 369). Philosophical approaches recognise the potential of the act of writing itself, its essential contribution to drawing out and the exposure of ideas it affords.

Research happens in the writing. While writing in an educational philosophy mindset "the force of ideas (and the language used to express them) is allowed to evolve. Sometimes you don't know what you think until you have written it." (Standish, 2010, p. 11). The evolution needs space and cannot be limited to a particular stage in the process, like a finite phase of data analysis. Thus writing as research is totally different to the "the marginalisation of writing in anything other than an attenuated sense" (Smith, 2020, p. 2) seen in the standard empirical attitude that "having got things written down and written up you can stop writing, and there is the sense that this was always the aim" (Smith, 2020, p. 1). Indeed, Richard Smith explicitly questions whether writing undertaken in a condensed period when the research is finished is writing at all or "merely 'writing up' or 'writing to report'" (Smith, 2020, p. 6).

Reading and writing are profoundly “personal work” (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 154). They exact a toll altogether different from the methodical processes of other research methods. This is, I believe, in large part due to their riskiness, which emanates from the sources they draw on and the manner in which they proceed. In other contexts there is data to rely on, to turn back to and refer to. The findings have been found before the researcher is drawn upon to express themselves. Negative findings are still results, often the richest and most profound. Doing research philosophically has instead the essential uncertainty of the creative endeavour at its heart. At either end of human communication we find “processes of interpretation and sense-making rather than simple unpacking and retrieving” (Biesta, 2009, p. 397). Reading as research “awakens us to the further possibilities of language” (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 156) changing our relationship to the written word from being a source in the definitive sense, to a source in the sense of beginning. Similarly “the educational value in writing in (educational) philosophy lies in its opening up for question matters that appear closed or taken for granted” (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 162). Reading and writing as research are usefully unsettling modes, affording the researcher access to challenging conversations as well as the time and space to explore their place within them.

A New Discursive Environment

Voice, Risk and Care are not themes so far from the norm as to be revolutionary or controversial. Rather, I argue throughout this thesis that these themes persist without sufficient engagement, without respect to their breadth and possibility. There is a reluctance to stand back and take in *all* that Voice, Risk and Care might mean. Voice, Risk and Care are examples of what Paul Standish terms "essentially contestable" concepts (Standish, 2010, p. 9). Similar to the concept of education and different from the concept of chemical digestion, for example, they are not amenable to definition in a final sense. The essence of what Voice, Risk and Care mean in an educational sense is arguable, variable, and responsive in context. For example, Cavellian Voice describes a particular tone and the right to take that tone (Cavell, 1994). For Noddings, at its most fundamental, to Care is to listen, displace motivation and respond (Noddings, 2013). In Biestian terms, Risk is necessary to if not definitive of education, and lies in the human nature of educational systems. To do away with Risk is to "wish this [educational] reality away" (Biesta, 2013, p. 2). All three concepts require being in the world with other people and all the unpredictability and possibility a life lived in relation implies. Standish holds then that these are not concerns for the experts. They are living questions which require discussion in the everyday environment of educators.

In this discursive environment the transferability or translatability of words is attended to carefully. There is a parallel between the assumed directness of translation and that of taking a term devised in a managerial setting, for example, and using it in an educational one. Both are processes and in need of care. Claudia Ruitenberg writes that "by defamiliarising language, translation can arrest thinking about a text in a way that assumes the language is understood" (Ruitenberg, 2009a, p. 421). Ruitenberg enquires into the phrase 'ways of knowing' through "interlinguistic translation", considering languages which have more than one translation for the English verb 'to know' (Ruitenberg, 2009a, p. 421). From this she considers how the deliberate creation of distance through translation is used not only in the interlinguistic sense of translation, but also in the interdiscursive sense (Ruitenberg, 2009a). Through interdiscursive translation an effort is made to shift "discourses into other discursive registers so as to enable new questions about them" (Ruitenberg, 2009a, p. 428). Naoko Saito discusses translation and the Cavellian assertion that there exists the potential for philosophy

itself to be thought of as translation. Ruitenberg draws on Saito's thinking when she looks at language in relation and "the educative effects of such displacement", when she asks "what questions and understandings become possible when one sees A in terms of B, when one transports A and lets it operate in the land of B?" (Ruitenberg, 2009a, p. 429).

Like Smith and Pirrie, Saito and Ruitenberg highlight the potential dangers when shifts in language go unattended. There is a risk to moving through language too quickly, assuming understanding, clean connections and stability of meaning, where really "language [is] a system or structure of differences [and] the structure is unstable" (Smith, 2020, p. 7). In choosing to draw on Cavell's work, for example, I chose the slow path. My intuition was that this obvious theme of Voice in a student learning to speak as an educator while in school during initial teacher education is far more nuanced than it first appears and that it is significant that the student teacher is not finding their voice in isolation. Cavell engages with Voice, its emergence and constriction across opera and film, but most particularly he writes in detail about the struggle to find and come into his own voice. It was his insistence on friendship, the "critical friend" and their significance in the lengths one goes to in a life to be the best version of oneself which helped deepen and draw out my ideas. This encouraged me to look closely at the figures the student teacher engages with in school, the school student and the in-school mentor, exposing relations of conversation and cooperation. The school student became significant in their potential to be a friend in conversation, while the mentor emerged as central in their cooperative role. The force of Cavell's writing caused me to reappraise my "relation to the words in use" (Standish, 2013, p. 51) in initial teacher education policy and the guidelines enacting it.

This research "does not just require sensitivity to language: in many cases it *consists in* careful attention to language—to concepts, as it is sometimes put" (Smith, 2020, p. 8), asking what our ordinary words are capable of in initial teacher education today. My concern "is not so much with clarifying a concept, but rather in drawing attention to it" (Fulford & Hodgson, 2016c, p. 168), or drawing attention back to it. This thematic approach strives to locate "the language that would make possible different interpretations" rather than accept "language at its thinnest" (Smith, 2020, p. 11). In short, I have worked to create a new environment for the discussion of Voice, Risk and Care as central normative concerns, recognising "the

importance of language in understanding the part of human behaviour that educational research is, presumably, dedicated to illuminating" (Smith, 2020, p. 8) towards developing initial teacher education. Although treated separately in the chapters to come, these normative concepts are intertwined when considered in the context of initial teacher education. This research progressed, first and foremost, from an imperative to think about the language of initial teacher education in an ordinary way, and to consider whether we ordinarily mean what we say. Recognising the lack of clarity in the everyday understanding of Voice, Risk and Care in the lived reality of student teachers in school, I echo Anne Pirrie in asking "what happens when… the language of the everyday reaches its boundaries and poses a question?" (Pirrie, 2015, p. 526).

One way to respond is to call on philosophical method itself. Part of engaging philosophically is thinking of new possibilities for philosophical thinking, of committing to a methodology which would further "both the aim and the communicability of philosophy of education" (Ruitenberg, 2009b, p. 321). Engaging with philosophers concerned both explicitly and implicitly with the educational introduced immense richness and newness to my educational thinking. Thinkers such as Cavell, Noddings and Biesta all have very specific understandings of commonly-used, ordinary terms such as Voice, Care and Risk, respectively. Successful engagement means "to shift a concept or text into a new linguistic or discursive environment where it raises new questions" (Ruitenberg, 2009b, p. 321). In this instance it is to take initial teacher education policy and practice and respond to it through novel readings of these particular interpretations of normative concerns. This collective process of reading and writing in relation allows new patterns to come to light and new approaches to unfold. Questions which are not central to the work of Cavell, Noddings and Biesta are shared with them in a spirit of creative endeavour. It is to push back against the notion that what is written is given. Together the education of educators is both cared for and transformed; possibility emerges where there is the trust to allow it and the openness to receive it.

Richard Smith draws attention to the strangeness of considering "referring as the paradigm function of language" and to its illuminative import in educational research (Smith, 2020, pp. 7–8). Smith writes that to understand human behaviour through educational research "does not just require sensitivity to language: in many cases it *consists in* careful attention to

language" (Smith, 2020, p. 8). A discursive environment calls for research to be read – to be attended to and listened to – differently. Reading differently is not easy. It is necessarily slow and open, and could be considered, in Ruitenberg's words, a "discursive impertinence" (Ruitenberg, 2009a, p. 430). In reading differently there is a sometimes inconvenient but always important *honesty of engagement*, a committing to and showing belief in the possibilities of the text. It is akin to Noddings' conceptualisation of listening, where to listen is to seek something outside of ourselves. Listening is the "characteristic and appropriate mode of consciousness in caring" (Noddings, 2013, p. 33). When the educator cares they "really hear, see or feel what the other is trying to convey" (Noddings, 2005, p. 16), to read a policy, for example, in terms of what it says and means, rather than how it can be fulfilled. Such a reading inserts itself between the reader and the text, calling for them to displace their motivation and pause before response, unsettling any sense of obviousness or familiarity.

It would be easy to say that I close this thesis in the final discursive effort of bringing Noddings, Biesta and Cavell into conversation with each other. Although it is possible to describe the final chapter of this thesis in this way, there is a problem in suggesting that sources converse. Joris Vlieghe captures this when he writes:

> I engaged in a conversation with two other authors, but in a sense this is not accurate… It is perhaps more appropriate to say that this kind of work eventually consists in *a conversation with oneself*: looking at words and conceptual clarifications others have developed, one tests whether they make sense for oneself.
>
> (Vlieghe, 2016, p. 63).

As Vlieghe observes, in reading philosophically the reader engages with the author, the text and their own ideas simultaneously. The reader encounters the source, its style and its context. This encounter is situated in the landscape of their own research, so coloured by the ideas and questions the reader is interested in. This is what is meant by 'reading in terms of' and how it can seem so like a conversation with oneself. Furthermore the attention to language Vlieghe notes, what he terms "looking at words", is characteristic of the method employed throughout. The central themes of Voice, Risk and Care and their associated policy concerns are read into and opened up to develop a fully philosophical account of the words

ordinarily used in initial teacher education. Through this sustained attention to language the import of relation to Voice, of the clinical to Risk and of research to Care, is drawn out.

In reality, it is *written* out, because writing and reading as philosophical engagement are themselves engaged. There are forms of writing which act as reading. Throughout this study I have written as I read. I have carried along a series of notebooks (hand-written, as this is the appropriate pace for me to read and write for understanding), but these notes have not been transcribed as the final text. Rather "this 'writing' [is] a more fruitful form of reading" (Munday, 2016, p. 108), a space to foster thinking, re-thinking and creativity. It is a space for writing-through rather than writing-up. In this philosophical approach to educational research "the reading and writing does something" (Vansieleghem, 2016, p. 97). Writing as research puts the quality of the writing itself at the heart of the quality of the research.

Good philosophy can, in Richard Smith's view, come down to the quality of the writing. This is a complaint less at the heart of good empirical research (Smith, 2009) than good philosophical research, as "the separation between writing and philosophy cannot be established so easily, or perhaps cannot be established at all" (Smith, 2010, p. 164). Afforded the space it requires, writing is educative in the transformative sense. As Standish said it is a space to figure out one's own meaning, to give expression to ideas rather than transmit knowledge (Standish, 2010). Writing as research is an activation of the possible, an opportunity to challenge one's own understanding and so strengthen it. Reading and writing together give the researcher space to grow and develop "as other people's words sometimes have a way of changing you as they flow through you and on to the page" (Smith, 2016a, p. 130).

Section 2 The Thematic Chapters

Chapter 3 Voice

Introduction

The purpose of this section is to examine Voice as a central theme in initial teacher education and to explore in particular the role of the mentor relationship in its development.

It takes as its starting point the reimagination in Irish initial teacher education of the in-school experience of student teachers as a co-operative one. While established expectations persist in that the co-operating teacher will act as gatekeeper to the school community, granting the student teacher access and opportunities to practise the role of educator, I suggest that there is a fresh mutuality. The co-operating teacher will be observed by and observe (but not assess) the student as they teach, and the student teacher is now explicitly expected to lead a research project with their co-operating teacher.

These reforms re-place the education of the educator in the school environment, bringing a mutuality to the fore of everyday life, where teachers teach each other and learn from their students. They raise questions of listening, conversation, speech and silence – of the voice as capability, so part of who the educator is rather than a tool or a skill. This doctoral work explores the potential for understanding and fostering this new tenor to the educator's voice. It asks: what is the role of relationship, particularly mentorship, in the development of the educator's voice?

Following a critical introduction to the policy context, I consider what we mean when we say 'Voice' and 'Relation'. Specifically, I will argue that turning to the work of Stanley Cavell can make a significant contribution in ventilating these concepts. In my view the work of Cavell substantially enriches any discussion of the emergence of the educator's voice during initial teacher education. His philosophy makes a significant contribution to thinking about Voice and the education of adults. Themes of transformation of self and society, and of what it means to learn or to teach, recur throughout Cavell's work. He is concerned with education as a concept rather than in a formalised sense (such as systems of schooling). Transformation throughout life is inevitable, imposed upon and required of each individual and society as a whole. The development of a professional voice is one such case. Cavell asks to what extent and in what ways are these transformative moments *educational*?

Transformation of Voice calls for an increased awareness of what we say and what we mean when we speak, which is a central Cavellian concern. The development and the expression of our voice is linked to membership of a community of language and ideas, and to the responsibility for ourselves and society we assume when we speak. In considering the educator's voice, its emergence and transformation, I turn to Cavell's theory of performative and passionate speech, as well as his writing on acknowledgement and autobiography in discussing the mentorship relation itself. The thread throughout this discussion is an insistence that appreciation and mutuality are essential to professional development.

The concepts of performative and passionate utterance as explored by Cavell enrich the consideration of what it means to use our voice. In Cavellian terms, performative speech includes words which *do* something in being spoken, for example "I bequeath this watch to my brother". Contrastingly, passionate utterance *brings something out* in the speaker as well as the one spoken to. One might say that performative speech acts, while passionate speech addresses. In the context of initial teacher education, possibilities of both performative and passionate utterance are alive. The student teacher can encounter performative speech most acutely in their interactions with the accrediting programme's placement tutor. In a position to provide feedback to and assess the student teacher, their words are both made active and yet limited by systemic parameters. Passionate utterance describes well how I imagine engagement between the student and co-operating teacher might progress in this new co-operative relation. On this model, the co-operating teacher does not assess the student. Rather they invite the student into their classroom and engage with them in and around educational experiences. Each observes the other's teaching and they come together to discuss, potentially to research, the educative moment together. The scene is set for a powerful engagement. A central question arises here: How can we relate in such a way to move the mentorship relationship from the performative and the assertive towards the passionate and the responsive?

To think about transformation of Voice as a role and a responsibility of the mentorship relation, I turn to two aspects of Cavell's philosophy as capabilities of the educator - Acknowledgement and Autobiography. Cavell refers to Wittgenstein's approaching the solving of problems not through the provision of new information but by arranging what we

have always known. We know that the student and co-operating teacher work better when they spend time getting to know each other. This can be considered in terms of Cavellian acknowledgment, with a focus not on what I know about you but rather on the efforts I make to see you fully; in other words, Cavellian acknowledgment is a matter of ethics rather than epistemology. This shift in tone brings the student teacher and their mentor into view of each other as vulnerable, human and continuously learning. It brings them into that orientation of appreciation I alluded to earlier, where to praise or to be glad of the presence of the other is to acknowledge the problem of them and their essential unknowability. In moving from performative to passionate utterance in our acknowledgment of the other we shift from inviting them to participate in a prearranged order to an invitation to improvise in the pursuit of something better. Such improvisation – such desire to try – is, in Cavellian terms, a moment of moral perfectionism.

An alternative meaning of the term 'relate' is 'to tell', and here I am reading Cavell's writing on autobiography as an illumination of the changes which take place in the educator's voice when the student and co-operating teachers come together to narrate their experiences as educators. The educator's voice does not emerge from silence. We have all been to school and when we return to school we bring with us what Deborah Britzman calls "our school biography" (Britzman, 2003, p. 1). There is a story of school previously written when we were a student, which is ours, but as we were in the position of student it was also narrated by more voices with more power at the time. As a student teacher stepping into the classroom, we unearth that school biography and write again. Likewise, the co-operating teacher has their own school story which they bring to the mentorship relation. In this way, as the student and co-operating teacher come together to talk about the educator's experience during school placement, they are engaged in recounting their experiences. Recounting explores the dual sense of what happens when we look back over an experience. We recount in the sense of sharing and in order "to add it up again" (Cavell, 1994, p. 6). Telling stories is key to nourishing the emergent voice, as this relation describes a sort of memoir, an autobiography.

Cavell writes that the reasons for his turn to autobiography are both practical and scholarly, a position I relate to acutely. In turning to autobiographical exercise, Cavell's feeling was "not exactly that I have become lost and need to find myself… but that I feel the need to recount

what I have so far written, to add it up again" (Cavell, 1994, pp. 5–6). Cavell describes philosophy's discomfort with the autobiographical prolonging his own struggle to find his voice in philosophy. The established reluctance to own the "I" as a personal and professional imperative got in his way. It was not until he found the ordinary language philosophy of his teacher J.L. Austin and the later writings of Ludwig Wittgenstein that Cavell began to find his intellectual voice. He came to realise that ordinary language philosophy requires engagement with the autobiographical and taking seriously what we mean when we speak (Cavell, 1994).

My interest in looking at these moments during initial teacher education is to lift the everyday features of teacher/student engagement and to look at them again. I hope to encourage a richer understanding of the mentorship relation, and to highlight the potential of this relation in meaning-making and professional development.

Voice

What is meant by the educator's voice?

Part of the challenge in addressing this question is the nuanced nature of Voice as a concept. Stanley Cavell in his extensive writing on voice places having and using one's voice as a concern of the self and of society. This is the voice of ordinary language philosophy, "our unastonishing yet astonishing ability to say what we say, I for you, you for you" (Cavell, 1994, p. 59). Building on the work of his teacher J.L. Austin, and both Austin's and Cavell's own engagement with the *Philosophical Investigations* of Ludwig Wittgenstein (2009), Cavell describes "the voice" both as a tone and as a right to take that tone (Cavell, 1994, p. 3). This is the voice called upon to mean what it says, to speak in neither formalised nor literary nor metaphysical tones, yet to be recognisably philosophical (Cavell, 1994). Cavell does not offer one unified concept of voice. Rather, it is a recurrent and significant theme in his writing. As Timothy Gould, Cavell's former student, captures the point, for Cavell, voice epitomises "an entire region of questions about the means by which human beings express themselves and the depth of our need for such expression" (Gould, 1998, p. xv). The layers of tension and complexity in Cavell's account of Voice resonate with the educational but still need to be opened up, and to do so I look away from Cavell briefly to draw on the work of Deborah Britzman. In my view the work of Britzman helps to locate Cavell's philosophy in specific educational contexts.

When writing on educating educators in school, Britzman sees the concept of voice in the experience of educational life as spanning literal, metaphorical and political terrains (Britzman, 2003). The literal voice might be usefully considered as the "teacher voice" we all know so well, a tone that serves to focus and cajole, that brings out both the speech and the perspectives of the speaker. During initial teacher education we take care of that voice in many practical ways, including mandatory lessons in how to protect the voice and ensuring the opportunity to hear the voice of experienced practitioners during school placement. I am interested in what informs the *choices* around that voice, envisaging voice as an area of emergence and freedom. This is a broader conceptualization that makes sense of the educator's voice by taking in the metaphorical and the political senses. The metaphorical

voice describes the qualities and feelings conveyed by the speaker's words (tone, inflection, accent, style), while the political expresses a commitment to voice as a concern of rights and representation (Ibid.).

When Cavell describes "the voice" he is referring to the voice a philosopher takes when expressing themselves recognisably as a philosopher; what is in point here is a recognisably philosophical tone and the right of an individual, here referring to his own right, to take that tone (Cavell, 1994, p. 3). As such, Cavell foregrounds the metaphorical voice and links it to the political. The voice in Cavell's work does not emerge in isolation. Communities of language to which we commit and the responsibility we individually and collectively hold therein are exemplified by the ordinary language philosophy formulation of "When we say…, we mean" (Cavell, 2002, p. 3). The first-person plural formulation is not employed to generalise on behalf of a group; rather, the voice locates itself among others and invites the listener to at least understand if not join them. The metaphorical voice "is linked to trying to represent something of the self but in doing so, bumping up against the language, or the prevailing discourses" (Britzman, 2003, p. 18). Nowadays the educator endeavours to gain and to use their voice in an increasingly managerial world of policy and group think. Without community and relation the educator's voice can struggle to gain a foothold on this slippery terrain. This presents a particular challenge as the student teacher works towards achieving independence. There is always a danger that they will avoid the independent road and fall back into conformity. As Cavell writes

> The words that I must inherit, my very means of expression, can impel me towards conformity. This is a matter of the criteria of my culture supplying the conditions in terms of which or against which I must find self-reliance—the alternative being precisely that dull conformity. Self-reliance involves 'the simultaneous tolerance and intolerance of words'.
>
> (Cavell, 1979, p. 186).

An educator who studies and practises in a co-operative context has the opportunity to think about their voice in a personal and professional sense, as well as in a broad context of relation. This is the mode of teacher education on school placement towards which the Irish system is

striving. The educator's voice is supported in emerging, valued as very much their own while assuredly not alone. In fact, the process of listening – of addressing "questions of ear… questions of the detection of voice" (Cavell, 1994, p. 30) – is essential to Voice's emergence. In his writing on Voice and the power of language, Cavell dedicates careful attention to speech acts, and to exploring how words can be active and expressive, even beyond our own understanding (Cavell, 1994). Cavell engages positively with "the fact that I do not understand all my word's arrivals (Why should I? How could I?), but rather that I may be understood by them, in their return to me, too well" (Cavell, 1994, p. 73). How my words "arrive", or land on the ears of others, is not something I can fully control. And neither can I control the responses of others. But at the very least, in this uncertain exchange, attempts are made to acknowledge each other's humanity. This essential unknowability brings the emergence of Voice into relation and makes it a concern of Cavellian acknowledgement.

There can be moments where the voice fails. Trying to control the meaning of one's words can relegate the voice to mere echoes (Cavell, 1994). The voice can be silent while speaking if it does not recognise its existence in relation and the consequent responsibility to be intelligible . There is a risk to using one's voice and using it well, as our speech exposes us and our thinking (Ibid.). If there is a fear of expressing oneself publicly, "either of inexpressiveness, one in which I am not merely unknown, but in which I am powerless to make myself known; or one in which what I express is beyond my control" the question Cavell asks is "Why do we attach significance to any words and deeds, of others or of ourselves?" (Cavell, 1979, p. 351). The relatability of one's voice, its being universally heard, is indicative of having reached and claiming a sense of self (Cavell, 1994).

The political, the voice as a concern of rights and representation, is at the heart of Cavell's concern with the emergence of Voice. The tone which Cavell describes as "the voice", emerged from the experience of his struggle to be heard through the denial by established philosophical traditions of his right to take that tone. The significance of ordinary language to Cavell personally resonated with the experience of philosophy turning a deaf ear to him: "… I felt that something about ordinary language philosophy was giving me a voice in philosophy" (Cavell, 1994, p. 69). Through argumentation and denial, what Cavell refers to as the

deflection to scepticism, philosophy had lost its voice and become selectively deaf. He felt "that asking myself what I say when, letting that matter, presented a defiance of philosophy's interest in language, as if what philosophy meant by logic demanded, in the name of rationality, the repression of voice" (Ibid.). To Cavell the problem stems from turning away from everyday life and denying its necessary messiness.

The links with an educational context here are clear. Educators, new and experienced, can relate to feeling deprived of a voice when concerns of the system drown out the everyday. Cavell sees this struggle playing out between the definition of criteria in a given context, for example the school, and the capability of the individual for self-expression, or the voice of the educator. The educator's voice, constricted by rubrics and strong interventions, "cannot be heard because of the pressures of conformism and what is suppressed through imperious demands for certainty" (Standish, 2004, p. 100). As Standish draws attention to here, it is the independence of the educator's voice at stake when managerialism and measurement cultures dominate. In such environments it is a struggle to express ordinary educational concerns and have them heard. Clearly significant are the political and metaphorical tones to the educator's voice. Supporting their emergence during initial teacher education is vital.

Cavellian voice proceeds from a point of repression to recovery. Something initially holds the voice back and through a kind of education the voice regains its capability for expression. We can see this in the progress of the student teacher if we recognise that they come to school with a prior experience. No matter how positive and affirming their school biography, its narrative is told by a subordinate voice. It is through being seen and engaged with as an educator and through having the opportunity to begin composing a new chapter in one's school biography that the student teacher (re)gains their educator's voice.

Relation

For an educative understanding of relation, I turn to the work of Nel Noddings. Noddings' concept of relation requires one party to experience engrossment and motivational displacement (an idea understood by her to mean a shift from finding motivation in one's own reality to being motivated by the reality of the one cared for) and to be met with responsiveness or reciprocity in return (Noddings, 2013). This model is clearly co-operative and not necessarily unidirectional; thus it is a useful way to think about the student-co-operative teacher relation. Noddings uses "relation as ontologically basic" (Noddings, 2013, p. 150) meaning that human encounter and affective response should be acknowledged as a basic fact of human existence (Noddings, 2013), which makes sense in considering the essential relationality of students, teachers, subjects and the educational event. In taking a relational approach, "we may think of relation as a set of ordered pairs generated by some rule [requiring] that the rule include some description of affect— that is, that the rule say something about the subjective experience of members in the relation" (Noddings, 2013, p. 150). The relation recognizes the individual, and their individuality and independence emerge in relation.

Thinking about relation in terms of the subjective experience of each individual is a capability approach. It takes each person in the relationship as an end, rather than focusing on the existence of the relationship itself (Nussbaum, 2011). This moves us forward from the co-operating teacher being solely a gatekeeper to a class where the student teacher could practise, whose responsibility was to their students and the continuation of the curriculum in that they had no formal relationship with the student teacher. It moves us forward to a new model where the school students and the curriculum are still at the fore, but the student and co-operating teachers come to them together. Provision is made for the student and co-operating teachers to spend time together with an explicit expectation of discussion; they are to observe and feedback on each other's teaching and planning (The Teaching Council, 2013). In this way they are well defined as an "ordered [pair] generated by some rule", in Noddings' words; however, the manner of their relation and their expectations are kept open. Whether they will choose to relate in a co-operative way is to some extent determined by the educative

potential of the mentorship relation and how it is understood in an ITE context by all engaged parties

A moment in Wittgenstein's *Philosophical investigations* (2009) Cavell returns to time and again (For example, Cavell, 1979, p. 125, 1994, p. 14, 2005, pp. 112–113) recounts a profoundly relational event, and for Cavell an educational one. The passage is as follows:

> If I have exhausted the justifications [for my following a rule the way I do, for speaking as I do] I have reached bedrock, and my spade is turned. Then I am inclined to say: "This is simply what I do."
>
> (Cavell, 1994, p. 14).

This scenario has been variously interpreted, and Cavell acknowledges that his reading is different to the norm (Cavell, 1994, p. 14). There could be a sense of resignation or irritation in the phrase "this is simply what I do". Instead, here Cavell hears the voice of the educator and reads the moment as "a scene of instruction" (Ibid.). It is an encounter familiar to those who have engaged with an enquiring student, a moment where the educational encounter falls short as the teacher shares with their student their own sense of language and its limitations.

Reading this moment as between co-operating and student teachers, I am interested in what happens next. Theirs is an explicitly educational relationship, where thorough understanding is key. It is also a moment of professional engagement, so to respond to a student teacher impatiently or coarsely would be to undo the co-operative teacher's position. As a 'scene of instruction' there is a sense that something came before, the student's enquiries most likely, and that something is yet to come. The student teacher and their mentor will come together to discuss and consider many things – from the logistics of their own mentorship responsibilities, school ethos and norms, to curriculum, policy, and assessment at local and national level. They will have to tease out how best to work together, how best to serve the needs of all involved. Throughout their relationship they will negotiate the vagaries of the classroom, the needs of particular students, the boundaries of innovation and professionalism. Cavell's invocation of Wittgenstein and the metaphorical turning of the

spade set just such a scene of persistent questioning and consistent attempts to respond. In this particular moment, the subject of the questions is the agency of the answerer – the interrogation, gentle or not, centres around why this person, this educator, does what it is that they do.

Prior to responding with "this is simply what I do" (Cavell, 1994, p. 14), if it is to be an educational scene, there seems to me a pause, perhaps an inaudible exhalation. A snapped reply would serve to close the enquiry, or turn it to argument. While one or more parties may well feel antagonised or antagonistic, resigned by choice or coercion, what I read here is a sense of opportunity for both parties. Engaging in this way the co-operating teacher's voice moves from answering – or giving "justifications" – and is turned towards the potential for enquiry. In pausing to say "this is simply what I do" there is an opportunity to ask questions of oneself and to invite response from the other. This is a moment where student and teacher might think together.

What voice does the speaker use in their own mind, left now to lean upon the spade and think? I would suggest that there is an invitation *to relate* in the culmination of this enquiry; the invitation is to think back and recount one's thinking in a manner committed to sense-making. Of course there is a risk in this context that the invitation is not accepted. The co-operating teacher may draw on their experience or authority to fortify what they do as the best or only way. Here, the speaker gains the high ground and in doing so leaves the relationship. On the other hand, for the co-operative relation to take root and flourish, both parties must understand the mutuality of their relation and must be committed to making themselves intelligible to each other. In mentorship, engagement is foregrounded and the self is both vulnerable to and reliant on the world. Thus, when the self stumbles it finds its footing in the world, and gains independence through community.

Another reading of this scenario involves the teacher, student or experienced, saying "this is simply what I do" as they find themselves at a loss. This is not the same as losing, since the context is not a debate or an argument. Rather, it is a sincere, though not necessarily friendly, engagement. It is also not the same as finding oneself lost, as the teacher is in their place of work, doing what they do, leaning on their metaphorical spade. They know where they are

and they are not defeated. It would be more accurate to say that their justifications have run out. The more they say the further into negative equity they retreat and so they say the only thing left to say, the utterance that clearly emerges from the absence of fulfilling reasons: 'This is simply what I do'. The speaker has options here. Brush it off, move on as if further justification is obsolete, or move into the relationship and try to find themselves there. As Cavell puts it, "the recovery from loss is… a finding of the world, a returning of it, to it" (Cavell, 1989, p. 114). As such, recognising that the point of simply doing what we do has been reached constitutes another invitation. Returning to relation brings an opportunity to (re)locate the educator's voice and to inhabit it anew. It is at this point that we might consider how to move the mentorship relation from an extended consultation to a genuine dialogue. The first step towards an awareness of our voice in relation is to consider our life in language, what we mean and what we do in speech. I turn now to Cavell's exploration of performative and passionate speech.

Performative Speech

In considering the problems which arise in the emergence of the educator's voice, Cavell's writing on performative speech is helpful in illuminating the power and significance of performative utterances. Cavell's work here highlights those human encounters, or half-encounters, where the attempt to elicit voice prioritises performance over sincerity and results ultimately in silence. Through his consideration of Austin's theory of the performative, Cavell shows us that to understand what is said is not enough; when the speaker is in a position of power, their speech is a form of commitment. In other words, performative speech is concerned with words which do something by being spoken and are not open to response.

Cavell turns to the work of his mentor J.L. Austin with great appreciation and care. Reading *How to Do Things with Words* (Austin, 1962), the publication of Austin's William James Lectures which he attended at Harvard in 1955, Cavell draws attention to the neglect of passion in this otherwise meticulously developed theory of the performative utterance. Over twelve lectures Austin pays specific attention to those statements which run counter to "philosophy's obsession with the statement, or say the tyranny of assertion" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 161). The orthodoxy that Austin challenged is a positivist one: that if a statement is not true or false then it has no significance or validity that can be ascertained, and served (only) an emotive purpose, with the aim of eliciting action on the basis of arousing emotion (Cavell, 2005b). Austin rejected this emotive theory of meaning and put forward his own theory of the performative, considering in great detail those statements which are neither true nor false nor nonsensical (Ibid.). As part of this developing theory, he identified certain statements best understood as *doing* something rather than making an assertion about something. Such statements are "non-descriptive, or non-assertional, or non-constative gestures of speech" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 159), neither are they nonsense nor true-or-false statements. They do not include "verbal danger-signals" like good, all, ought or can; rather, each will have what Austin describes as "humdrum verbs" such as "name", "give" or "bet" (Austin, 1962, p. 5). Easily understood as doing what they say, the everydayness of such utterances as "I do" or "I give and bequeath this watch to my brother", to use two of Austin's own examples, is underpinned by complex common understanding as well as prior truths and assumptions. Performatives also have context; there is a required appropriateness to the time

and place of the statement as well as the identity of the one speaking in order that the utterance be imbued with energy and so succeed in its performance. For example, “I do” – uttered by a groom in the appropriate moment and setting, and in the presence of appropriate witnesses – performs in a manner in which “I do” spoken in response to “Do you have a pen I could borrow?” does not.

These factors together allow such sentences to perform (commitment to marriage) rather than to indicate or to report on a performance, though they may also inform both casually (the guests at the wedding) and as a formal indicator (to the registrar). As Austin puts it “to utter the sentence … is not to describe my doing of what I should be said in so uttering to be doing or to state that I am doing it: it is to do it.” (Austin, 1962, p. 6).

Bringing Austin’s general work on language to the specific context of ITE, the performative utterance might be exemplified by communications between the university’s placement tutor and the student teacher. The placement tutor is in a position to assess the student teacher based on their observed practice, to deem an individual fit to practise. This is expressed in speech to the student teacher in accordance with the Teaching Council Guidelines on School Placement which state that the Higher Education Institution (HEI) placement tutors “assess the student teacher’s practice in accordance with the HEI’s requirements” and “provide guidance and advice to the student teacher regarding his/her suitability to be a teacher” (The Teaching Council, 2013, p. 18). The Teaching Council will accredit the student teacher on successful completion of their studies; however, it is the placement tutor who will communicate to the Teaching Council and to the student teacher whether or not they are fit to practise. Failure on school placement precludes their accreditation (The Teaching Council, 2017b). It follows, then, that for the placement tutor to tell a student “I pass you” is constitutive of a performative speech act, as although they may go on to fail the rest of their modules and not qualify, the student has been deemed suitable to be a teacher. To declare “I fail you” acts to rule out their further progression towards a career in education at that moment. These are important encounters with the performative as they not only assess a given facet of initial teacher education but also act as gatekeepers. They underline the significance of school placement in an era when it is under fire. Questions of “whether such

intensive and extended placement is necessary or indeed helpful to student teachers" are being posed at the highest levels of educational policy in Ireland (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 27). Taking these as encounters of ordinary language, Cavellian philosophy holds us to understanding the commitment behind the utterance. To gain further clarity on the power such performatives hold, we can look behind the words to their context, and consider them against the criteria Austin provided for the happy functioning of a performative statement.

The fulfilment of the necessary criteria Austin termed as "the felicity" of the performative utterance rather than its truth or falsity, as these statements are clearly neither true nor false but can be impeded in their action (Austin, 1962, p. 14). In a case that is non-felicitous, the performative would not do what it says. This felicity or infelicity Austin termed criticism of speech and, by extension, of action as speech, so that claims of felicity of a statement could be considered as rigorously as claims of truth, and to that end he put forward a series of six conditions (Ibid.). These are not requirements. Rather, Austin is describing "some at least of the things which are necessary for the smooth or 'happy' functioning of the performative" (Ibid.), such that if any of these conditions were broken the performative would be infelicitous in what it seeks to do. These conditions are:

> (A. 1) There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, that procedure to include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances, and further
> (A. 2) The particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked.
> (B. 1) The procedure must be executed by all participants both correctly and
> (B. 2) completely.
> (Γ. 1) Where, as often, the procedure is designed for use by persons having certain thoughts or feelings, or for the inauguration of certain consequential conduct on the part of any participant, then a person participating in and so invoking the procedure must in fact have those thoughts or feelings, and the participants must intend so to conduct themselves, and further
> (Γ. 2) must actually so conduct themselves subsequently (Austin, 1962, pp. 14–15).

If these conditions are fulfilled the spoken utterance will have done something; it will be counted as a performative one. Similarly, the criteria laid out in the Teaching Council Guidelines are clear and unambiguous in the conventions, context and consequences to declaring a student teacher to have passed or failed their school placement module (The Teaching Council, 2013).

Insincerity in assertion nullifies the performative as assertion implies belief. It may be due to not believing, for example saying "I warn you" when there is no basis for that concern, or by not intending to commit to the assertion, for example making a faithless promise (Cavell, 2005b, p. 167). This should serve as a reminder to initial teacher education programmes that in assessing a student as suitable to be a teacher they simultaneously assert what it is to be a teacher, and that this individual is an exemplar. The criteria to qualify as a teacher in practice are definitive of what it means to be a teacher in practice. Similarly, not following through on what a performative entails would nullify it. In Cavell's example of "I promise but I ought not" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 168) the speaker effectively says "I would promise but…". It is avoiding a promise not making one. As such, performative utterances, like constative statements, are stopped in their tracks by fiction but are rendered inactive rather than nonsensical. It still makes sense for the placement tutor to say "I pass you but I ought not", and it is similarly dangerous to the integrity of the educational profession as saying "I would fail you but I ought not".

While there is mention made that the student teacher should "engage with constructive feedback from HEI tutors" (The Teaching Council, 2013, p. 19) this is not an invitation to engage with the tutor themselves. I would argue that what is missing in this relation is the dialogic side of voice, which was a concern of Cavell's with Austin's theory of the performative. I turn now to the other formal in-school relation all student teachers experience, that of their co-operating teacher, and consider it in light of Cavell's work from Austin's beginnings – the concept of passionate speech.

Passionate Speech

> If I could not rationally expect, by variously expressing myself to you, to have the effect of alarming you or reassuring you, of offending or amusing you, boring or interesting you, exasperating or fascinating you,… I would lack the capacity to make myself intelligible to you.
>
> And what you would lack is not some information I might impart to you.
>
> (Cavell, 2005b, p. 172).

In his considerable work on neglected modes of speech, Austin shied from the realm of the passionate (at least according to Cavell's reading). Cavell interprets this avoidance as an unnecessary absence, perhaps a shortcoming in Austin's own expressive capabilities; that the expression of passion was simply not a part of who the philosopher was. Thus Cavell set out from Austin's side, remaining in the spirit of his thinking, to "question a theory of language that pictures speech as at heart a matter of action and only incidentally as a matter of articulating and hence expressing desire" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 159). In his essay, "Performative and Passionate Utterance", Cavell describes Austin's meticulous formulation of a theory of the performative, and undertakes to extend it to take account of passionate utterance (Cavell, 2005b, pp. 155–191).

As previously mentioned, J.L. Austin in his writings on performative utterances (speech which *does something* in its utterance) was at pains to distinguish these utterances from constative statements, or statements of fact. To this end, he described three speech acts: the locutionary, the illocutionary and the perlocutionary (Cavell, 2005b). These acts have a sort of snowballing nature where in making a meaningful statement (a locutionary act) one generally does something in speaking (an illocutionary act) and may bring forth something by speaking (a perlocutionary act). So by saying "I warn you" I have said something of meaning, performed the act of warning and possibly succeeded in my intention to elicit a feeling of worry in you and prompt you to act. Austin focused on the illocutionary, or the performative, deeming the perlocutionary to be irrelevant to the action which is brought about. In other words, to use the example of "I warn you" again, it does not matter how I make you feel as long as I have succeeded in warning you. While this may be the case, Cavell described Austin's

halting his consideration here as a "surprising and unnecessary limitation" to the consideration of speech acts as a whole, and wished to extend Austin's discussion to include those cases of perlocutionary and *passionate* speech (Cavell, 2005b, p. 172).

Performative speech occurs in the illocutionary act of words which do something in being spoken, for example "I bequeath this watch to my brother". Passionate utterance, in contrast, *brings something out* in the speaker as well as the one spoken to. It functions in everyday moments and ordinary language, for example, if a friend declared "You were wrong to steal that money". Passionate utterance requires engagement. It is designed to have consequential effects on the feelings, thoughts and actions of others, and the speaker is not in a position of formal judgement over the one addressed (Cavell, 2005b). Hence, if a judge made the same declaration it would be performative rather than passionate, acting through the authority of the speaker. Likewise, if I said "I warn you" and you were to feel concerned and to ask me why, then to progress in open discussion as my warning was not formalised by authority over you, the statement would have been a perlocutionary act. Importantly, such a passionate utterance brings the speaker and the one addressed into relation.

Passionate utterance describes well how I imagine engagement between the student and co-operating teacher to progress in this new co-operative relation. To reiterate, the co-operating teacher does not assess the student. Rather, they invite the student into their classroom and engage with them in and around educational experiences. The "structured support and guidance" provided by co-operating teachers is described as pivotal "though it is not evaluative" (The Teaching Council, 2013, p. 15). Each observes the other's teaching and they come together to discuss, and potentially to research, the educative together. There is a formal recognition of the power of dialogue between student teachers and mentors, and the transformative potential such engagement can have for both parties (The Teaching Council, 2013). The scene is set for a powerful engagement.

Cavell undertook to extend Austin's theory of the performative to consider passionate speech as a type of perlocutionary utterance. In considering these speech acts, some but not all of which are emotive, Cavell is suggesting that "in determining our sense of the effects of speech in and as action" those utterances that do something *by* being said, rather than *in* being said

as illocutionary acts do, require deeper consideration. It is an invitation to think more about "I hear you" and focus less on "I pass you". The scene set for these passionate utterances is very interesting when considering mentorship in initial teacher education. A particular sense of relation is suggested which speaks directly to the co-operating teacher and the student teacher. Firstly, the one speaking and the one addressed exist together outside a formal power dynamic. While the co-operating and student teachers observe each other's classes, there is no element of assessment in their feedback to each other. This engagement is founded upon passionate speech: "locutionary acts designed to have consequential effects on the feelings, thoughts, and actions of others" the context of whom requires "exchange, not mediation or arbitration" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 177). Passionate speech brings something out in the speaker and the one spoken to.

Requiring engagement and proceeding only when the speaker is not in a position of formal judgement over the one addressed, passionate speech is designed to have consequential effects on the feelings, thoughts and actions of others. As such, passionate utterances are not "just any statements made in just any contexts to just any effect; once issued, each appears as deeply characteristic and revelatory of both the utterer and his or her addressee" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 180). This mutuality in passionate speech, its potential to share through engagement and dialogue, is at the centre of mentorship in initial teacher education. The everyday speech of the co-operating and student teachers endeavours to bring forth the voice of the other. Passionate utterances "make room for, and reward, imagination and virtuosity" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 173), making the most of this new co-operative relation. Engaging in dialogue usefully troubles the co-operating teacher's identity as well. In the mentorship encounter, moments of emotive statement and response arise which are tempting to act upon. Conceptualising the engagement as passionate rather than performative moves to resist assessing events in the educator's life as true or false, and instead encourages a dialogue. It insists that both parties slow down and think about what they mean when they speak, and what their speech *means* to the other, with a view to deepening this emerging relationship.

Cavellian philosophy has a unique grasp on the ephemeral (voice) and the concrete (everyday life). He asks whether we must put meaning behind our words and make what we say an

expression of significance. Asking whether we must mean what we say has a particular resonance in considering the educator's mindset. In the words of Cavell scholar Sandra Laugier, "to mean what we say is to know, or to tell, what matters, what we mind" (Laugier, 2011, p. 996). Moments such as these give insight into what is valued and attended to. Cavell sends us back to our own lives to understand what is important to us through gaining an understanding of our own importance. Using the idea of passionate speech to describe the co-operative relation opens it up as a space where student and co-operating teachers might experience "the revelation of one's own relevance" (Ibid.). In coming to see what matters to oneself, and coming together to learn, both the significance of having clear conceptual understanding and of making sense of it for oneself are highlighted.

As previously discussed, when describing "the voice" Cavell considers it both as a tone and as the right to take that tone (Cavell, 1994, p. 3). In the context of passionate utterance he raises the issue of tone once again, considering the contribution made by tone to the meaning and intelligibility of a statement. He is particularly interested in whether tone can be detached from or is stuck to an utterance. In speaking as an educator, does it matter whether I speak performatively, so that my words act, or passionately, so that my words engage?

Taking an educational tone says something about the speaker and about what is being said. Cavell holds that "the tone of an utterance gets stuck to the utterance" and whether appropriate or not impacts upon the intelligibility of the utterance (Cavell, 2005b, p. 163). This is an important consideration in teacher education where there is a tension between the tone of the student educator and the emergent nature of their voice.

There is a temptation for the student teacher to address their class using performative speech. There is an obviousness – a predefined nature to performatives – wherein by their utterance they make themselves known immediately, which Austin terms their conventional nature (Austin, 1962). Performatives are immediately recognisable, and whether the perlocutionary act succeeds or fails the intention of the words are clear. The student teacher can gain a sense of security in issuing instructions and directives, threating consequences and claiming authority outright. It is a fool's paradise, however. By relying on performative utterances the voice of the educator is constricted. Missing from these utterances, crucially,

is a measure of openness and responsivity definitive of educational engagement. It is in dialogue that the educational progresses meaningfully "more intimately staking our future" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 176) as relational. The co-operation of an experienced educator is integral to developing resonance in the emerging voice of the student teacher. The student teacher has the opportunity to hear the educator's voice employed in literal, metaphorical and political tones, and to discuss their observations. In this way the mentorship relation models the openness characteristic of an educator in a classroom, rather than a conductor directing an orchestra. Listening is as much a part of passionate utterance as speech, as Cavell reminds us (Cavell, 2005b). The decision to speak is wrapped up with the decision to listen, so the development of the educator's voice is bound in "ordinary commitments [including] the commitment to listen to one whom you have questioned" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 176).

In practice in the classroom such ordinary commitments can feel like an extraordinary risk. For example, take the phrase "I encourage", frequently used to describe the roles and responsibilities of the co-operating teacher (The Teaching Council, 2013). In the utterance of this phrase, encouragement has been given, although the figure addressed may not feel entirely encouraged. To be encouraged is a feeling, so "I encourage you" is both passionate and performative. The happy occurrence of encouragement is not assured in saying "I encourage". It can only be determined by engaging with and listening to the one addressed. Thinking of educational engagement as passionate speech encourages consideration and response; it involves reaching into the self and reaching out to the other. The passionate utterance is necessarily open. It waits for a response which cannot be predetermined from another who cannot be fully known.

Saying that the passionate utterance is necessarily open, however, does not give a speaker emotive licence without responsibility for their perlocutionary actions. To know or to gain a sense of "what perlocutionary acts I am liable for 'bringing off' [as] part of knowing what I am doing and saying, or am capable of knowing and saying" (Austin, 1962, p. 103) is required of passionate speech and central to teacher education. A capability approach "takes each person as an end" and "holds that the crucial good societies should be promoting for their people is a set of opportunities" (Nussbaum, 2011, p. 25). As such the speaker, in this account the teacher, endeavours consciously to become capable of affording their students the

opportunity to respond. Part of this is fully understanding the potential their educational voice holds to bring forth a passionate response and taking their capability to foster passionate dialogue as a responsibility of the educator's role. Taking each student as an end is to be aware of what one is capable of knowing or sensing as their mentor. The case in favour of passionate speech in education is clear when what it is to speak passionately and the responsibility inherent in eliciting response are understood. Thus, for the co-operating teacher engaging the student teacher, their perlocutionary capabilities are both essential and indebted to care.

Acknowledgement

How do we relate in an orientation of appreciation?

Cavell writes that "there are special problems about our knowledge of another… And these problems can be said to invoke a special concept of knowledge, or region of the concept of knowledge, one which is not a function of certainty" (Cavell, 2002, p. 238). This region of regard for uncertainty in the concept of knowledge is explored by Cavell beginning with this scenario:

> [An individual] begins with a full appreciation of the decisively significant facts that I may be suffering when no one else is, and that no one (else) may know (or care?); and that others may be suffering and I not know, which is equally appalling.
>
> (Cavell, 2002, p. 228).

In Cavell's consideration, this individual then deflects from direct consideration of the issue at hand in its ordinary sense and moves to consider it philosophically. Cora Diamond termed the issue "the difficulty of reality", and the deflection "the difficulty of philosophy" (Diamond, 2008, pp. 45, 57). I would suggest that this issue is recognisable as a difficulty of education's reality too. During school placement the student teacher will be flooded by people, information and uncertainty. It is difficult to articulate the challenge of this experience and tempting to focus in on what they believe to be certain and possible to control. While uncertainty itself is not surprising, it is unsettling and can prompt the student to deflect from the original issues, towards narratives of control. For example, the student teacher may think "The students keep talking, I don't know why and they don't respond to my attempts to stop them. I need to control the class." In this instance the student teacher is deflecting from the issue of the students choosing to ignore them. Instead of focusing on the potential reasons for their disengagement (e.g. the task was unclear, it was not of a suitable standard, they are testing the boundaries of acceptable behaviour) the focus shifts to changing the students' behaviour. The co-operating teacher is a key figure in this scenario, and care is essential.

In engaging with their co-operating teacher there is a temptation to expect a solution, a magic phrase or pedagogy which will turn the student teacher's experience around. The co-operating teacher might be tempted to respond: "I have had the same experience. This is what you need to do." There are several issues here. Firstly, the experience of the co-operating teacher was not the same; they are a different person, who engaged different students in a different context. It is important to be sympathetic but disingenuous to claim that all experiences of a type are identical. Secondly, by claiming expertise the co-operating teacher is misleading their student. There is no knowing whether an approach which was successful one day will succeed the next. These issues – not fully facing up to student disengagement (on the part of the student teacher) and failing to see the student teacher's experience as unique (on the part of the co-operating teacher) – stem from a common problem. Both student and co-operating teachers are further deflecting from the original scenario.

In order to see the problem differently, I suggest that the student and co-operating teachers should start by looking at each other in a relational rather than functional way. In moving from performative to passionate utterance as discussed previously, the mentorship relation shifts from an invitation to participate in a prearranged order to an invitation to improvise in the pursuit of something better.

Cavell calls on us to shift our relational mindset from one of seeking to one of learning (Cavell, 2002). To acknowledge another person is to give voice to our essential ignorance of them, and in turn to be open to them. Acknowledgment "is not a description of a given response but a category in terms of which a given response is evaluated." (Cavell, 2002, p. 242). What Cavell means by this statement is difficult to say but it involves at the very least his suggestion that acknowledgment is more a continuing attitude than a final answer. It involves an ongoing sensitivity to the person in front of us in addition to an ongoing admission of their complexity. Returning to the ITE encounter: in feeling confusion, irritation or despair in the student teacher who thinks education requires control I am not failing to acknowledge them, but if I dismiss their conclusion as not worth talking about and refuse to engage, I am. Acknowledgment is, firstly, the ability to see the other person as "fully meant, fully complex, fully sincere" (Mahon, 2016, p. 48), to take them seriously and to take them as they are.

Secondly, to acknowledge is to openly and generously recognise that you cannot ever fully know another person; it is to value the effort that is being made in trying to know them while at the same time valuing their essential unknowability. This shift in tone brings the student teacher and their mentor into view of each other as vulnerable, human, and *learning*. It brings them into that orientation of appreciation alluded to earlier, where to praise or be glad of the presence of the other is to acknowledge the problem of them and their essential unknowability. This is the "event" of moral perfectionism which at its core involves venturing, communicating, and trying again.

Learning from another person is at its best when both parties are open to interrogating themselves and each other in what they think and say. This model of mentorship is "an invincible form of scepticism, a recurrent pattern of doubt" (Colapietro, 2012, p. 126) which opens up possibilities and options. It risks changing minds and shifting mindsets into more fluid, responsive modes. Foregrounding the good that can come from openness to questions, or indeed from inviting them, has the potential to help educators better work with and make the most of the potential their students' sense of uncertainty represents. It affords co-operating teachers the opportunity to model consideration and hold a perspective averse to the notion of the self as fixed.

A particular scene of acknowledgement during initial teacher observation is the classroom observation. In previous programmes of teacher education only the HEI representative would observe the student teacher practise, and then only for the purpose of assessment. Now, the student and co-operating teachers frequently observe each other's teaching, and spend time in discussion, responding to the observation experience.

School placement is intended to be beneficial to all involved. If properly resourced and supported "it can present opportunities for sharing ideas and new methodologies. It can foster open dialogue on teaching and learning and offer a variety of opportunities for real engagement and learning among teachers throughout their careers." (The Teaching Council, 2013, p. 9). During school placement, particularly in the experience of observing or being observed, the student teacher brings education in practice to bear on their own identity as an educator. Contributing to this moment are prior experience of school, new learning as a

student teacher, and the established norms of a school placement context. The educator's identity emerges in their particular interpretation of the balance between independence and conformity. Taking the co-operative relation seriously makes it incumbent on the student teacher to open their mind and respond, rather than react. In Paul Standish's words, if we understand acknowledgement as an enabling of voice, then "this subtly shifts the emphasis [..] from a striving after the mastery of a subject or skill to a sensitisation to the unlimited demands of what is to be learned" (Standish, 2004, p. 105). In becoming sensitive the ear is attuned in relation, deepening this dialogue and valuing listening as essential to the emergence of voice.

For the voice to emerge intelligibly, Cavell describes the following requirement:

> …a convening of my culture's criteria, in order to confront them with my words and life as I pursue them and as I may imagine them; and at the same time to confront my words and life as I pursue them with the life my culture's words may imagine for me: to confront the culture with itself along the lines in which it meets in me.
>
> (Cavell, 1979, p. 125).

The effort to gather the "culture's criteria", or how it describes itself, and one's own "words and life" in an attempt to form a cogent self-image as an educator is a lifelong endeavour. Participating as a co-operating teacher can form part of that development. It can be thought of as an engagement in Cavellian perfectionism. The Cavellian perfectionist relation begins as "a process of education is undertaken, in part through… a discussion of education, in which… each self is drawn on a journey of ascent to… a further state of that self, where… the higher is determined not by natural talent but by seeking to know what you are made of and cultivating the thing you are meant to do" (Cavell, 1991, p. 7). As such it is a call to the experienced educator to reorient their mindset from turned back towards themselves and the past, to instead look outwards in appreciation. Taking on this attitude appreciates the presence of the student teacher and in so doing promotes the emergence of their voice. It also sees an appreciation in the experienced educator as, through relation, they see that they have the capability to re-orientate themselves.

This journeying upwards, turning outwards, desiring and working towards our best selves is by Cavell's definition of perfectionist endeavour undertaken with a friend (Cavell, 1991, p. 6). It is a friendship, but there is an imbalance. In the example Cavell uses of Plato's *Republic* it is an imbalance of age, but this is not to say that the older should not aspire to learn from the younger. As such it is a good model for a co-operative relation during school placement. School placement is a unique opportunity to work with another educational professional at a different stage in their career. There is a common context and language. School placement necessitates witnessing each other's practice, planning for and sharing a class of students, and spending time in reflection together. From the everyday life shared by the student and co-operating teacher comes a recognition that they are not the same but are similar enough to try to understand each other. For Cavell this difference is crucial as the perfectionist focus is on "finding one's way rather than on getting oneself or another to take the way" (Cavell, 1991, p. xxxii). The educator's identity is established only in that it cannot be defined in a final way, which opens up the idea that others too are not complete and so not completely knowable. For the perfectionist relation to function each must recognise the other, so the criteria of being an educator must encompass the student and the experienced alike while recognising that neither fulfil them completely. It pushes back against the narrative of the self-reliant educator, the expert teacher, which relies for its perpetuation on denials of voice. Instead, perfectionist thinking establishes as desirable those ways "in which we find our own thoughts challenged" (Standish, 2004, p. 103). Standish continues, "…one name for that thinking is acknowledgement, and… this is the opposite of denial" (Ibid.). Perfectionist thinking is a matter of genuine openness to the other.

What might acknowledgment bring about? In a guiding document for providers of initial teacher education, the profound importance of acknowledgement in the relation between co-operating and student teachers is expressed as follows:

> [School placement] is also a valuable, and sometimes critical, experience in determining, through both self and external evaluation, the student teacher's suitability and capability to be a teacher.
>
> (The Teaching Council, 2017b, p. 16).

Earlier in this work I have noted that the co-operating teacher does not formally assess the student teacher during their school placement (p. 50) However, there is an insistence in the Sahlberg reviews that "Ideal partnerships involve shared responsibility between the school and the university for the assessment of student competence. This builds on good mentoring arrangements within schools for student teachers." (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 22) What could assessment that builds on mentoring look like? The temptation would be to interpret assessment and evaluation as grading. Thinking of the relation as one of mutual growth and acknowledgment helps push back against these strong tendencies. It could move the relationship from consultative to dialogic, engaging with students around their identity as educators.

Consider the co-operating teacher observing a student teacher teach a class. They will naturally wonder how they can help the student, what constructive feedback they can provide which will benefit the student's development. In embracing a fully co-operative mindset, the experienced educator is encouraged to imagine what they too can learn, recognising that "as representative we are educations for one another." (Cavell, 1991, p. 31). Imagine the experienced educator pausing before response and observing "this is simply what I do", recognising the experience of observing the student teacher's practice as an invitation to explore their own.

It may refresh and even relieve the co-operating teacher to be acknowledged in this way. Having practised for a long time without another figure in their classroom or one with whom to have practice-oriented conversations, the experienced educator has been alone with their voice. When it has been some time since the educational voice was an active consideration, "when you have twisted or covered your expressions far or long enough, or haven't yet found the words which give the phenomenon expression" another invested party " may know better than you how it is with you" (Cavell, 2002, p. 245). Their capability of acknowledgment is a function of the openness of the relation, however. As Cavell observes "I know your pain the way you do" (Ibid.) and it is a challenge to share one's educational mindset. Being observed and receiving feedback is unsettling, unnerving even, at any point in the educator's career but the student teacher responding to their mentor poses a particular challenge. Engaging in this way calls on the student and co-operating teachers as well as the system of initial teacher

education, to consider how they value observation and response in the case of the co-operating teacher's practice. Opening up, Cavell suggests, sets the other person free. Encouraging openness in the co-operating teacher's attitude fosters independence in the student teacher. It is an opportunity for the student teacher to see themselves as an educator, to respond to "the fact of [the co-operating teacher's] separateness" and practise their professional voice (Ibid.). This perspective allows for a full-voiced response on the part of the student.

Developing in relation to each other can be impeded by models of knowledge acquisition. Though the consequences are context dependent, "failure to know" in a theoretical sense "might just mean a piece of ignorance, an absence of something, a blank" (Cavell, 2002, p. 243). Getting to know a person is very different. A relation which is not mutually open to the other risks failing to acknowledge, introducing "the presence of something, a confusion, an indifference, a callousness, an exhaustion, a coldness" (Ibid.). Thinking of the other in terms of what can be known rather than valuing their unknowability restricts or limits the development of relation, and impedes the emergence of voice. One way to hold the relationship open is to attend to it.

In Simone Weil's philosophy, attentiveness is a suspension of thought and opening our minds to let another's thinking in. Encountering difference is a pleasure if one is attentive, and it makes clear how much more there is to know about the other person. She describes beautifully the consequences of inattentiveness:

> What could be more stupid than to tighten up our muscles and set our jaws… Attention is something quite different. Pride is a tightening up of this kind. There is a lack of grace (we can give the word its double meaning here) in the proud man. It is the result of a mistake. Attention… presupposes faith and love.
>
> (Weil, 2002, pp. 116–117).

Entering into the co-operative relation is an act of faith and love towards the educational endeavour, and school placement itself is "based on a tradition of goodwill" as "teachers work with student teachers in the interests of sharing, developing and supporting good practice"

making a mutual investment in the future of the profession (The Teaching Council, 2013, pp. 7, 10). Putting pride first would be to the detriment of all voices.

It may be that the reasons for one's behaviour, the roots of "this is simply what I do", are not clear to us. The voice can lack both language and support, realizing "one hasn't forms of words at one's command to release those feelings, and hasn't anyone else whose interest in helping to find the words one trusts" (Cavell, 2002, p. 245), recognizing the importance of mentorship in its absence. There may be no malice in a reluctance to open up. Standish describes acknowledgment as central to overcoming habits of control, which can stem from denial or deflection (Standish, 2004). In working to overcome the habit to deny or deflect we may slowly come to a sort of acknowledgement of self and find our voice. Cavell suggests a turn to poetry when we struggle to find the words for our own feelings or experience (For example, (Cavell, 1988). Standish (2004) suggests art, and one could imagine this being a particular moment for the humanities in general to shine. In the instance of the student and co-operating teacher they may find their stories closer to home. To explore this idea I will engage with Cavell's writing on autobiography in the next section.

In his 2004 paper *In Her Own Words*, Paul Standish brings Cavell's writing on voice to bear on Michael Fielding's work on student voice in modern schooling (Standish, 2004). Standish identifies in the performativity of schooling (for example, through the use of specified learning outcomes) a risk to the voice of students and teachers, as well as an undermining of the substance of the curriculum itself. He explains: "The fact that it is not only the learner's but the teacher's voice that performativity suppresses compromises the ways in which the subject matter that the teacher is committed to passing on is experienced by learners" (Standish, 2004, p. 103). This suppression is exemplified in the provision by some initial teacher education programmes of rubrics for use when the student or co-operating teacher observe each other's teaching. Rubrics are popular, often provided by the accrediting HEI in an effort to structure classroom observation. There is a scepticism to these structures, however, where it is thought that through acute observation of the teacher and related enumeration of criteria, they can be deemed to be present. This approach risks "the loss of the world through an impossible effort to certify its existence by means of the senses" (Cavell,

1994, p. 140). By restricting the voice of the student and co-operating teachers, the encounter is diluted to a list of observable criteria. This is also an example of the voicelessness Standish identifies in the habits of forced speech creeping into education. These moments elevate the activation of voice, registering rather than responding to the speaker.

If the educational endeavour is taken over by doing and fulfilling, characterised by 'busy work', the time and space for the slow work of thinking and acknowledgment shrinks. In valuing active learning and participative activity in the classroom, the pendulum swung with unnecessary vigour to devalue quiet application or attentiveness (For an example of this devaluing in the context of the university lecture, see Fulford & Mahon, 2020). Lacking space to make sense and find meaning, the voice is clipped. It jumps to react, rather than pausing to allow considered response. In contrast, the perfectionist relation works to call forth the voice through acknowledgement. It shows both parties better possibilities that might be developed in trust over time, emphasising the care and the respect that are essential to bringing forth an emergent voice. With this emergent voice in mind, I will explore in the final part of this chapter the central idea of autobiography. I suggest that, like Acknowledgment, Autobiography is a key capability of the student teacher.

Autobiography

Becoming capable of Autobiography brings the personal and the professional senses of the educator into relation, to face each other and to narrate the student teacher's in-school experience together. In becoming capable of Acknowledgment, the educator recognises that they cannot ever know the truth of another person but might still endeavour to open themselves to this other person's possibility. Through the capability of Autobiography, the educator turns this generosity inwards, developing an appreciation for their own essential unknowability and the contingency of their educational self. In both cases respect is key, as is the shift from authority to humility, as the student teacher develops their educational voice in relation.

A goal of teacher education is for the student to "become, in a real sense, though as yet in an initial sense, one's own best critic" (The Teaching Council, 2011, p. 11) and it is envisaged that such "reflective, critical and research-based learning" continue throughout their career (The Teaching Council, 2011, p. 10). In working to locate and engage with their educator's voice, the student and co-operating teachers refer to their own school stories. They *listen back* in an attitude of openness. Engaging in this attitude of learning rather than seeking is to acknowledge each other and privilege encounter over report (Cavell, 2002). The richness of the school biography as autobiographical account emerges when the student and co-operating teacher are capable of Autobiography.

I suggest Autobiography as the capability to bring the personal and the professional of the student teacher's experience in school into relation. The etymological origins of 'relation' can be traced to the Anglo-French *relacioun* meaning 'connection, correspondence' and also 'act of telling'. Similarly the Old French *relacion* or the Latin *relationem* both hold resonances of coming together, reporting, looking back and restoring (Etymology Dictionary [online], 2021a). To relate, as 'to tell', then connects, communicates and looks back restoratively. Deborah Britzman describes "hindsight [as] perhaps one of the interesting resources for teacher education" (Britzman, 2003, p. 14) as it brings our attention to what the past means to us. Returning to school is strange in both its mundanity and in its potential to bring forth "a vision of education that we wished we had already experienced" (Ibid.). All this is to say

that going to school as an educator is unavoidably an act of looking back, which informs the their practice whether they realise it or not. Thus the personal school biography inevitably influences the professional development of the student teacher, but "these biographical markers only become eventful when one tries to convey their worth to others" (Ibid.). A further, public act of relation is called for.

In her Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy, Hannah Arendt writes of the "factor of publicity" to describe the essential role community plays in the development of critical thinking (Arendt, 1992, p. 40). Critical thinking, in this sense, is that higher order engagement characteristic of Socratic dialogue. It is engagement capable of "[bringing] to light" the "hidden or latent implications" of our thoughts (Arendt, 1992, p. 41) and is impossible to learn "without the testing that arises from contact with other people's thinking" (Arendt, 1992, p. 42). In becoming capable of Autobiography the student teacher and their mentor work on opening up their thinking to bring in the thinking of others, and call on their capability of Imagination (p. 134) to make this possible (Arendt, 1992). In order for the capability of Autobiography to develop it requires a listener who comes to be a co-author. This other is becoming capable of Autobiography too. Their recognition of the potential for their own growth and their willingness to try – to be vulnerable and honest and allow another to be vulnerable and honest in their presence – roots such personal professional growth in relation. Simply put, the student teacher and their in-school mentor must be open to talking about the everyday world of the school together, without artifice or agenda.

Indeed, cycles of reminiscence and sense-making through personal narrative are central to founding and informing the mentorship relation itself. Time is formally allocated to the co-operating teacher so that they have space in their day to come together with the student teacher to discuss, plan and understand the in-school experience (The Teaching Council, 2013). The student teacher and their in-school mentor may look back no further than the previous class period, or as far as their own school days. In telling another "this is simply what I do" the speaker is telling a part of their story. The emergence of this voice is not assured. Rather, it is vulnerable to particular threats including professionalisation of dispositions and cultures of measurement. As such, the in-school mentor is called upon to consider their own

capability of Autobiography and to come into relation with the student teacher in an open and imaginative way.

These conversations can be mistaken for a casual or collegial interlude in the serious business of planning, teaching and assessment. Far from it. Relating experience is an essential element of learning to speak for oneself as it gives the opportunity to unravel the myriad influential voices (Cavell, 1994). In conversation it is possible to move from the "we" of avoiding ownership to the "we" of independence in community. The co-operating teacher in an orientation of appreciation both invites the student teacher into relation and benefits from their presence. On the other hand, the isolation of the Irish educator, their legendary autonomy (OECD, 1991), can lead to educators thinking about their teaching, by themselves, like "a man who has been living alone inside his head forever; and his head is a place of disorder wherein no companion is to be found" (Cavell, 1994, p. 124). In opening their classroom and sharing their thinking with such an observer as the student teacher, in that mindset of learning rather than seeking, the co-operating teacher opens up to their observations. Indeed, Cavell's man living alone inside his head, may through his actions and speech tell the observer more than he had told himself (Cavell, 1994). Vulnerability in this sense of mutuality exemplifies education.

Committing to Autobiography as a central capability of the educator proceeds from the question "'how can we find ourselves if we have never sought ourselves?'" (Cavell, 2010, p. 31). As a capability, Autobiography suggests that in the sincere expression of our self-seeking we can communicate a self to learn from in relation. Autobiography is a way of thinking about change in the educator's identity which brings forth and informs the voice. The oral tradition in mentorship is well established, of course, but its particular value is not. Sharing experience and hearing the experiences of others are beneficial, but it is difficult to say why. Considering narration as an encounter in philosophical thinking is to take a Cavellian view. For Cavell, finding one's voice is an exercise in autobiography (Cavell, 1994). The authentic voice emanates in relation, both to its past self and to the other person who listens (Ibid.). The speaker reaches back and relates the experience of their past self from the perspective of who they are now, and they do this in the presence of one listening.

To think about the relational value of recounting the story of one's own experience I turn briefly to the work of Vivienne Gornick, critic, memoirist, and creative writing professor. For Gornick, the value of memoir is not in the details but in the attitude of the memoirist towards their audience. Rather than seeking to convince that your interpretation of events is the real one, "truth in a memoir is achieved… when the reader comes to believe that the writer is working hard to engage with the experience at hand" (Gornick, 2001, p. 91). For meaning to come through in this way, "the power of a writing imagination is required" (Ibid.), and a reader's imagination too. Such writing calls for mutuality, for openness to the other as well as to the self. Gornick describes the autobiographical exercise as akin to one of Cavellian perfectionism; here, the writer poses the question "Who am I?" and responds "not with an answer but with depth of inquiry" (Gornick, 2001, p. 92). In Gornick's characteristically sensitive account, it is the movement towards wisdom, through engagement and experience, that counts in autobiographical exercises (Gornick, 2001, p. 14).

Autobiography is not literature or storytelling, it does not have what Iris Murdoch termed "an artful intention" (Murdoch, 1999, p. 44). An educational narrative "bears explanation", not in a definitive, comprehensive or ultimately authoritative way, but in a living sensible way, in the way "remarks and actions" make sense and can be explained sensibly (Cavell, 2002, p. 208). The point is education, not self-aggrandisement or confession. The ear is tuned.

Instinctively, a mentor looks back to help their mentee move forward. In this moment the mentor may choose to give an example from their practice or experience, an instance in their life as an educator or as a student which speaks to the present concern. Cavell considers this to be "the philosophical dimension of autobiography" in that "the human is representative, say, initiative, that each life is exemplary of all, a parable of each" (Cavell, 1994, p. 11). In this sense, we can see how becoming capable of Autobiography speaks directly to teacher education as a continuum. Continuing professional development is framed first as a right, designed to meet the educator's "identified needs", and then as a responsibility (The Teaching Council, 2011, p. 19). Through a number of initiatives, including the Droichead Integrated Professional Induction Framework (The Teaching Council, 2017a) and the Cosán Framework for Teachers' Learning (The Teaching Council, 2016b), the Teaching Council endeavour to establish this sense of continuity. They aim for a system of teacher education

where “initial teacher education, induction, early and continuing professional development and, indeed, late career support” would proceed “with each stage merging seamlessly into the next and interconnecting in a dynamic way with each of the others” (The Teaching Council, 2011, p. 8).

Becoming capable of Autobiography – of appreciating one’s always-unfolding story as an educator – calls for consideration of what is meant by ‘teacher education’ in terms of this continuum. Professional development, as described by the Teaching Council, generally centres on pedagogy or policy enactment (The Teaching Council, 2011). This is important work on one’s professional *doing* but does not substitute for the opportunity for meaningful consideration of one’s professional *being*. The progression as an educator is personal and professional in a way that autobiography is uniquely capable of addressing.

On considering his reasons for turning to autobiography, Cavell writes that it was “not exactly that I have become lost and need to find myself… but that I feel the need to recount what I have so far written, to add it up again” (Cavell, 1994, pp. 5–6). Simultaneously called upon to listen and to share, the activity of autobiographical engagement as recounting, in both senses of the term, has the potential to act as professional development for the experienced educator. There is an opportunity here to bring their experience into the world by relating it to the student teacher, and to “add it up again” with the “hindsight” of a lived educational life. In relating educational moments between the student and co-operating teachers, experience is restored, recounted, and shared. Mutuality is written into the mentorship relation; we relate *to* someone, and *for* ourselves.

Autobiography is a particular mode of attention. The individual is consciously placed in the world in relationship with others, and an effort is made to understand how they came to be in the world in this way. It calls for a sort of detective work, for the autobiographer to both tell their story and to be interested in it. Becoming capable of Autobiography and exercising this capability take time and patience. Drawing upon a memory without pause to consider its context then or our context now is reference, like drawing from a book by consulting the index without ever reading further. The attentiveness needed for autobiography can be thought of as “closeness, familiarity and looking *in* rather than looking *over*” (Pirrie, 2019, p.

91). In this sense, both the student teacher and the experienced educator resist the urge to look *over* or review, and instead draw their stories out into the educational space and look *in* to them patiently. Anne Pirrie terms this "process of movement through the world" "pedestrianism" to describe the educator's "thoughtful immersion in the world" (Pirrie, 2019, p. 25). Without this thoughtful, slow, and close retrospection, the educator's life in the world of the school lacks depth and the steady foundations of self-understanding on which to move forward. Pirrie writes of the Scottish philosopher Nan Shepard who "criss-crossed the same terrain for most of her life, creating a meshwork of entangled lines… her way of knowing was inimical to the very idea of progress as… a unilinear forward movement, from Point A to Point B" (Pirrie, 2019, p. 91). This is another way to think about the educator as a lifelong learner, in a cumulative sense rather than an additive one. Teachers can feel overwhelmed by the pressure to innovate and change, to always be gaining new skills and changing the ways they express themselves. Knowing that there is always more is not far from feeling always behind, which can make the educator's voice reactive. In taking Shepard's lead I consider instead a life of learning as taking the new and, in community, looking back and looking in. This shift brings professional development into the sphere of sense-making, strengthening the educator's voice.

The Teaching Council's assertion that the initial, inductive and in-career element of teacher education should be underpinned by "another set of "three 'I's", namely, innovation, integration and improvement" (The Teaching Council, 2011, p. 8) foregrounds looking back to look forward and Autobiography as a central capability of the educator. For example, looking back can be innovative. In his own autobiography, *Little Did I Know*, Cavell plays with time and usefully disrupts the 'start-to-finish' nature of the genre (Cavell, 2010). He foregrounds what happened, the "accidents avoided or embraced, strangers taken to heart or neglected, talents imposed or transfigured, malice insufficiently rebuked, love inadequately acknowledged" (Cavell, 2010, p. 4), linking memories by association, and so resists "leading fairly directly to death without clearly enough implying the singularity of this life" (Cavell, 2010, p. 4). If acknowledgement is a journey, then autobiography is what happened along the way. All this is to say that in Cavellian terms it is not enough that a student teacher's lesson was observed and then the experience of observation communicated by their mentor. Both parties must attend to their respective contexts and listen to each other.

To be capable of Autobiography as educational engagement is to resist the creeping imposition of rubrics and structures and insist on considered, meaningful response. A threat to autobiography is what Cavell terms “false seriousness” (Cavell, 1994, p. 125). When weighed down with consequence, our words do not travel well. An example of this arises when the student teacher and their mentor are required to engage via a prescribed rubric. Such a formal obligation to share in prespecified ways puts distance between the experienced educator and the student teacher, infringing on the openness and mutuality necessary for growth. Instead of sharing and listening in an open, educative sense their engagement is limited by formal expectations.

The inward turn in self-reference “presupposes the existence of a ‘real me’ or the possibility of finding the core of the self” (Saito, 2009, p. 255). It turns autobiography from an orientation of appreciation and openness to insights which emerge, towards a narrative that can be classified or imposed. We see this unfold when student teachers are required to reflect, for example (Brennan, 2019). In restricting autobiographical expression the educator is rendered voiceless; they can express themselves but not freely so losing the educator’s voice in any meaningful way. Likewise the mentor’s voice loses its educational tone. In *requiring* the attention of the listener their ear is turned away and the relation, as anything more than functional, is lost. Naoko Saito, an esteemed Cavellian scholar, describes these risks of using language “in such a way as to secure and identify the self” and using narrative to categorise and so assimilate difference (Saito, 2009, p. 255). Indeed, “living an ethical life requires the ability to leave behind what is certain, and clear, in order to examine the question: how shall I live?” (O’Reilly, 2019, p. 162) and it is only in acknowledging the partiality of the self that the voice emerges.

The educational self emerges through the shift from claims of authority to respectful humility. Saito takes Cavell’s reading “to extend beyond the procedure or method of problem-solving to the very process of the individual’s continual relating and re-relating of herself” to her lived and perceived reality, “and, thus, to the language community and to others with whom she shares the experience of… meaning-making” (Saito, 2009, pp. 256–257). What Saito is underlining here is our responsibility to *make ourselves understood*, to ourselves as well as to each other.

Thinking about the relevant educational context here, we might say that in learning to teach, the student teacher's educational self is transformed. Through sincere engagement with their co-operating teacher and the students they teach, school placement has the potential to be uniquely impactful. Deborah Britzman realised during her own experience as a student teacher that "learning to teach [did] something to the person I was becoming" (Britzman, 2003, p. 12) and recognised that "the immediacy of classroom life" was not conducive to her "efforts to be thoughtful" (Britzman, 2003, p. 6). The experience of educating while learning to educate is unsettling and calls for moments of pause and reflection on the developing educational self. The mentorship relation can introduce a very important and necessary space during school placement, and an appropriate context in which to think *through* experience.

In having conversations of this sort, the vulnerability of the mentor and the mentee is valued. In offering up their moments of unsurety or their mistakes, as well as recognising the momentary, fragile nature of success, the student teacher and their in-school mentor come together to look back, to research, in order to move forward. Respecting autobiography reframes failure and triumph as experience. The educational is at stake in the tone of relation and attitude of questioning the *event*. A criticism levelled at the autobiographical is that it can be construed as "talk therapy", as a sort of confessional or psychoanalytic exercise, or overly negative and traumatic for the author, turning the mentorship moment into one of blame and fault-finding. Cavell holds that placing the critical and the clinical in opposition is to try and minimise two forces of human nature; in his own words, "if… autobiographical experiments are philosophically pertinent they must confront the critical with the clinical, which means distrust both as they stand, I mean distrust their opposition" (Cavell, 1994, p. 8). Looking at our lives and growing under that gaze are not fully separable. If to be critical is to be awake, and to be clinical is to be focused, then one does not progress without the other.

Susan Florio-Ruane asks whether "difficult conversations in which teachers participate joyfully as co-creators of knowledge" are possible and responds by asserting the need to be up to the task (Florio-Ruane, 2001, p. 162). There is a danger that looking at the self might become a way to avoid looking outwards, a sort of project of the self. Pursued in this way autobiography is a sort of absorption or therapy rather than a capability. Rather, to be capable of Autobiography – or so I would argue – makes an openness to the *self* part of who we are

and what we do, rather than a consuming passion. It misses a central point – becoming capable of Autobiography opens up the complexity of the world and the challenge of living our lives in relation. It should not necessarily make life simpler, but rather clearer, more accessible and thus more interesting. It is to recognise the educative potential of telling one's story and of being heard, and of hearing the story of another, beyond understanding the stories themselves. These are the kind of experiences John Dewey calls "educative" as they look back and reach forward while being firmly rooted in the present (Dewey, 1938). The educator capable of Autobiography recognises that personal narrative enriches and complicates their educational self.

Cavell is not unaware of the difficulty in becoming capable of Autobiography. While emphasising the significance of the ordinary throughout his work, he admits to exhibiting a "sort of horror of stating the obvious" in his own writing (Cavell, 2010, p. 187). This balance between what we want to say and how we feel we should express ourselves is a living concern in education. In practice, meaning what we say makes little headway when we are perceived as not sounding professional. But in adopting the language and tone of professionalism there lies a "danger of evasion" (Cavell, 2002, p. xxxv) of the educator's voice. Here authenticity, sincerity, and honesty become clouded over by a self-consciousness. In becoming capable of Autobiography, the educator learns to own this friction, to embrace it, and to *own up* when formalised language interferes with living in the real world of the school.

A central idea of Susan Florio-Ruane's work on engaging with autobiography during initial teacher education is that conversation plays an important role in becoming capable of autobiography (Florio-Ruane, 2001). She thinks of conversation, for the purposes of education, as having a "friendly yet deliberate nature", a simple, gentle but focussed coming together to talk about ideas (Florio-Ruane, 2001, p. 59). It is a commitment to relating patiently, mirroring the shift in teacher education from "teaching by telling… to learning by talking" through professional conversations (Florio-Ruane, 2001, pp. 60–61). Her model of conversation takes time, valuing both reflection and assertion and coming to understand our educational selves and making sense of why we do what we do.

It is not necessarily easy and should not be smooth. Cavell writes that "it is inconvenient to question a convention", to "throw myself back upon my culture, and ask why we do what we do, judge as we judge, how we have arrived at these crossroads" when we realise that our ideas, our conclusions are not our own (Cavell, 1979, p. 125). In these moments when we come up against those conventions that pass by un-thought through in everyday life it is not easy to choose to stop and think, let alone to converse. There is a sense of exposure and vulnerability which accompanies public moments of growth. To say ""This is what I do" (what I say, what I sense, what I know), and honor that" (Ibid.) is a challenge to commit with open eyes and whole heart to education as necessarily risky, weak and open. It calls for a sincerity in the task of education which Cavell expresses beautifully in this passage from *The Claim of Reason*:

> … I have to bring my own language and life into imagination. What I require is a convening of my culture's criteria, in order to confront them with my words and life as I pursue them and as I may imagine them; and at the same time to confront my words and life as I pursue them with the life my culture's words may imagine for me: to confront the culture with itself, along the lines in which it meets in me.
>
> (Cavell, 1979, p. 125).

This confrontation is a choice, but a pivotal and defining one. It is the choice we make, Cavell writes, in philosophising and in education, and as such this type of engagement describes philosophy as the education of grown-ups. There are many ways to read such a statement, but I take it to mean that philosophy is a way *of committing*, of interacting and of working through life from within the self and from without. It is a way to think about society and sincerity which challenges. He later writes that "the anxiety in teaching, in serious communication, is that I myself require education. And for grownups this is not natural growth, but *change*" (Cavell, 1979, p. 125). An openness to just such change as this underpins the capability of Autobiography. To tell one's story is to bring "language and life into imagination" through professional conversation (Ibid.). Spending time thinking out loud with educators of varying levels of experience and from a diverse range of backgrounds affords both the student and their mentor an invaluable opportunity to confront education's "criteria", its norms and assumptions, with their lived reality. It is, for example, an ideal forum

to consider the Teaching Council's standards, which are echoed in the code of conduct, and so resonate through the life of the educator. How do prescribed ideas of professional values, professional skills and practice, and professional knowledge and understanding make sense in the life of the educator? The educator capable of Autobiography confronts these criteria of educational culture in the moments where thought and action are influenced – along the lines in which it meets in them.

There is potential in bringing people together in this way, and there is danger. Cavell's contribution is distinctly different from storytelling in its emphasis on the difficult and the transformational. For Cavell telling one's story *should* be challenging, drawing attention to what can be said and what cannot be known. Furthermore, engaging with another's voice should challenge the listener, without explicitly setting them a challenge. Cavell, writing about his own writing, puts it thus: "The writing had cost me something, in such a way, perhaps, that it has to, and should, cost the reader something" (Cavell, 2010, p. 442). The cost of engagement is ethical; to become capable of Autobiography demands effort, work on the part of the student teacher and the part of those they are in relation to.

Seeing that all experience as an educator is "emergent and relative" (Florio-Ruane, 2001, p. 15), that we are all part of a human system with human brilliance and human flaws is immensely powerful. It is also terrifying. The student teacher or their mentor are likely to shy away from the risky edge of their realities and seek out safe patches of commonality or the relatable. They need support and impetus to clear their throats, to take a breath and tell their story. This is perhaps the greatest challenge and the best reason to become capable of Autobiography – to begin to understand the complexity of our own story wakes us up to the complexity of the stories of others. Thus the capability of Interruption (p. 124), Imagination (p. 134), and Attention (p. 177) are called forth.

The autobiographical is never the full story. Human memories are flawed and contingent, and at their best only see one side of a given recollection. In becoming capable of Autobiography, the educator is called upon to appreciate this partiality and imperfection as a condition of community. The educator recognises that they do not have a comprehensive grasp of their educational encounters and understands that "the acknowledgment of the partiality of the

self is an essential condition for achieving the universal" (Saito, 2009, p. 254). These are stories which live in relation and refuse to be fixed.

In telling their story the student teacher comes to see that it is not theirs alone, to see the others who would be allied to or would contest this telling. As such, becoming capable of Autobiography sheds light on our life in relation, our sources and what we value. Felicity, rather than truth, describes the relation between a statement and reality. For Cavell, a felicitous utterance fits with reality, while an infelicitous one both fails to relate reality well and teaches us something in the failure; we do not judge a statement by its felicity but learn from it (Cavell, 1994). How our words fail us is as important, arguably more significant in our development as a subject in the world, than when we are straightforwardly understood. In falling over our words, what matters is how we pick ourselves back up and how we reflect that encounter in preparing to speak again.

Thus, the turn to autobiography can be thought of as redemptive. In other words, in the telling of our story we can renew our *selves* through taking responsibility for our lives in words that are deliberately chosen. In this process we redeem an interest in ourselves. Indeed, becoming capable of Autobiography involves not only becoming interested in our lives but becoming dedicated to them in an honest and public way. I have been arguing throughout this chapter that educators are increasingly required to express themselves in technicised or formalised ways (think again of the 'assessment rubric' which the co-operating teacher must marshal in reference to their student teacher). Such forces of professionalisation, as I see them, render potentially expressive language *inexpressive* , somehow distanced from the ordinary; in Mahon's terms "our personal words… become forgotten (repressed or somehow *lost*)" (Mahon, 2014, p. 11). On the contrary, the educator capable of Autobiography can go back and find those words close to their heart and their practice. They can recover an ordinary language of education which makes sense for them.

The story of an educator is composed in the everydayness of school life. It tells the evolution of the student teacher as they walk through crowds of school students, engage with non-teaching colleagues, or chat with experienced educators in the queue at the photocopier. The Guiding Principles of initial, early career and continuous professional development stipulate

that teacher education “be based on a broad understanding of the practice of teaching as one involving complex relationships and requiring different types of professional knowledge, attitudes and dispositions” (The Teaching Council, 2011, p. 10). Simple moments help the student teacher develop the capability of Autobiography and make their own way in the story of school. Such moments are often initially mediated by their in-school mentor co-operating with the student teacher by introducing them to colleagues, inviting them to eat or to join a conversation, be it casual or professional. I would suggest that these casual or accidental moments are just as important as the time formally allocated for professional conversation. In those moments of engagement around a challenge or conundrum of the classroom, there is a looking back to view the moment, as “initial teacher education should develop knowledge-of practice, knowledge-for practice and also student teachers’ capacity and skill for reflecting critically on their own practice and that of others, referred to in the literature as knowledge-in practice” (The Teaching Council, 2011, p. 11). Mentorship – slow, thoughtful mentorship – is an encounter wherein this mindset could conceivably emerge, brought forth by the reflective nature of the relation. It is precisely this mode of investment that allows the co-operating teacher to bring the student teacher to their voice in the school.

Chapter 4 Risk

Introduction

This section philosophically considers 'Risk' and the educator's emergence as a subject in the world. The purpose of this section is to address Risk as a fundamental, normative concern of the in-school experience during initial teacher education. Specifically, I suggest that the proposed shift to clinical teacher training models of in-school experience during initial teacher education poses a threat to the student teacher's experience of Risk and their opportunity to become capable of educational Risk. My argument is that the sanitisation of experience, the absence of professional in-school teacher educators, and the intervention of the university in school put the emergence of educators as individuals who understand their significance and the significance of others at stake.

In Ireland, typically the in-school experience of student teachers is responsive to the world of the school. The student teacher sources their own school placement and takes their place in school life as determined by the particular opportunities to practise and to contribute that are present there. The accrediting programme of initial teacher education plays a limited role during the in-school experience. They support the student teacher, approving the choice of school, proposed timetable, and duration of placement. HEI-based tutors liaise with the school and the student teacher to arrange supervisions in order to guide and assess the student. Apart from these logistical and qualifying roles, the university steps out and allows the student teacher to be immersed in the life of the school.

The natural variety of experience which arises through this model, particularly as students now undertake at least two placements in different schools, has been raised as problematic (Sahlberg, 2018). The International Review Panel on ITE in in the Irish context has noted that a uniform experience for all students is desirable and yet cannot be assured (Ibid.). This section takes as its starting point a concerning proposal to address this diversity of experience by shifting the current model to a clinical school model (Sahlberg, 2012, 2018). On this view, the university would lead and operate the in-school element of initial teacher education in a manner "similar to how bedside training occurs in modern medical schools" (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 27). A key element to the success of these programmes in other countries is the presence of professional teacher educators in schools who are both present in the classroom and

research-active. Their absence leaves the student teacher grasping for the attention of harried professionals in an ER, rather than the slow, rich case-conference model envisaged. One piece of the clinical model which has been adopted is the suggestion that, in shifting from a one-year diploma to a two-year Masters level qualification, student teachers would experience teaching in more than one school, and that they would no longer spend the entire academic year in school (Sahlberg, 2012). Subsequent review by the panel suggested that the time student teachers spend in school be reduced further or even eliminated (Sahlberg, 2018). While the primacy of the in-school experience during initial teacher education persists, and successful completion is a requirement for qualification (The Teaching Council, 2017b), there is clearly change.

It is essential to consider philosophically the potential ramifications of such changes for the development of student teachers as educators. Of particular concern to me is the potential for constriction of the in-school experience by the university or the adoption of a functional view of the school by student teachers. Either would diminish the school as a space for student teachers to experience the educational world and to develop as subjects of action and responsibility. To explore the potential impact of the clinical on the educator's emergence I turn to the philosophy of Gert Biesta, a contemporary philosopher of education who has written extensively on education as an 'event' which proceeds in relationship with others and in the world. The term 'event' has a rich philosophical lineage but in essence it denotes a happening or specific occurrence that is unpredicted and unpredictable. For Biesta, true education is always an 'event' as its essence cannot be foreseen or assured. As an event education is always at risk – Biesta would say that all genuine human encounters are fundamentally risky – differentiating education from training or reproduction. Education as an interpersonal engagement may or may not happen and depends on the openness of both people and systems to the unpredictable and the real. Through Biesta's philosophy I look to the student teacher as a beginner, stepping into the diverse and vibrant world of the school as an educator for the first time. This is a key experience in their education for subjectification and for the emergence of capabilities which will support their freedom into the future.

As Biesta argues, the event of education proceeds under conditions of weakness and openness, respectful of difficulty and frustration. Education is appreciative of those

encounters which slow and even stall forward momentum, privileging making meaningful sense over making measurable progress. The value placed on the weak, slow, messy and human of in-school experience "depends crucially on the extent to which we believe that education is not just about the reproduction… of what already exists, but is genuinely interested in the ways in which new beginnings and new beginners can come into the world" (Biesta, 2013, p. 4). Any student teacher will tell you how important it is to plan, but what is crucial in Biesta's educational philosophy is a counter-balancing element of *surprise*.

This section opens with a consideration of "Clinical" and "Risk" in initial teacher education. Neither is a term generally associated with education, the former having restrictive medical undertones and the latter implying an unhealthy disregard for infrastructure and responsibilities. I begin by considering what exactly is proposed by introducing the clinical into the in-school experience of student teachers in Ireland, tracing the appearance and evolution of the term. I draw on Biesta's philosophy in order to privilege humility over authority in initial teacher education. Turning to the philosophy of Gert Biesta reveals an appreciation for the risky, the weak, open and unpredictable of educational reality. In Biestian terms, Risk is necessary to if not definitive of education, and lies in the *human* nature of educational systems.

Biesta approaches education as comprising three central and interrelated domains; these are "*qualification*, *socialisation*, and *subjectification*" (Biesta, 2013, p. ix, authors' emphasis). Originally conceived as functions, this framework has evolved to facilitate detailed, open engagement with questions of good education (Biesta, 2010b). They capture the tripartite phenomenon of an educational moment rather than three independent spheres of concern (Ibid.). The domain of qualification is concerned with the acquisition of knowledge and skills, as well as values and dispositions towards education (Biesta, 2013). Socialisation considers the ways in which, through education, we become part of existing traditions, and adopt "ways of doing and being" (Biesta, 2013, p. 4). Subjectification is a process of personal evolution which proceeds in relation through thought and dialogue. It is interested in creating spaces for the individual to emerge as a subject of action, imbued with the responsibility associated with that action. In this chapter I am particularly concerned with the domain of

subjectification. The following sections consider the subject of the educator in terms of their freedom and relation in the world of the school.

The aim of subjectification is to encourage in each person the desire to be a subject in their own right, to choose to 'come into the world' as significant. Biesta coined the term subject-ness to describe why it is that a person matters, to describe their uniqueness in terms of irreplaceability. The educational domain of subjectification includes processes of deconstruction, coming to understand what we are and what we are not, as well as of difference, a recognition that we exist in a political sense which raises questions of value and power (Biesta, 2013). Valuing Risk and foregrounding subjectification of the student teacher makes the educational task one of making the existence of an individual as subject in the world possible, desirable, and necessary. Education becomes an engagement with the other, an attempt to arouse in them the desire to want to exist as a subject in dialogue with the world.

Biesta's educational domains are also useful in analysing practical proposals, in considering whether suggested approaches are thoroughly educational and, if not, where the gaps or problems arise. My position here is that clinical schools – "clinically supervised", "university-operated" teacher training schools – describe a sanitised experience. They are the epitome of the "strong", where desirable outcomes are predictable and measurable, and the experience risk-free. On the other hand, "weakness, crucially, creates the conditions for young people to test and to explore their multiple versions of self—to identify what precisely is at stake in their exercise of freedom and responsibility" (Mahon & O'Brien, 2018, p. 182). Biesta's philosophy insists that our significance emerges, persists and flourishes in relation and in response. A central question arises here: How can we think about the in-school experience of student teachers in terms of those capabilities which promote subjectivity?

In this chapter, this central question is approached through two themes in Gert Biesta's philosophy – Imagination and Interruption. These are essentially risky, open, and unpredictable capabilities which contribute in a meaningful way to the educator's life as a subject in the world. The first capability I explore is Interruption in three senses: to be interrupted, to interrupt another, and to interrupt oneself. To be capable of Interruption is to

value pause, engagement, and resistance. It is to be open to the unpredictable from outside and from within oneself. Interruption is risky, unpredictable, and weak, making it a thoroughly educational engagement.

Finally, I turn to Imagination as a capability of the educator. The in-school experience during initial teacher education is the first opportunity for the student teacher to be in school as an educator in a supported sense. It is their first opportunity to experience the plurality and difference of school life as an educator, and as such calls upon them to imagine and reimagine the educator and the student as subjects in the world. Through the supported nature of the in-school experience the student teacher is afforded the opportunity to "exist in dialogue with the world" (Biesta, 2018, p. 15) to move beyond assertion of the self or the curriculum and instead listen and respond. In doing so the educator capable of Imagination comes to the world of the school anew, often. This is a slow, difficult, and frustrating way to learn. It is an essentially *weak* way in Biesta's conception of the term, and it calls for openness and pause. I suggest that the in-school experience is a key locus for development of the habits which allow a student teacher to become capable of Imagination and Interruption. As such, the in-school experience might allow for supported uncertainty and creativity, for listening and response to one's own subject-ness as it emerges in the world of the school.

The Clinical Model and Teacher Education

What might a clinical approach to teacher education mean in Irish initial teacher education?

In this chapter I will look specifically at the idea of taking a clinical approach to teacher education, first mentioned in the Irish context in the two Sahlberg reports I introduced in Chapter 1 (p. 9) (Sahlberg, 2012, 2018). There was no mention of the clinical and teacher education prior to the Panel's recommendations communicated through these documents, nor has this particular aspect been taken up explicitly since then, at least not in the same way that the co-operative or research-related recommendations were. That is not to say that it has not had an effect, nor that it may be adopted in future. As such, I believe that the recommendation for a clinical approach/model demands careful consideration in Irish initial teacher education.

There is extensive multidisciplinary literature on the clinical in educational terms, particularly regarding the tensions and challenges in approaching the education of educators in a clinical way. Lessons learned in educating medical students towards becoming a clinician have been selectively and variously adopted towards developing clinical education models in teacher education worldwide (For example, see APT NOKUT, 2020; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; US-NCATE, 2010). How can a clearer idea of what the Panel envisaged for Ireland be achieved? Looking to the panel themselves sheds some light. Finland is cited in both reports as a model of advanced and innovative teacher education, and the Chair of the International Panel, Professor Pasi Sahlberg, is at the forefront of initial teacher education policy in Finland. The Teaching Council commissioned extensive research into school placement in Ireland in 2014. It includes a comprehensive review of the in-school experience of student teachers in a selection of countries considered "familiar to those in the teacher education sector in Ireland for various educational, cultural, historical and linguistic reasons. These are: Scotland, New Zealand, Singapore, Finland, and Western Australia" (Hall et al., 2018, p. 53). In the 2018 report on this research and elsewhere (For example O'Doherty & Harford, 2017), the Finnish model is cited as having been "especially influential in shaping some of the reforms that occurred in Ireland" (Hall et al., 2018, p. 18). As such, the Finnish model can shed light on what the clinical might mean in teacher education in Ireland.

There are three key features to the clinical teacher training model in Finland. The first is involvement of the university during the in-school experience. Student teachers go on placement to Teacher Training Schools where their experience is organised and overseen directly by the university (Sahlberg, 2010). In Finland the university has a high degree of control over the in-school experience of student teachers as "the general view in Finland is that teacher education is best delivered through universities organizing and controlling teaching practice through on-site or proximal [Teacher Training Schools]" (Raiker, 2011, p. 6 quoted in Hall et al., 2018, p. 56). Student teachers do some clinical training in the university itself, practicing skills in seminar settings, but the majority of their in-school experience occurs in "special Teacher Training Schools governed by the universities, which have similar curricula and practices as normal public schools" but a different staff profile and educational remit to "normal public schools" (Sahlberg, 2010, p. 5). In brief, "schools where practice teaching occurs have higher professional staff requirements, and supervising teachers have to prove that they are competent to work with student teachers" (Ibid.). Supervising teachers are also research-active and linked directly to the university. As such, student teachers are mentored and assessed by the same person. Furthermore, "Teacher Training Schools are also expected to pursue research and development roles in collaboration with the Department of Teacher Education and, sometimes, with the academic faculties who also have teacher education functions" (Ibid.) which sets them apart in their orientation to education.

Where student teachers in Ireland can expect to spend at least 40% of their time in classrooms either team-teaching or as the primary educator, in Finland this is lower at one third (Sahlberg, 2010). This is the second key feature of the clinical teacher training model in Finland. The amount of time spent in school is less and the emphasis on in-school experience as a particularly valuable part of initial teacher education is not as pronounced as it is in Ireland. The time of the student teacher is also fragmented, taking place in blocks of time in a Teacher Training School as determined by the university's requirements (Ibid.). As such, the Finnish experience in-school is the epitome of 'placement'.

The third and final key feature of the clinical teacher training model in Finland, which I alluded to previously, is the nature of professional relationships and supervision. It is arguable that

the strength of such systems as the Finnish one lies in their consideration of the in-school co-operating or mentor teacher. The teaching staff in Finnish Teacher Training Schools tasked with mentoring and supervising student teachers are highly trained as educators and as teacher educators. The university recognises the centrality of co-operating teachers and takes responsibility for the educational encounters they mediate. Furthermore, in Finland the levels of initial and continuing teacher education are highly integrated. State-funded annual in-service training "primarily in areas important for implementing education policy and reforms" (Council for Creative Education Finland [Online], 2021) is undertaken by all Finnish educators. It is this cohesiveness to which the literature turns when accounting for the success of clinical teacher training in Finland (Burn & Mutton, 2015).

What does this model mean in the Irish context? Is clinical teacher training in the Finnish mode possible, necessary, or desirable? The first consideration is the intervention of the university during the in-school experience. It is argued that entering into clinical practice is to be *in* the field, rather than a specialist *of* it (Warner et al., 1977). This differentiates, for example, a practising physician from the medical researchers they refer to in order to inform their treatment recommendations. Teacher Training Schools both have access to the resources and support of university education departments, and are limited by their systematic, functional approach to education. Sahlberg concedes that graduates of this system may not necessarily have acquired experience of participating in a "community of educators, taking full responsibility for a classroom or students, or interacting with parents" (Burn & Mutton, 2015, p. 224).

In-school mentoring of student teachers by professionals who inhabit the classroom and teacher education spheres simultaneously sounds ideal in theory. It also sounds expensive, in terms of time and planning, financial investment and structural requirements. After the first Sahlberg report, a version of the co-operating teacher model was launched in Ireland (The Teaching Council, 2013). This was a slimmed down interpretation of the Finnish idea, which shifted the relationship between the in-school mentor teacher and the student teacher with little or no investment in the mentor teacher and no formal link to the university. Even in this minimal form it was deemed on review to be under-resourced (Hall et al., 2018) and has recently been side-lined in favour of a return to the in-school mentor as "guide" (The Teaching

Council, 2020, p. 6). As discussed in Chapter 3, there is a considerable richness to the co-operating teacher model, undermined by a piecemeal approach and undervaluing of the in-school mentor.

The second feature of the Finnish clinical teacher training model is the 'placement' approach to in-school experience. When it was decided in 2013 to expand the postgraduate qualification of second-level educators in Ireland from a one-year Diploma to a two-year Masters programme this placement model was adopted. Student teachers are placed in two schools over two years for a minimum of twenty-four weeks, where they engage in one hundred hours of in-class teaching (The Teaching Council, 2020). The placement in Year 2 must be at least ten weeks long (Ibid.). Apart from these minima the experience varies between institutions and between students on the same programme. For example, a student might not be able to secure a single placement which fulfils the requirements for Year 1. In that case they can complete their placement across multiple schools as long as at some point they spend 3 consecutive weeks in one school. Another student may secure the required minimum of two schools but those schools may not be particularly different from each other, even though the intention is that students have a more diverse experience through this approach. Should the university take a more active role in organising school placements? Perhaps. Does that mean the university should be more involved in the organisation of the in-school experience? Rather than asking where the line is drawn I suggest we ask why. I suggest, in other words, that we focus on the experience of the student teacher prior to logistical concerns.

Before moving any further into or away from the clinical teacher training model of in-school experience, those interested and engaged in initial teacher education in Ireland need to pause and consider what all this means for the student teacher as an educator. As Biesta writes, a focus on what education should *do* rather than what education *is* or should *be*, provides "a rather narrow educational 'diet' – perhaps effective in terms of what can be measured but not very nourishing" (Biesta, 2018, p. 11). Certainly, the strength of the clinical teacher training system lies in the domains of qualification and socialisation (Biesta, 2013). These are invaluable attributes, difficult to find fault in, and yet there is an underlying sense of both constriction and fragmentation. A functional experience such as this "is unable to do justice

to the complexity of human togetherness" (Osberg & Biesta, 2021, p. 58). What remains in question is the impact this model has on the third and arguably most crucial of Biesta's educational domains: that of subjectification, or the student teacher's coming into their own as a person of individuality, agency, and confidence.

The control of the in-school experience by the university places the student teacher in school towards a single end, namely completion of a programme of study in an environment designed for their needs. I would argue however, that this singularity of orientation is problematic in educational terms, as it removes an important open-endedness; as Biesta writes, "what is special and most likely unique about education is that it is not oriented toward *one* purpose" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 92). Removing the messiness and unpredictability of everyday school life restricts the education of the educator towards their own subjectivity and so undermines the educational nature of the programme. It raises questions of how we understand education during the in-school experience of student teachers. Is it towards "an external, priori or 'ready-made' socio-political (normative) purpose" or can we think about education in terms of itself, as "an emergent entity that does not simply serve a purpose, but also brings with it the purpose it serves" (Osberg & Biesta, 2021, p. 58)? Can the in-school experience of student teachers embrace fully its educative potential through formally valuing the risky, weak and open nature of lived experience? How can it learn to both be prepared and also wait and see? While there are merits, such as greater value of the mentor and diversity of experience, the former comes at a cost and the latter cannot be assured. Again, my argument would be that the clinical school model is overly constrictive for the beginning teacher. As Biesta would say, it does not allow sufficiently for the "beautiful risks of education" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 101).

Risk

Certain. Safe. Planned. Secure. True. Sure. Reading the antonyms of Risk it is easy to see why they appeal in educational terms. Students, teachers, parents, and stakeholders put their trust in the idea of education. While students evolve and emerge over time in unpredictable ways, their education, the systems and the people involved, are expected to be both ready and responsible. A consideration of Risk in education is uncomfortable, therefore. Though it can hardly be denied that education is a risky endeavour.

Fundamentally it is never clear how a course of study will progress, which elements will be meaningful or rich and what the end point will reveal. The response to such normal uncertainties as these has been to regularise education, to predefine progression and outcomes in such a way that the experience itself is coloured by expectations and aims before it ever begins. In second level classrooms, for example, it is now standard practice for the teacher to share the learning outcomes and success criteria before class begins. A similar tone of structuration is creeping into the in-school experience of student teachers. While some planning and an idea of what to expect are helpful, experiencing uncertainty in the supported context of their initial teacher education is, I hold, essential. Risk emerges as a central normative concern of initial teacher education and as an educational capability in two senses – a capability of the educational context and of the educator themselves.

Firstly, the nature of the educational context is risky. In order for education, rather than training or reproduction, to proceed the educational context must be held open to possibility. This is a risky space where value is placed on weakness as an "acknowledgment that education is not a mechanism and should not be turned into one" (Biesta, 2013, p. 4). A space such as this is educational, in that it reaches beyond the domains of qualification and socialisation to subjectification and the opportunities for the individual to emerge as subject. Risk then is a condition for the development of the educator. Then there is Risk as a capability of the educator. To be risky is not intuitively a capability to be promoted in the educator, as it might communicate a level of freedom suggestive of an unhealthy disregard for the student. Considering the student as a subject in their own right, rather than an object of what the system wants from them, calls on the educator to be open to the student's articulation of

their own subjectivity. The capability of the educator to live and endeavour through such Risk puts the subjectivity of the student at stake. Likewise, the emergence of the student teacher as subject depends on the capability of the educators and the systems of education they encounter to recognise the value of Risk and hold that space open for them. To discuss Risk in the educational context and as a capability of the educator I turn to the philosophy of Gert Biesta. Through his unique appreciation of these "beautiful risks" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 101), I address what educational risks are and what they are for, beginning with a clarification of un-educational risk.

Not all risks in educational settings are educational risks. There are risks which arise internally and pressures imposed from without which pose a risk to education and are to be avoided or mitigated. For example, the risks posed when students, teachers or the system as a whole is not invested or engaged attacks education from within. These are the risks introduced through, for example, teachers being assigned subjects they are not qualified to teach, or students who have become disengaged or demotivated and now struggle to apply themselves. The presence of such risks undermine education and restrict its potential.

The manner in which questions of improving investment and engagement in education are addressed, and where the response to these challenges come from matters. It is tempting to swing the pendulum of control in the opposite direction and insist upon predefinition, to reach for the measurable and the strong in an effort to eliminate risk from education. In doing so, Biesta insists, the educational itself is eliminated as our desire to see our students learn and progress leads to the imposition of functional models which attempt to turn a human relation into a technology (Biesta, 2013).

Biesta insists again and again that education, as distinct from training or reproduction, is an *event*. Recognising education as an event respects its inherent weakness. Even given the best intentions of the educator and the students, their engagement may stay at the functional level of information transfer and never be acknowledged as an interruption, an educational intervention or relation. Richard Rorty describes it as the difference between the methodological and the inspiring, the distinction "between knowing what you want to get out of a person or thing or text in advance" as opposed to "hoping that the person or thing or text

will help you want something different – that he or she or it will help you to change your purposes and thus to change your life" (Rorty, 1999, p. 145). Rorty was writing about reading, but in place of the reader we might imagine the student teacher. Such a perspective, going to school as an educator for the first time open to the world of the school helping to change your purposes from student to teacher "and thus to change your life", is immensely powerful. It may or may not happen, and as such the in-school experience as educational event proceeds through risk and is always at risk. The educational task is to encourage students towards such a worldly perspective and not get in their way.

In Biesta's philosophy there are three spheres of educational risk. The first of these "beautiful risks", (Biesta, 2020b, pp. 102–103) emanates from the intentions of educators and is the risk that those intentions will not be fulfilled in the manner the educator communicates, or at all. When there are students in the room, the educational intention to give "knowledge, skills and understanding, but also values, attitudes, ways of doing and ways of being" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 102) are the educator's responsibility and their challenge. Value is placed on the students both getting it and getting it right. This value is passed on to the students as indicative of their success and stays with the educator as a reflection of their capability. A seemingly banal enquiry from their mentor as to how the class are doing instinctively sends the student teacher reaching for grades and homework records. The student teacher aims to describe the students through the shorthand of their attainment and compliance, and thus support themselves as a capable educator. Intentions are simultaneously the backbone of the educational encounter and the source of educational risk as the degree to which students and educators succeed is never assured. Biesta highlights the existential and the practical elements of keeping the educational encounter open in this way. It is a challenge to embrace the risk necessary for students to emerge as subjects, to "get it and get it right" in their own way, and to hold this space open in practice. A mentor teacher who values openness over surety, might instead say "Tell me about the class – is it enjoyable?", foregrounding relation in the classroom and dialogue in teacher education.

Further to the risk of intentions not being fulfilled is the outright rejection of those intentions. Student teachers can be faced with rejection of their methods. They can be faced with suspicious or downright rebellious students who do not acknowledge this new person as their

teacher. The student teacher is challenged to put the student as subject first, respecting their apprehension and privileging response over assertion. The acquisition of knowledge and skills cannot happen without the subject present and open to becoming skilful and knowledgeable. Social orders do not persist or change without the subject's choice to be a part of them, or apart from them. Subjectification insists upon processes of education proceeding in thought and dialogue in the world of the school. This open, risky environment of thought and dialogue is a condition of progress towards the educator's intentions and puts those intentions at stake.

Risk in initial teacher education is a deeply challenging concept. It calls on student teachers to accept their life with others as an existence in dialogue with the world (Naughton & Cole, 2018). Living as a subject in the world raises questions of freedom and relation. Educators are called to become capable of appreciating, really valuing, that "individuals emerge in and through educational processes in unique and unpredictable ways" (Biesta, 2010a, p. 6), that education towards subjectivity is education towards freedom. The risks *to* education as a relationship, similar to Cavell's risks to acknowledgement, lie in not recognising that the educational event requires "response before assertion and anxiety before triumph" (Mahon, 2016, p. 49). It is a practical and existential challenge to our student teacher, calling on them to see narratives of control as fundamentally uneducational and strive to become capable of Risk.

There is a temptation for the student teacher to rely on their status in the classroom to establish their significance. Documents outlining teacher education define a teacher as an individual registered with the Teaching Council (For example, see The Teaching Council, 2013, p. 6), giving the impression that this is all one needs to hold the place of educator in the school. One can hold a qualification and have joined the social order of the school, but it is the school student through their acknowledgment of the educational nature of the relation who authorises the teacher. There is always the risk that this acknowledgment will never come or will come too late. The acknowledgement of the student shifts their relation to the teacher from one of power or imposition into an educational space. Simply put, as a child names their parent, the student names the teacher. Authority in this sense is a risk, one where we give another person (the student) the power to name us (as teacher) (Biesta, 2017).

Being a subject of action in the world is not an achievement, not something one can claim to have or to be. Rather it is a commitment. Education as subjectification encourages students to desire an unresolved existence in the world, where they stay in touch with the resistance within and without, committing to acknowledging this friction, and developing an instinctive curiosity towards these frustrations. The education of student teachers in school is both the experience of dialogue with the world and the exploration of their desires in the world. Learning and trying to live as a subject in the world "is characterized by the desire to give one's desires a "reality check," so to speak, so as to come into a relationship with what and who is other, not simply overrule it." (Biesta, 2020b, p. 97). The in-school experience during initial teacher education is a key moment in the encouragement of this desire.

In-school experience holds a unique educative potential for the subjectification of the educator, for their development as a person of presence and significance in the world of the school if the essential educative Risk is understood, respected and valued.

Relation and the Subject

> Plurality is the condition of human action.
>
> (Arendt, 1958, p. 8).

What does relation mean to the educator emerging as a subject in the world? The emergence of an individual as a subject *in* the world, rather than an object *of* the world, is a process of personal evolution which does not and cannot take place in isolation. By definition, subjectification calls for community of thought and for dialogue (Biesta, 2018). In being or becoming a subject capable of action the individual is imbued with the responsibility associated with that action. For Gert Biesta, the question of subjectivity or the emergence of the individual as a subject in the world, is an educational one. It gets to the heart of problematic models of education for autonomy or rationality, and it resists political models for education. Turning away from judging, measuring or categorising individuals, from asking who the student is or will be, Biesta instead takes the educational question to be: How does the subject exist in the world?

The short answer is that the subject exists *in relation*, which serves to locate the significance of each individual in the world; subjectivity is not something they possess or can claim to possess but is always dependent on their interaction with others. Subjectivity proceeds through the event or events whereby the individual comes into the world as a subject. This "coming-into-the-world" recognises the dual educational concern of subjectivity, the concern for *each* and for *every* student. As such, the subject can only emerge in the presence of a plurality of others towards awareness of themselves as a person of significance in the world.

To express how being a subject in relation matters to the subject themselves Biesta has coined the concept "uniqueness-as-irreplaceability" (Biesta, 2010b, p. 85) He suggests that uniqueness as an educational concern sets the individual apart through their responsibility to the world, a call to which only they can respond, should they choose to. Instead of setting the subject apart as different, their uniqueness as irreplaceable in relation to others is indicative of their significance. In this section I will consider the implications of coming-into-the-world and uniqueness-as-irreplaceability for initial teacher education. Specifically, I will consider

how a foregrounding of this concept can help us develop a rich and nuanced understanding of why a fully immersive in-school experience is important to the education of educators.

Beginning with Jean Luc Nancy's concept of 'coming into presence', Biesta presents his philosophy of subjectivity as *an existence* (Biesta, 2013). In other words, coming into presence as a subject "referred to an *event* rather than an essence or identity" (Biesta, 2013, p. 142); as such, this coming into presence is always at risk. An individual may or may not come into presence. The limiting factors may be outside of their control or through their own choice. To explain the importance of the environment in which the subject is situated, Biesta draws on Hannah Arendt's assertion that "plurality is the condition of human action" (Arendt, 1958, p. 8) and that responsibility for this plurality constitutes "the condition of human action and human freedom" (Biesta, 2010b, p. 90).

Focusing on existence foregrounds subjectivity rather than identity. In other words, it foregrounds the life of the teacher as a person of significance in the world while acknowledging "the alterity and integrity of who or what is other" (Biesta, 2017, p. 8). To exist as a subject in the world is to understand and respect the world as neither at your disposal nor of your making. It is to resist narratives of control, and recognise risk as the condition of subjectivity as well as the capability to which the subject strives. A prepared, limited version of in-school experience is not conducive to the emergent subject-ness of the student teacher. For the student teacher to acknowledge the world they need to *be in the world*, the real, whole world of the school. Biesta questions whether an existence withdrawn from the world is to exist at all as "we end up existing only with and for ourselves" losing relation to that which would call the subject forth in their significance (Ibid.). Likewise, an existence in an impoverished world is not really to exist as "to exist as a subject actually means to be in an ongoing state of dialogue with what and who is other" (Biesta, 2017, p. 3). It is impossible to become a subject of action in the world without having encountered the world, lived in it, failed, succeeded and most of all risked in it.

Action for Arendt comprises both our beginnings and how they are taken up by other people (Biesta, 2020b). Action depends on and proceeds through plurality. As such, the environment of the subject matters, as subjectivity is only possible "in a world populated by other human

beings who are not like us" (Biesta, 2006, p. 32). This perspective recognises the subject as continually coming into presence in dialogue with that which is other. Coming into presence conceived in this way is always at risk and relies upon a life lived in radical open-endedness (Osberg & Biesta, 2021). The risk that makes subjectivity possible also exposes those new beginnings to the world and to the response of others. This "deconstructive nature of 'coming into presence'" (Winter & Biesta, 2011, p. 538) means that the conditions of Risk which allow the possibility of the emergence of the subject into the world also put those beginnings at risk. Because of this duality, Biesta shifted from "coming into presence" to "coming into the world" in order to highlight that the subject can only come into presence in the world of plurality and difference (Biesta, 2013, p. 143). This is a world-centred approach, orienting itself in appreciation of the whole world of education or the school. It values the open, risky "thoroughly worldly space" (Biesta, 2018, p. 16), and resists placing the focus of education on one aspect of that world such as the student, the curriculum or the requirements of an initial teacher education programme.

If we apply this thinking to educational programmes such as initial teacher education, we might consider that such programmes have a dual responsibility to their students: to open avenues into the world and to preserve "a particular "worldly" quality of the spaces and places in which newcomers can come into presence" (Biesta, 2010b, p. 90). The subject is not capable of action in isolation as it is only in the world that others can take up our beginnings. Again, the condition for the emergence of the subject as capable of action is made possible by openness, while being dependent upon the capability of the subject to live and endeavour through Risk.

Through Hannah Arendt's philosophy Biesta comes to an existential concept of uniqueness in relation, a uniqueness that is lived and that comes alive through an existence in the presence of others (Biesta, 2010b). If this uniqueness were possessed it would serve to differentiate, to be something about me that makes me unique *from* you. Uniqueness thought of as difference distances, and changes encounters with plurality from the educative towards the diagnostic. Uniqueness lived, however, serves to try and bring individuals into an orientation of appreciation.

It is risky; a subject can deny their own irreplaceability and refuse to come into the world as a uniquely responsible person. An individual may not be open to seeing the uniqueness of others in relation to themselves, and it may not be clear why their uniqueness depends on plurality and difference. Likewise, the world the subject comes to presence in may not acknowledge their irreplaceability. Brief fragmented in-school experiences put the subjectivity of the student teacher at stake in this way. There is neither the time nor their imperative to form meaningful relationships and commit to dialogue, so the significance of the educator doesn't have the chance to emerge. Time is a necessary condition for uniqueness when conceived as irreplaceability, as this uniqueness exists in the world and so is always under threat from strong, functional systems. Time allows for openness and risk. This risk is essential, allowing the freedom to see each other fully and in relation, and affording the space needed for subjects to make their appearance. It is only in this risky space that the individual may come to understand and develop as significant in their uniqueness in the world.

For Biesta, Arendt's treatment of uniqueness has two limitations: its emphasis on uniqueness in plurality and the third-person perspective it assumes (Biesta, 2017). Arendt considers the existence of subjects and attributes this significance from the outside. Biesta calls on Levinas in shifting the question of uniqueness from characteristics, possession and difference to relation and mattering uniquely in the world (Ibid.). He asks "when does it matter that I am I?" and answers that it is when I am significant in my irreplaceability (Biesta, 2017, p. 11). For Levinas, responsibility is "the first reality of the self", emerging through encounters where the individual holds a responsibility particular to them (Biesta, 2017, p. 12).

Consider the student teacher stepping into the classroom as educator for the first time. Coming to a sense of self in this new role, and an appreciation of their significance, relies on community. Their educational self will emerge in relation, through weak, slow, frustrating processes of dialogue. It cannot be prescribed or attributed by an outside source. Taking a first-person perspective on the uniqueness of the subject, Levinas approaches subject-ness, why the subject matters, "as something I have to "figure out", that no one else can figure out for me, and that I cannot figure out for anyone else" (Biesta, 2017, p. 11). In this sense, uniqueness only exists in relation, and only emerges for the individual in relation. Moving

away from uniqueness as a feature of identity, something attributed from the outside or claimed as a possession, Biesta coins "uniqueness-as-irreplaceability" to consider when it matters that I am me. This shifts uniqueness to a consideration of significance in relation, to situations or existential events where my uniqueness, and so my subjectivity, is at stake. In these moments I am called in a manner to which only I can respond.

Subject-ness so conceptualised links the subject to their capability to respond, which is a question of freedom as well as of choice. Such encounters are definitive of the individual's subjectivity, of whether and how they choose to exist in the world. The risk definitive of this encounter is the very condition of uniqueness-as-irreplaceability, and of subjectivity itself. To attempt to force someone else to respond would be to deny their subject-ness, and in doing so would damage the relation and negatively impact on the one who acted to compel response. Doing so is to fail to "encounter [the other] as subjects in their own right" but rather "as objects of our actions and intentions" which makes us objects of those same actions and intentions too (Biesta, 2017, pp. 12–13). Taking on this responsibility is not a duty, nor an unavoidable consequence of the human condition. It is a risk the subject chooses to become capable of. The call to respond is not assured. It comes from beyond the subject, and is not something they can call forth or control. Uniqueness cannot be produced or guaranteed but it can be promoted through encounter with otherness and difference, which might provoke a "responsive and responsible response" (Biesta, 2017, p. 13). As such educational contexts need to be kept open for just such a call to emerge for the student teacher, and to give them the opportunity to respond.

I would argue that modern programmes of initial teacher education work towards a 'friction-less' in-school experience for student teachers, one where the possibility of surprise is minimised and their expectations are met in a clear and obvious way. Biesta takes a very different approach to bringing the individual into the world as subject. Such a smooth and sure in-school experience would, in Biestian terms, work *against* the subjectification of student teachers. Such an experience would remove those essential encounters of resistance and interruption by which they would know they were in the world at all. In fact "the key question in relation to what it means to exist in the world is what we do when we encounter resistance" (Biesta, 2018, p. 16). If the aim of education, as Biesta holds, is to encourage each

individual to desire existence as a subject, resistance teaches us about our desires and how they exist in the world (Biesta, 2018). Education as subjectification encourages "an "appetite" for trying to live one's life in the world, so to speak; it is about arousing a desire for wanting to try to live one's life in the world, without thinking oneself in the centre of the world" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 98). This makes the educational task one of making that existence possible or, at the very least, not getting in the way (Biesta, 2017). Those interested and engaged in initial teacher education carry this task as an imperative, a responsibility particular to this educational world.

Existing as subject in the world calls for a receptivity towards being taught. Learning is a decision from the inside, but teaching is an event that comes to us from outside, "an address that transcends us", only possible through holding relation open (Biesta, 2017, p. 3). Throughout their in-school experience the student teacher is being taught, if they are honest and humble enough to acknowledge it. They are taught by their co-operating teachers and by their students, by the curriculum and its lived reality in school. Theirs is an existence in educational relation which calls forth their response. What kind of student are they – the learner who seeks or the one taught who responds? Biesta understands the philosophical implication of his work on subjectification as the idea that "our subject-ness may not be located in our capacity to learn, to make sense, to give meaning, and so forth, but is first and foremost found in our ability to be addressed, to be spoken to, to be taught" (Biesta, 2017, p. 4). For the educator to be a subject in the world calls for the capability to receive teaching, privileging response over assertion. The experience of encounter, of being addressed by another, is prior to sense-making, and the in-school experience should aim to open up existential possibilities other than "the learner" to student teachers. Thus, an aim of initial teacher education should be to open up avenues for student teachers to develop a nuanced sense of understanding. Through learning to listen generously, educators have the opportunity to come to value moments of confusion and unknowing, to choose to hold open the space for risk in the educational existence in relation.

Irreplaceability in this sense is not a delicate notion. It is a robust call, for you and only you will do. Uniqueness in this sense highlights the singular significance of the individual in their capability to attend to the world. The subject matters when they engage in the world, both in

the representative and singular senses. This uniqueness is a response in relation. It can be denied but not evaded.

Freedom and the Subject

What does freedom mean to the educator emerging as a subject in the world?

Subjectivity is by no means new, but subject*ification*, bringing subjectivity about, is introduced and developed by Gert Biesta as an educational concern (Biesta, 2013). He begins from the Kantian insistence that only through education could an individual develop the autonomous relational capabilities of human subjectivity (Biesta, 2010b). Bringing education and the development of independent thought together in this way made human freedom a concern of education. Biesta picks up this connection and terms it the domain of subjectification, or the emergence of the individual as a subject of action.

At stake in the domain of subjectification "is our freedom as human beings and, more specifically, our freedom to act or to refrain from action" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 93). The questions of freedom which arise are imbued with the responsibility of a life of significance in relation, from a first-person perspective. They concern the freedom needed to be a subject of action in the world and the fundamentally existential nature of that freedom. Consider the student teacher approaching a mixed-ability Science class. There will be a great breadth of potential shown by their students, and they will struggle in diverse ways. Differentiation is important, but so is openness and respect. The students may resist the educator's attempts to facilitate their learning at an appropriate level. They may not see themselves in the same way their teacher or the system of education sees them. How will the educator approach the myriad challenges this group will present every day?

The domain of subjectification is interested in how, during formal education, people 'come into presence' and 'come into the world'. Coming into presence in this sense is the emergence of the individual as unique and significant without reference to preconceived ideas of how they should be (Biesta, 2010b). In 'coming into presence' the student teacher is figuring out why they matter. As such it is a career-long commitment. Each individual should have a chance to come into presence, to make a start on figuring out who they uniquely are as an educator without judgment or comment (Ibid.). When Biesta cites 'uniqueness' he is not talking about talents which make the educator special or differences in pedagogical approach.

This uniqueness is a central concern of subjectification, both holding a particular understanding of why recognising each person as unique matters [uniqueness as irreplaceability] and as an essential part of the educative interest in human freedom [not socialisation]. The emphasis on freedom is important because it differentiates the student teacher becoming part of a community, socialisation, from the student teacher becoming a unique person of significance, subjectification. In short, Biestian uniqueness is concerned with responsibility.

Recently Biesta has written further on the three domains of educational purpose, focussing particularly on clarifying his conception of subjectification (Biesta, 2020b). Arguing that it is "the most difficult… to conceive" and "the most important of the three domains… because it is only when subjectification enters the scene that we are in the domain of education" (Biesta, 2020b, pp. 101–102). Thus Biesta's model has shifted from qualification, socialisation and subjectification making up a tripartite overlapping Venn Diagram, to placing subjectification either at the centre or as an encompassing layer around the other two (Biesta, 2020b, p. 102). These visuals communicate the shift from three domains of education to three domains of educational purpose where subjectification is always the priority. What is central to this updated account is both the freedom particular to subjectification and the changing relationship of the subject to their own subject-ness.

Biesta draws on Hannah Arendt's modalities of life, namely labour, work and action (Biesta, 2010b). While labour and work are concerned with structure, action is the personal ongoing freedom to create, and the possibility to achieve freedom through creation (Ibid.). Action in this sense is to take initiative, to begin something, and addresses the capability of each person to be a beginning and a beginner (Arendt, 1977; Biesta, 2017). This is particularly pertinent for student teachers, beginning as a beginner in a very public way through their words and their deeds. By emphasising beginnings, the freedom to be a beginner and so the freedom to make mistakes and need help is opened up.

It is also pertinent to their students in school.For the student teacher approaching our Science class, recognising that everyone no matter their standard will at some point meet with challenge is a liberating moment in the life of a classroom. It is the educator's responsibility

to give their students this conception of freedom, the freedom to strive and to falter, to act as a beginner. For our nascent educator, this means becoming comfortable with an open, honest creative classroom where they take responsibility for letting students take initiative. There may be fewer differentiated worksheets and more moments of slow, frustrating engagement, but this is the educational way.

This freedom is of the individual in community. Where each person can initiate something unique they become both irreplaceable to the world and free in it. It is not a freedom of the will or intellect but a freedom of choice, "the freedom to call something into being which did not exist before… not even as an object of cognition or imagination and which therefore… could not be known" (Arendt, 1977, p. 150). Freedom to Arendt is an event, present when people act guided by principles such as "honour or glory, love of equality… or distinction or excellence… or distrust or hatred" which originate outside of themselves (Arendt, 1977, p. 151). It is a sort of confidence. The student teacher learns to be inspired by their students, to respond rather than assert. It is a shift from freedom as sovereignty to freedom as beginning, and makes freedom and the appearance of the subject a concern of education.

According to Arendt, action brings together being free and the capability to do something. The subject's capability for action depends on other people, also beginners, taking up their beginnings and making their own of them (Arendt, 1958). This is risky and depends on the capability of the educator to work with Risk. Letting their beginnings be taken up in the world is the freedom of the subject, and the capability to do so is their capability to act. The student teacher may try new approaches with their challenging class and some will not work out. Coming to understand exactly why, rather than attributing blame or insisting on having their own way, brings the educator into the world as a subject of responsibility. Thus, freedom and action are capabilities only when they are committed to in relation, and this is the condition for the emergence of the subject into the world. Relation works both ways. Any attempt to control our beginnings as they move into the world will not only impinge on our own subjectivity but the subjectivity of others. Likewise, a diminished world will not respond in a rich and authentic way. For example, if our student teacher were to spend a month with that Science class in order to trial the "think-pair-share" pedagogy, the constraints put on their experience make it uneducational. The time is too short, the space is not free and the

educator is not being responsive to their students. It is an academic exercise of 'placement', one that puts the education of the student teacher and the school students at stake.

Biesta turns to the work of Hannah Arendt in order to better understand what makes a world worldly and why authentic encounter with the world matters in education for subjectivity. Arendt holds that "to be isolated is to be deprived of the capacity to act" (Arendt, 1958, p. 188), and diminution of the world is a form of isolation. For Arendt the public domain "denotes a particular *quality* of human interaction" a context of worldliness in the space where people act and speak together (Biesta, 2010b, p. 83). It is "where I appear to others as others appear to me", where people make their appearance explicitly (Arendt, 1958, p. 198). Thus, not only does the student teacher rely on relation, they rely on plurality and difference, openness and messiness, if they are to emerge as a free subject of action in the world. The emergence of subjectivity depends crucially on their attitude to difficulty, whether to engage, eliminate or evade. Rich in-school experiences during initial teacher education offer an invaluable opportunity to encounter difficulty in a free but supported sense.

Freedom towards subjectivity is not the freedom to make one's own way or construct knowledge as one sees fit. It is a freedom in the world, an existence in dialogue. It is the freedom of sense-making, and the freedom to respond as only I can. A risky encounter, this freedom calls on the individual to make a space in the world rather than thoughtlessly slotting in (Biesta, 2017). Let us turn again to our student teacher and their Science class. A mixed ability class is often rich in questions, not always pertinent but expressions of interest and engagement in their own way. How will our student teacher respond? Will they live in dialogue or refuse their unique responsibility? Freedom in this sense is existential, not something the subject owns or can claim. The subject is called upon to become capable of Risk so that they can understand the possibility sense-making represents and to value the essential alterity of the other, rather than seeing either as a threat to their own freedom. As a radically open engagement the educator has the option to resist and refuse to emerge as a subject in their own life. They may choose to focus only on enacting repeatable pedagogies and fulfilling the instrumental expectations of their programme. Or they may recognise the responsibilities they hold to themselves and to their students go beyond qualification, calling for openness and trust. As such the task of education is to encourage students to take up their

freedom wholeheartedly and to desire a life as a subject in the world, to foreground their subjectivity so that it is unavoidable and deny them "the comfort of *not* being a subject" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 95).

Freedom can be limited by phenomena which appear as false-freedoms. The notion that students should be independent learners, for example, sounds empowering when in reality it turns the student into the administrator of their educational experience, "where they need to monitor and regulate themselves and their behaviour, thus basically turning themselves into an object of their own control and management" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 100) and are deprived of the definitively educational experience of being taught (Biesta, 2017). This "self-objectification" takes away the freedom to create and to experience freedom through creation, and makes the subject an object of study and of judgement by themselves. They are both self-scrutinising and alone. This returns to the point that subjectification cannot be produced or insisted upon, by the subject themselves or an outside force. The subject comes into the world through encounter, when they choose to respond to a call only they can address. Forcing responsibilities upon an individual goes directly against education for subjectification because to be a subject is to be free to choose not to respond or take up our responsibility (Biesta, 2020b). The educational concern is in encouraging each and every individual to desire to live in the world as a subject, to freely take up their responsibility in the world and learn their own significance.

Arendt's freedom of the subject speaks to the possibility of beginnings and the capability of bringing those beginnings out into the world. Action is risky because it not only depends on the individual acting but on the reaction of others, which is essentially undefinable. But our existence is never our own or for our self, we exist as subjects in and with the world. Just as "action… is never possible in isolation", it is impossible without plurality (Biesta, 2010b, p. 82). It resides in and depends on otherness. Action only happens, in Arendt's conception of the term, when the beginnings of one person are taken up by another (Biesta, 2020b). In this way, action is inherently risky and relies on Risk as a necessary condition of its emergence.

This duality places the significance, the subject-ness, of action firmly in relation. We are both subject to our action and our actions are subject to the response of others. Our beginnings

matter to the beginnings of other people, because for Arendt and by extension for Biesta, we are all beginners as subjects (Biesta, 2010b). Subjectification is not possible to realise, it is an ongoing process of personal evolution in thought and through dialogue with the world. Thinking of the student teacher in the context of the school, their beginnings as an educator are being taken up by students, colleagues and the life of the school. They are interpreted by other people in a given context, and as such are always at risk if they are to be authentic and free. Constricting the beginnings of a student teacher through, for example, short fragmented 'placements' or by specifying the pedagogies they employ, inhibits their emergence as a subject in the world. It restricts the student teacher's beginnings, and it restricts how the world of the school can respond to those beginnings so blocking the opportunities of others to come into the world as subjects in the fullest sense. Thinking of our Science class again, the school students may just go along with whatever the student teacher suggests as they know this will be for one class per week for a month. There is no need to acknowledge the educator or to relate to them; they may as well 'just go along with it' and look forward to having their "real" teacher back fulltime.

These tight programmes of initial teacher education objectify student teachers and school communities. The programmes engage with school students and their world only as objects to be instructed or contexts to make use of. On the contrary, subjectification is not interested in *who* individuals are or what they do; it is concerned with *how* individuals are. Subjectification asks "the question of how I exist, how I try to lead my life, how I try to respond and engage with what I encounter in my life" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 99), questions of capability, of what I am free to do and to be (Nussbaum, 2011). In highly-controlled, clinical in-school experiences the student teacher cannot exist as a subject; they do not have the opportunity to find out how they are in the world of the school. The question of subject-ness, the subject coming to an understanding of why they matter in the world, is an existential one, rather than something that can be required and then assessed. The student teacher needs the opportunity to live in the world of the school and come gradually to an understanding of their presence in that world. They need the opportunity to "acknowledge and come to terms with the reality of what and who we encounter in the world… *as world*" (Biesta, 2018, p. 15) in order to understand their significance, to see their subject-ness emerge in relation, and to become free.

Just as subjectivity is not the assured endpoint of a particular educational path, neither is freedom. Both are events which can occur at any time or not at all, irrespective of whether the individual seeks to exist as significant in the world. They resist discourses of “not yet” equally to unfulfillable promises of “when”, rejecting both the language of becoming and the imposition of strong educational systems. The world of the school is not a space one qualifies into as a subject of action and responsibility, lived into through encounter and relation. Given time, space and support our student teacher will come to know their Science class as a world of its own, one with integrity and richness. Such an in-school experience allows the student teacher to come to understand what freedom and responsibility mean in an educational context. Likewise the development of school students is inhibited if they cannot respond authentically to their teacher. Given time and space they will start to see the student teacher as part of their school world, for better or for worse. In this way the educator and the school students engage with each other’s beginnings, free to encounter the world of the school.

Interruption

How can we think of Interruption as a condition of education and an educational capability?

In considering Risk as a capability of the educator I suggest that it is both the condition for their emergence and the existential challenge of their career. Education proceeds in open, weak, risky circumstances and any attempt to fix the experience, in either sense of the word, turns education into something else. In educating towards subjectivity "the educational concern for the uniqueness and singularity of the human being entails a concern and responsibility for the *worldliness* of the world, a concern for the creation of worldly spaces, spaces of plurality and difference" (Biesta, 2006, p. 149). The imposition of the strong, in the form of predefined expectations or limitations imposed on experience, remove the space the educational relation proceeds in. Programmes of focused qualification such as clinical teacher training push student teachers forward towards the fulfilment of criteria at the expense of developing a clear sense of self as an educator. Encounter and the unpredictable are mitigated against, and by extension the experience is stripped of that which makes it educational.

In this section I am interested in the educational value of disruptive encounter during initial teacher education. To think of Interruption as a condition of education and an essential capability of the educator places value on those encounters which slow or even stall. It is not necessarily comfortable or welcome, but interruption has the potential to introduce something new and worldly. For the educator to choose an existence as subject in the world is to appreciate and become capable of educational Interruption. I explore the value of interruption and the threat posed by clinical models to slow, unpredictable encounter during the in-school experience of student teachers.

Two facets to the subjectivity of the educator I have considered in detail are 'coming-into-the-world' and 'uniqueness-as-irreplaceability'. In education for subjectification, the aim is to encourage students to desire an existence in the world as a subject of action. This existence brings with it freedom and responsibility. It is a choice, and, as such, existence as an educator *without* coming into the world as a subject is possible. Brief fragmented in-school experiences

exemplify this possibility and are a dangerous induction for the student teacher. Initial teacher education should be mindful of the risk that educators may choose to proceed through their career in a world of their own. It is a development towards an innate reflex of interruption, working towards an existence where we habitually interrupt ourselves and where we acknowledge that an openness towards indirect and direct external interruptions is possible, necessary and desirable. These interruptions need to come from students and from contexts, from schools and from stakeholders. The everydayness of education should break through the desires of the student teacher and interrupt asking whether each of those desires and prior assumptions are indeed desirable, useful or true. This can be planned for in two ways – the time invested and the quality/qualities of the in-school experience. Rather than predefining expectations, the prior focus should be on ensuring that no event or encounter in the world of the school is foreclosed.

Consider the prospective teacher researching programmes of initial teacher education. They see that the in-school experience of some is spread evenly over the entire school year in both years of the programme. These students must engage with two schools but potentially more. Other programmes have brief 'placements' comprising a few weeks at a time in a variety of schools. The Teaching Council, which overseas and accredits all of these programmes, claims that the in-school experience of student teachers is paramount yet how can they explain this variance in approach to the world of the school? Looking to the school as a contributor to teacher education orients the student teacher as interrupter. They arrive into the school in order to achieve something, to gain something and take it away. This is profoundly limiting for them, as well as questionable for school students. It takes away the opportunity to experience school, in its routine and its messy humanity. Our future educator would be right to wonder what the world of the school will be to them?

I have previously discussed in detail what it means to come into the world, but how can we know that we are in the world? Biesta suggests that "the encounter with the world… manifests itself as the experience of *resistance*" (Biesta, 2018, p. 16). Resistance is a form of interruption which manifests as friction, a force which slows us down by refusing to go smoothly with our flow. It can manifest as indirect resistance ("the world is trying to teach us something"), direct external resistance (a question posed directly to us in relation), or direct

internal resistance ("a question in our own lives") (Biesta, 2017, p. 16). These forms of resistance have one thing in common – they require time and attention in order to manifest. If our student teacher has embarked on a programme which parachutes her into schools for four weeks at a time, twice a year with a pre-defined agenda to fulfil, as clinical teacher training models suggest, neither the opportunity for the world to raise up and teach her something nor the natural arrival of questions outside of her remit are valued. Though, given the relentless realness of the world of the school, they will arise.

The key educational question interruption-as-resistance raises "in relation to what it means to exist in the world is what we do when we encounter resistance" (Biesta, 2018, p. 16). It is disingenuous to suggest that school will not call on her, but will she chose to respond as a subject, as only she can? Has that opportunity been shut down by the nature of her in-school perspective? How resistance is met during initial teacher education influences the subjectification of the educator, setting the tone for their existence in the world. A positive experience of openness and interruption during the in-school experience, where the student teacher has time and is supported in multiple ways, is invaluable as they come to consider an existence as a subject in the world. Such an existence calls on the educator to view their desires, such as an orderly classroom or high-attaining students, in the context of the world. Through subjectification desires shift from singular pursuits to an aspect of how we situate and orient ourselves in the world.

In encountering resistance there is always the risk that it will be shut down, by the system as we have seen in the previous example, or by the student teacher themselves. Think of the Science teacher we encountered earlier. Faced with a barrage of random science-related questions how do they respond? Do they act as a subject of freedom and responsibility in the world? If the educator pushes back with their intentions they exhibit a lack of respect for the integrity of the source of resistance. In so doing the context which allowed resistance to emerge is shut down, what Biesta terms "world-destruction" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 97). In this case the classroom environment becomes toxic to the students' interventions. A second possible reaction to encountering resistance is to withdraw oneself as subject and refuse to engage. Biesta terms this abandonment of the educator's ambitions and initiatives in the world "self-destruction" as the self ceases to exist in the world as a subject (Ibid.). Here the

teacher makes it clear that they are not interested or listening, withdrawing from the world of the classroom and dialogue with their students. In the former the world retreats from educational engagement, and in the latter it is the educator who shifts to a functional mode. Staying in the world and protecting its risky educational nature are the difficult, frustrating and slow option by comparison. For example, our educator may dedicate some time each class to scientific questions which interest the students but are not directly related to the topic. Perhaps they also dedicate physical space to displaying these questions and inviting the students to research answers. In this way, our student teacher is being taught by their students to be a responsible, free person of significance and to ensure the openness of the world of the school.

In my view, clinical teacher training models introduce an element of world-destruction by removing the weak and unpredictable elements from in-school experience, and they encourage self-destruction by promoting expedience and surety. The clinical enacted in this way undermines educational engagement as an ongoing exploration of the encounter with what and who is other, of what an existence in and with the world might mean. As such, opportunities for the student teacher to experience in a meaningful way the life of the school in its plurality and difference is turned down in favour of "systematic clinical practice" (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 18) in "university-operated clinical training schools" (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 33). Minimising risk, interruption and resistance deprives the student of key teachings about their educational desires and how those desires exist in the world.

These two extremes are not inevitable, and in reality they are fantastical. No frictionless world or self is possible to achieve. Student teachers will encounter resistance during their in-school experience and throughout their career. From the beginning, the context of initial teacher education and the educational nature of the support they receive are invaluable to their subjectivity. The challenge, once an existence as subject in the world has been chosen, is for the educator to recognise resistance as different from rebellion or insurrection. Resistance is a hesitant educational gesture, and as such the response to resistance is pause rather than intervention. Biesta terms this a state of "being in dialogue" or a middle ground where the educator chooses to live in difficulty, balancing their uniqueness with their desire to exist in the world (Biesta, 2017, p. 15). Being in dialogue is "not a place of pure self-expression, but

rather a place where our self-expression encounters limits, interruptions, responses" (Ibid.). Living with resistance would amount to world-destruction and self-destruction combined, a sort of senseless response or a form of complacency. Here the educator throws up their hands and pronounces "this is simply what I do", rejecting the possibility for reflection and perspective the space has to offer. Turning once more to our beginning Science teacher, living with resistance for them might look like shouting over the students' questions. They might decide that teenagers are distracted and disruptive, and other than disciplinary measures there is nothing that can be done. They might ask questions like "do you think you're smart, changing the topic like that?" in an effort to gain superiority. Dialogue in response to resistance is not a contest or a problem to be solved. Rather, it is an ongoing, lifelong challenge inherent to a committed existence in the world as a subject.

Interruption is the pinnacle of resistance, asking us whether what we desire is actually desirable and so interrupting us on the path of that desire. It is the resistance we encounter once we agree to live in the world with other, the resistance that shapes us, turns us around, alters our velocity, sometimes almost imperceptibly and sometimes completely. Interruption is the resistance that stops us in our tracks, that calls us to stop and think, but first to listen. To be interrupted in this way is to have registered something in relation. This call, this question, interrupts us so that we might fully exist in the world.

For teachers at any career-stage, being in dialogue is as much about self-awareness and turning inwards as it is about an awareness of the other and turning outward. It is "a way of being together that seeks to do justice to all partners involved ", the self and others (Biesta, 2017, p. 14). The education of student teachers in school is both the experience of dialogue with the world and the exploration of their desires in the world. Both have transformative potential for the student teacher who chooses to exist in the world as a subject of action. The challenge for teacher education is to create, in the sense previously described, an in-school experience for student teachers which allows them to encounter this friction. This is an experience during which the student teacher is resisted and resists so that they can begin to become capable of Interruption by their own unique responsibility and the world they are coming into. How well we can address such questions depends to a large part on how we have lived in the world and that world itself. What interruptions to their desires are student

teachers experiencing in a clinical environment? How are they learning to deal with these interruptions, with other people and with the world?

We also need to think about the message and norms our systems implicitly and explicitly send out. Biesta uses the example of capitalism preferring an infantile population motivated by personal desires (Biesta, 2017). What message does clinical schooling, brief, self-oriented in-school experience, send to student teachers? What does it say of our regard for life in school? Introducing the student teacher into the reality of school life and allowing them to practice there for a reasonable period of time gives the opportunity to experience interruption in a supported way and become capable of Interruption in an educational sense.

> The difference between fantasy and reality maps onto an important distinction in the educational literature between an "infantile" and a "grown-up" way of trying to live one's life. If the infantile way of leading one's life is characterised by a disregard for what is real — just pursuing one's own desires, just doing what one wants to do — the grown-up way of trying to lead one's life is characterized by the desire to give one's desires a "reality check," so to speak, so as to come into a relationship with what and who is other, not simply overrule it.
>
> (Biesta, 2020b, p. 97).

Giving one's desires, and the desires imposed by educational systems, a "reality check" is interrupting oneself. It is to resist the perpetual forward motion of qualification and socialisation. In doing so the educator chooses to call on the freedom of being a subject in the world in order to become capable of the responsibility inherent in their subjectivity. The key to grown-upness, to coming into the world as a subject of action, is that it is not a destination, it is a commitment. Education as subjectification encourages students to desire an unresolved existence in the world, where they engage with interruptions from within and without, committing to acknowledging this friction, and developing an instinctive curiosity towards these frustrations.

Education conceived in this way "… doesn't think of grown-upness as the outcome of a developmental trajectory or a trajectory of cultivation or socialization, but rather as a never-resolved existential challenge: the challenge of trying to live one's life in the difficult "middle

ground" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 97). While Biesta has himself resisted describing pedagogical interventions towards the three domains of education, he is clear on the expectations of education programmes towards a fully functioning domain of subjectification:

> One thing it asks from education is that it make an encounter with the real possible — an encounter that allows for a "reality check." This requires, among other things, that education not remain merely conceptual but that there is something real at stake in it; that the world, in its materiality and its sociality, can be encountered. An encounter with what is real manifests itself in most cases as an *interruption* — an interruption of the flow of intentions and initiatives, which means that education for subjectification has an interruptive quality.
>
> (Biesta, 2020b, p. 98).

This is not to suggest that in-school experiences for student teachers would undermine school students or act as an interruption to their education in a detrimental sense. On the contrary, Biesta is calling for the world of the school to intervene during initial teacher education in a meaningful, disruptive and interruptive way. The presence of the university predefining or operating the in-school experience of student teachers precludes a weak, risky and truly educational encounter with the real. Attempts to ensure uniform experiences during initial teacher education undermine the reality of school life, as the "materiality" and "sociality" unique to each school become unavailable to the student teacher absorbed by fulfilling predefined criteria.

The educational encounter open to interruption is the slow way. Student teachers need time to encounter the real world of the school and their desires as they exist in that world if they are to understand their unique significance. The freedom of a subject *in* the world exists subject *to* the world, and is a freedom imbued with responsibility. As Biesta puts it, "when spaces lose their worldly quality they cease to be spaces where action is possible and freedom can appear" (Biesta, 2006, p. 150). This responsibility which calls forth the subject as significant in their uniqueness "always and structurally comes from the outside" (Biesta, 2017, p. 13), spontaneously interrupting the subject and their desires. This can be a shock to the student teacher but is essential to their emergence as a subject with an appreciation of their own significance, their uniqueness-as-irreplaceability. The interruption is not assured and

cannot be guaranteed, but it can be hampered or inhibited. It calls for openness in the individual and in how they exist in relation to the world, an orientation towards the possible. What matters educationally is to exist in and with the world in a grown-up way, in acknowledgment of the alterity and integrity of what and who is other.

Neglecting to interrupt is also un-educational. Unchallenged, preconceived ideas of the good student, of poor behaviour and of high standards, as well as resources available including support at home, give the student teacher an impression of what they can assume, depend on, or afford not to think about. This is a dangerous game. It can set the educator up for failure and disenfranchise their future students. It emphasises the need for high-quality in-school mentorship. Mentors in the mode of co-operating teachers know the context of the school and its students and are invested in the education of the student teacher. Taking a minimalist approach to in-school mentorship undermines all involved. This is not a question of attempting to make school effortless. To create an environment in which struggle is not part of the teacher's learning experience is to neglect the responsibility of those engaged and interested in education to ensure the "worldliness" of the in-school experience of student teachers (Biesta, 2006, p. 148). There are several potential consequences of this. Firstly, the student teacher may come to believe that they should not need to struggle, so when faced with reality they think they are not a good teacher, not capable. They have a skewed idea of themselves and are not liberated to ask questions, engage with colleagues and structures, and work with struggle as part of the event of education rather than an event in it. They embody competence rather than capability, and retreat to what can and cannot be done

Secondly, the educator may come to see instances of struggle as outliers and approaches them as a challenge. They view school students and classrooms as projects in need of normalisation rather than understanding. Their idea of education is narrow, as is their idea of struggle. This student teacher is focused on themselves and their experience, so that the clinical teacher training prescribed outcomes become truth and other stories go unexplored. The student teacher's ethical imagination is undeveloped. This calls for time and space, and is a good example of Biesta's "suspension" in action and of the need for educational programmes to sustain and support their students as they negotiate a dialogical mode of

existence (Biesta, 2020b, p. 98). In this way the student is encouraged to become capable of Interruption, starting with interrupting themselves.

Other interruptions may feel un-educational, they may seem like an imposition. Take for example our Science teacher who really engages with the questions their class poses. So much so that they pose questions in response, which the class interpret as work and on the surface reject. But the educational encounter is fundamentally uninvited. Experiencing the world in all its alterity is difficult, and taking the time to respond responsibly, in relation, is the slow and frustrating path. The beginning Science teacher needs to figure out how to interrupt educationally but in the mode of dialogue. This will be different for every class and relies on the educator taking the time to develop in relation to their students. Brief 'placements' in school or overbearing mentors can get in the student teacher's way. Biesta warns against "taking all resistance out of education by making it flexible, personalised and tailored" (Biesta, 2017, p. 19) or sanitised, predefined and measurable. In these instances education becomes responsive only to the self, losing its relationality to the world. The alternative would be an educational experience, one of being supported towards being in the world, experiencing resistance and learning its value, and in so doing arousing the desire to exist dialogically, in the middle ground.

Unsolicited educational interruptions may appear as acts of power from the perspective of the student. Deborah Britzman writes of Anna Freud's belief that education is composed from all types of interference and that it begins in the individual rather than when something is done to them (Britzman, 2003). Freud describes these relations as "qualified by the push and pull of dependency and autonomy, immaturity and maturity, and mutual interference and influence… having to learn and having to teach is felt as interference… Significance, or better, education, is made from this conflict" (Britzman, 2003, p. 8). Going beyond transmission and interpretation, education "becomes a process of asking, a process of asking difficult questions" (Biesta, 2006, p. 150). When "the question of the desired and desirable is introduced by the teacher - as a powerful interruption – the ambition is that the question becomes a living question in the life of the student" (Biesta, 2017, p. 20).

For example, the co-operating teacher attempts to orient the student teacher's attention towards their desires and encourage them to ask whether these are the desires of a subject existing in and with the world. The work of the teacher, and by extension those engaged in teacher education, then includes being capable of introducing interruption, suspension and sustenance in an educational way. Done well, this educational relation has the potential to move from one of power and intrusion to authority, where the educator is named as teacher retrospectively by their student. This shifts the locus of power to the nascent educator, letting them speak in response to the mentor's interruption in an authoritative way. They can then practise relating openly and in dialogue in the classroom with their mentor's support. The switch from holding power to authority resides in acknowledgement. It is in the student's acknowledgment of the teacher as a force in their lives, so bringing forth the subject-ness of the student. Interruption becomes contribution, and they move into a reciprocal relation.

It is impossible to know when this acknowledgement will take place, or indeed whether it will at all. As with all aspects of education towards subjectivity, interruption is risky. The educator risks having their subject-ness go no further than power, or their questions seen as interrogation rather than usefully unsettling. There is no way to assure this will not happen. Risk to the subject-ness of the educator, whether or not the student will turn and in so turning reimagine the educator's systemic responsibility and power into significance and authority, is the condition for the student teacher to come into the world as a unique subject of action. Encouraging response is a slow and risky way of introducing resistance but key to the educator's capability of Interruption. The ambition of Biesta's "educational interruptions" is that, though they begin with the mentor, they become habitual of the student teacher. In this way the student asks themselves whether what they desire is desirable as naturally as they refer to those desires themselves. Educational authority is then shared between educators and students and derived from dialogue. The interruption is a risk undertaken in the hope of future acknowledgement, which would then and only then name the educator.

Imagination

> By logic and reason we die hourly; by imagination we live.
>
> Attributed to W.B. Yeats
>
> (Andrews, 2014, p. 10).

This section takes as its starting point the idea that Imagination is a key component of the capability of Risk in an educational sense. To become capable of creating and maintaining the conditions of education calls for a sense of what might be. The educator is oriented towards their own subjectivity, that of their students and the sense of possibility inherent in the educational encounter. They take an educational disposition, characterised by "the courage to put the claims to truth in one's own standpoint at risk, with a view to gaining a better understanding" (Hogan, 2010, p. 164). As such, those engaged and interested in teacher education should recognise Imagination as an educational capability. This shifts the question of educating educators from the functional to the risky, "rather than asking what education *produces*, we should be asking what education means. And rather than asking what education *makes*, we should be asking what education makes possible" (Biesta, 2018, p. 13). Such a model envisages a gentler sense of progression, moving with consideration and respect, thoughtfully immersed in the world and open to inspiration from diverse sources. Resisting strong questions of creating or measuring imaginative competencies in the educator, this work is interested in Imagination as an educational capability and the role of imagination in becoming capable of educational Risk. It asks, what does Imagination mean as a risky capability of the educator?

Pádraig Hogan suggests that "the most important imaginative challenge for the teacher" is not cutting-edge pedagogy or classroom management, but "bringing forth an engaged response from the students" (Hogan, 2010, p. 80). I suggest that the most important imaginative challenge, the one which really shows Imagination as a capability of educational systems and of the educator, is what they do with that response. To imagine, capably, is to "extend our experience sufficiently to grasp [the world and vantage point of another person] as a human possibility" (Greene, 2000, p. 4). Engaging student teachers to respond during the in-school experience takes myriad forms, from the writing of lesson plan reflections to the

professional conversations now the norm after observing their co-operating teacher or being observed by them (The Teaching Council, 2013). Consideration of the attitudes fostered towards imaginative engagement and how it is followed up or built on is essential. These engagements could be functional tick-box exercises where the time in school does not allow for exploration. Initial teacher education should be concerned with holding open the space for student teachers to become capable of Imagination, consciously incorporating the freedom to reimagine and respond to the world of the school, towards the student teacher becoming a subject of action in the world.

There is a reciprocal relationship between subjectivity and imagination. The educator's choice to exist as a subject in the world impacts upon their capabilities of Imagination. Their capability of Imagination colours their emergence as a subject in relation and their freedom to exist as a subject in the world. The educator who chooses to exist in the world becomes open to possibilities, which in turn develop their capability to imagine. This is an ethical understanding of the subject-ness, the particular significance of the educator in the world. Biesta calls on the philosophy of Emanuel Levinas in exploring subjectivity (Biesta, 2013). Particularly, he engages with Levinas' challenge to the consideration of the individual subject as "a substantial centre of meaning and initiative" prior to or independent of engagement with other people (Biesta, 2013, p. 19). It is responsibility, the ethical relation, which is central to subjectivity in Levinas' thinking and exists before the individual comes into consciousness. It begins with every new life. This relationship is not chosen, it is definitive. Each is significant in respect to the other. This significance, this subjectivity comes to light when the living of a life is interrupted by relation to the other and we are called to speak for ourselves. It is a calling for response, the posing of a question only the addressed can answer sincerely. Levinas highlights this moment of response "without evasion", of a question only the addressed can answer, as both the nexus of responsibility and the moment uniqueness is apparent (Biesta, 2013, pp. 19–20). In Biestian terms this is a weak encounter.

The event of subjectivity is in the encounter rather than the held or developed qualities an individual may lay claim to. Therein lies the risk that however competent a person is, it is their capability to respond, to live in relation, which determines whether their subjectivity emerges. The concern, and this is key, lies in how the significance of the individual emerges.

The nature of their significance, the answer to that singular question, is not the point. Rather *how* the answer is possible, manifests itself and is lived out loud is the educational concern. The in-school experience of student teachers is a central sphere of possibility during initial teacher education, full of "vistas that might open, connections that might be made" to newly inform the student's encounter with the world of the school (Greene, 2000, p. 18). These lenses cannot be created, their development proceeds through weak and risky processes. The student is invited to look, cognisant that "people look differently, see differently; the requirement is that they look long enough in order to see" (Greene, 2007, p. 4).

Biesta's focus is on the creative potential of education itself, particularly the potential for education to bring people into the world as subjects of action (Biesta, 2013). The question becomes whether and how education creates in people a sense of their own significance and a sense of the world. He draws attention to several problems in the treatment of creativity in education, where systems of education try to harness the power of imagination and in doing so shut down its educative potential. The first is the idea of creativity as a response or antidote to those modes of education which stifle (Ibid.). The student teacher might be invited to reflect as part of a restrictive lesson planning rubric, for example, in a nod to their voice. The second is the idea of creativity as a closed system, the notion that, for example, the student teacher begins their initial teacher education programme with no ideas about education and has a suite of fully formed ideas about the world of the school to draw on at the end. This is echoed in course materials which claim to 'create' the educators of tomorrow. These are both strong, functional interpretations of what creativity is for. Imagination, on the other hand, is a risky capability, thriving in open systems in which recognise and value the educational nature of unpredictable, weak encounters and events.

Imagination in this sense is a habit, rather than an activity. Imagination plays a role in "how we approach each day, carrying out and evading those responsibilities to which we have committed ourselves, and simply being ourselves in the world, negotiating our sometimes troubled paths between competing desires of our own and those of others" (Andrews, 2014, p. 1). Pádraig Hogan describes this negotiation as proceeding in an educational sense through "a perceptive and receptive communication with others" (Hogan, 2010, p. 78). Imagination colours our past and our future, allowing us to be story-tellers as we make meaning and sense

of the world. A student teacher embarking on their first in-school experience draws on memories of those people who educated them in preparing an idea of themself in school. This idea is not, nor should it be, fixed. The temptation to pin down the type of educator an individual is or will be undermines their essential and existential complexity and richness. For an educator to recognise their subjectivity as "perpetually created and recreated… contested and resisted" (Andrews, 2014, p. 3) depends on their capability to appreciate the open, risky, dynamic nature of educational engagement. Becoming capable of Risk allows the educator a fluid idea of self, drawing on the past and looking to the future. It is recognising that their subjectivity emerges in relation to their different ideas of self rather than as a process of choosing among the teachers they might be, as well as the world they respond to and which responds to them. All of these contribute to how the student teacher imagines themselves as an educator and how they imagine the educational relation.

To imagine is to recognise the end of one's experience and choose to go beyond it, drawing on sources beyond oneself. For the student teacher "Imagination and the transformations it makes possible are what defamiliarize the familiar, taken-for-granted and allow us to see it in a different light" (Greene, 2007, p. 2), creating the possibility for each student teacher to come to school in a new way. Giving up what you know, or think you know, is risky. Many students choose education as a career because of a significant educator. This is a valid and useful perspective, but it is both overly imagined and not imaginative enough. Holding fast to a childhood memory as definitive of who we wish to be, or not to be, is to objectify the educator. It makes the educator's sense of self an object of reference situated in the past, present, and future, rather than a dynamic subject of freedom and choice who emerges in relation not only to childhood memories but to all that has come since and all that is available now. Richly stimulating educational environments "combine a respect for a person's original spontaneous response (so long as it arises from a situated, lived life) with the realisation that there is always more and that the more one knows, the more one sees and feels" (Greene, 2007, p. 3). It allows the beginning teacher to expand their field of vision and become capable of imagining themselves through their students' eyes.

Imagination itself is risky, drawing on the self and others, knowledge, perception, and emotion. It is also routine. In everyday life, among their peers and lecturers in the university,

and among their colleagues in the staffroom a student teacher might naturally imagine what kind of educator they will be. I would like to see this comparison-as-difference lifted to a consideration of uniqueness, as discussed previously. In this way initial teacher education could harness the everydayness of a beginning teacher making sense of themselves in relation and lift it, encouraging them to habitually imagine and reimagine their educational self. Joseph Dunne describes R.G. Collingwood's use of "imaginative" to describe "the quite usual activity through which I constitute myself as a conscious person", the everyday imaginative expression individuals engage in which operates at a level between sense/emotion and thinking/interpretation (Dunne, 1993, p. 60). This is a space of "active attention" which acts on the self to both stabilise and transform (Ibid.). The in-school experience is a uniquely significant space in this sense, as the student teacher is both engaged in "active attention" to themselves and others, and they are supported to attend. Once again, it calls for time. There is an element of consolidation, of imagining as a verb which means to weave together ideas and impressions, what we know and what could be. Sustained time in school to dwell between feeling and reason allows the student teacher to life through imagination.

The student teacher in school actively engaged in making sense of their experiences and their significance develops the capability of Imagination in context and in community. The opportunity to imagine and reimagine the self as an educator, and education itself, depends on the openness of the in-school experience and its attitude to Risk. This openness is dependent upon the attitude of the initial teacher education programme and on the environment in the school. Norms may be presented as non-negotiable, curricular drivers as inarguable, and the position of the student teacher as irredeemably naive. These dismissive gestures shut down relation, limiting the student teacher's education by treating them as an object. Education for subjectification requires the opportunity for the student to step into the world of the school in order that they can be encouraged to come into the world and recognise their uniqueness as irreplaceability.

This is a gradual, slow and risky process in the school, where, as Joseph Dunne compellingly argues, dialogue is key:

> It can well happen that the point or significance of things said by each of them will be brought to light in new or revealing ways through the *context* that gradually accumulates and that is contributed to, of course, by the other voices; when viewpoints are brought together in conversation then, like the rubbing together of fire sticks… they can sometimes produce the illuminative spark that no one of them can quite produce on its own.
>
> (Dunne, 1993, p. 21).

The dialogic nature of imagination is part of its risk and this risk is the condition of its emergence. There is the risk that if "viewpoints are brought together" conversation does not follow. The voices may inhibit context from accumulating, or the context may have previously congealed and so be resistant to progress. There is no way to assure a positive in-school experience but reacting by suggesting that this risk be mitigated against exacerbates the situation (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 33). Bringing the university in to increasingly define the in-school experience threatens its worldliness and in turn the subjectivity of future educators. While it is of course desirable that all student teachers have a "fruitful and professionally valuable" experience in school, this work holds that moving towards "clinically supervised settings" would be to undermine the in-school context as "a genuine place to understand school-life and to practise teaching" (Ibid.). If the aim is for student teachers to experience "the real side of the teaching profession" and initial teacher education in Ireland values the in-school experience as "a real-life environment [which] can change the entire picture of what it is and what is required to be a teacher" then the risk that the placement does not go as planned should be recognised as a condition for its educational nature (Ibid.). Biesta argues that "If we see educational responsibility as a responsibility for the coming into presence of unique individual beings… then this responsibility is first and foremost a responsibility for a particular "worldly" quality of the spaces and places in which newcomers can come into presence" (Biesta, 2010b, p. 90). As such, the subjectification of the educator relies upon the integrity of the in-school experience and its distinctive "worldly" nature.

A far richer way to think about the tired adage 'we cannot be what we cannot see' is to think about "imagination as a means through which we can assemble a coherent world" (Greene, 2000, p. 3). The central tenet of Greene's work is that "imagination is what, above all, makes empathy possible" (Ibid.). As imagination operates in the space between emotion and knowledge, coming to know other people and gaining access to their lived experiences we become capable of weaving these alternate realities into our world. It can be difficult to open up to all we do not know. Imagination "permits us to give credence to alternative realities" as the capability to hold educational spaces open and value their unfamiliarity, their risky unpredictability, as both the condition for and the evidence of their educational nature. If the student teacher then chooses to emerge as subject they desire an existence in the real world, a world whose plurality and richness they have begun to appreciate.

In Finland student teachers are now completing some of their placements in "normal public schools" in order "to ensure that student teachers have experience of teaching pupils from diverse backgrounds" (Hall et al., 2018, p. 59; Sahlberg, 2012, p. 13). Furthermore, the population of educators in Ireland is notoriously homogenous (see for example Heinz & Keane, 2018; Keane & Heinz, 2015), and underrepresentation based on socioeconomic disadvantage, race, ethnicity and disability is being actively addressed through initiatives such as the Programme for Access to Higher Education (PATH 1) project (Department of Education and Skills, 2017; Higher Education Authority, 2017). The importance of these initiatives to diversify the experience of student teachers and the student teacher population itself to better reflect reality can be understood in terms of Risk and Imagination. It is counter-intuitive for initial teacher education programmes to profess concern with the diversity of student teacher experience while proposing to medicalise it. Moving the in-school experience of student teachers out of clinical Teacher Training Schools in Finland recognises the absence of that real-world quality which gives student teachers a supported experience of coming into the world. This shift reprioritises the education of the student teacher as a subject understanding that "the educational concern for the uniqueness and singularity of the human being entails a concern and responsibility for the *worldliness* of the world, a concern for the creation of worldly spaces, spaces of plurality and difference" (Biesta, 2006, p. 149). The duality of this concern is reflected in moves to diversify the teacher population, a priority of which is to "provide more role models for students from [underrepresented] groups" (Higher

Education Authority, 2017) that they might be better able to imagine themselves as an educator.

Education which appreciates Imagination as a key capability of the educator values a mode of thinking which promotes complexity and the development of increasingly generous and expansive habits of mind. The student teacher is encouraged to exist as a subject in the world, drawing connections, seeking patterns and perspectives beyond the familiar. In clinical school models everything is apparent, and the value of imagination, possibility and curiosity are side-lined. Prescription impedes on the opportunity for student teachers to explore the plurality of school life in a meaningful way, drawing on the realities of others to make sense of the educational world and come to desire an existence as subject in it. I will close this section with the observation of Maxine Greene that "to release the imagination too is to release the power of empathy, to become more present to those around us, perhaps to care" (Greene, 2007, p. 4) as it leads us to Chapter 5 and Care, the final theme of this doctoral work.

Chapter 5 Care

Introduction

This section philosophically considers the theme of Care and the educator's relationship with research. The purpose of this chapter is to consider anew why research matters in the everyday life of an educator and to explore what being research-based means in practice. The philosophical links I am making here, between the themes of Research and Care, are perhaps not entirely intuitive. In current educational discourse, research and care are not obvious bedfellows. Still, I would argue strongly that the conceptualisation of Care – as found in the work of Nel Noddings in particular – offers a fresh and revealing perspective on the educator's *motivation* to research, as well as a thoroughly educational model of research as lived in the world of the school.

The starting point for this chapter is the idea of initial teacher education as preparation for the educator as 'research-based reflective practitioner'. This characterisation of the educator has become integral to initial teacher education (The Teaching Council, 2020) and the educator's professional development at all levels in Ireland (The Teaching Council, 2016b), and is central to teacher education policy and its enactment since the government's Green Paper on Education, *Education for a Changing World,* was published in 1992 (Department of Education, 1992). In successive recent reviews of teacher education and its reform, it has been noted that initial teacher education programmes do not have a unified understanding of research (Sahlberg, 2012), and student teachers do not understand why they are required to undertake research projects (Sahlberg, 2018). I agree that student teachers should engage with research, by which I mean they should engage with the work of educational scholars and think purposefully about education and themselves as educators. Being research-based and reflective are important characteristics of the educator at all stages of their career. Far from being a new or discrete phenomenon, I would argue that the teacher-as-researcher is the embodiment of educational care and care, when considered through the philosophy of Nel Noddings, can be both motivation and guidance for the educator.

To begin with Noddings' model of care is to begin *in relation*. Our understanding of how we think about other people informs the way we think, which in turn influences how we interact and relate. Embarking on a programme of initial teacher education brings the student teacher

into relation with faculty and peers, school teachers, and school students, the material of the university and the material of the classroom. I suggest that Care is a meaningful source of motivation for student teachers, and educators in general, to engage with research. In the first section of this chapter I consider what we mean when we talk about Care and Research.

Noddings founds her ethic of care in relation and locates it in the lived reality of the educator. Care is not an attribute or a virtue; rather, it is *a quality of relation* dependent upon both parties for its completion. To care is to be engrossed, to incline towards and to be burdened by that which one would willingly invest in (Noddings, 2013). If we Care, as Noddings describes it at its most fundamental, we listen, our motivation is displaced and we respond (Ibid.). If Care has indeed been the relation, then the one-cared for acknowledges these three (Ibid.). Through her ethic of care and its detailed elaboration, Nel Noddings makes a singular contribution to asking better questions of educational care and education towards care.

For Noddings a definition of care is not the point, rather educators need to know what they are doing when they care. She proposes an open, generous model of care rooted in relation, where caring is something the educator does and part of who they are. This resonates with the conceptualisation of research put forward in initial teacher education policy and guidelines today. The educator is to be research-based and reflective, assimilating the attitudes and practices of educational research and applying them in the world of the school (Sahlberg, 2018). With these policy ideals in mind, I consider what research means in the context of initial teacher education and the experience student teachers have of the research process particularly during their time in school. Throughout this consideration, an alternative understanding of research is sought, one based in care and oriented towards appreciation of the educator and the world of the school.

On the model I am proposing, research is *the activity of taking an interest*. Beginning from a position of unsurety, the student teacher seeks to understand these relations better towards their education as an educator while preserving "the otherness of the other" (Biesta, 2006, p. 148). Their interest is underpinned by a commitment to relation. It is a commitment to try to better understand the lives of others, as well to reflective practice towards a better understanding of themselves and their practice. Drawing on an ethic of care "requires each

of us to recognise our own frailty and to bring out the best in one another" (Noddings, 2007, p. 225), thus a model of care is an ideal approach to relational research, calling on those involved to listen, displace motivation and to respond.

A new understanding of research underpinned by Care calls for a clear understanding of Noddings' particular ethic of Care in practice. In the second section of this chapter, I consider in turn the importance of 'listening', 'motivational displacement' and 'response'. These three elements describe both the concept of Care and the phases of caring. As such, Noddings' ethic puts care to work, presenting a rich and meaningful model through which research can proceed.

Listening is a respectful, receptive mode where the educator puts themselves quietly into the presence of the other they would care for (Noddings, 2013). When we displace our motivation we privately put our energies in service of the desires or the projects of the other and try to "feel with" them (Noddings, 2013, p. 30). It is a mode of thinking, a "rational-objective mode" which rejects abstraction as an aim (Noddings, 2005, p. 26). Rather the rational, reflective carer respects and refers always to the concrete and the particular. The educator holds a dual position, remaining present as themselves while striving to think and plan as if they were in the place of the other. It relies on the quality of the listening, receptive efforts which were prior, inserts pause before the third phase of response. Responding before reflection is not care (Noddings, 2013). In response I bring my commitment to care to life, perhaps through overt action or intervention, or through a cycling back to listening. The one cared-for understands that I care through my attitude to them, rather than a recognition of care in a definable sense.

The carer communicates their commitment, shows that they have listened and directed their motive energies towards the ends of the one cared-for. When the caring presence is acknowledged, the responsiveness of the cared-for completes the caring (Noddings, 2013). Cycles of Care so conceived speak to cycles of educational research and are immediately recognisable as good educational practice. The student teacher can see that what they do when they care *is* research and the reason for doing this research is care. By bringing research and reflection to the life of the school, care provides a framework for the student teacher to

think about themselves as a researcher in a way that makes sense. To proceed in educational care the educator "establishes a climate of receptivity" (Noddings, 2013, p. 60), which is particular to them and characterises their educational relations. In order to do so the educator needs to be capable of commitment to the other, maintaining and enhancing relatedness through engrossment and openness. The caring educator cultivates a sense of responsibility and of the possible. As such, the final consideration of the chapter is the educator's capabilities of Attention and Uncertainty.

Attention for Noddings is a commitment which is sustained and renewed over a lifetime. The one-caring feels a "readiness to care" (Noddings, 2013, p. 17), and commits themselves to act in accordance with this feeling. Caring attention is to listen, and receive what is said, to explore rationally and to plan, and in doing so to support the other. To attend calls for a slowing down. Careful attention enhances research and relation and extends to include attending to our own thinking and practice. Professional development of the reflective practitioner brings together "research-engaged reflection" and reflection as engaging in research (Winch et al., 2015, p. 206). The caring educator attends as a "situated, living human being who must think and decide" (Noddings, 2005, p. 7) and responds to the "I must". They reject notions of universalizability, which disregard the particulars of the educator and the student, constitute "a methodological error that undermines moral sensitivity" (Noddings, 2005, p. 8) and increases the distance between teachers and their students, making relation more difficult and as a consequence less likely.

An essential element of research is questioning the 'interpretive glance' to identify our own assumptions and positionality. There is an uncertainty inherent in the identity of the researcher and the teacher. I suggest that in order for the educator to be a researcher they need to be capable of working with the weak, unpredictable, and risky nature of educational relation. Approaching Uncertainty as a capability encourages a shift in the student teacher's approach to research in school, away from seeking answers and finality, towards asking better questions and understanding. While rules, standards and principles are useful as reference points to orient the educator, they do not provide universally true direction. In Noddings' words, "to think – to identify problems, define them, solve them, generalize from them – requires freedom from narrow constraints" (Noddings, 2005, p. 6). Valuing a research-based

approach to education foregrounds not-knowing, and this can be overwhelming to the student teacher. So much of the world of the school is new and initial teacher education has a responsibility to acknowledge insecurities, work with doubt, and try to ensure that the experience is usefully unsettling. If a discussion of classroom practices begins in Care, then it should not, by Noddings' philosophy, end in five key principles alone. Taking a caring approach, thinking will end where it began, with respect to the concrete particulars of the relation which may or may not be helped by drawing on the abstract. The teacher-as-researcher commits to responding "to the cared-for who addresses [them] in a special way and asks… for something concrete and, perhaps, even unique", to taking their cues "not from a stable principle but from the living other whom [they] encounter" (Noddings, 2007, p. 224). The student teacher capable of Uncertainty appreciates, in both sense of the word, all they do not know and desires to try and better understand their community and the lived reality of the school.

This chapter engages Nel Noddings' model of Care to look at how educators care and to develop a new idea of doing research educationally. I am not suggesting an intervention or a new methodology. Rather, this chapter reaches for something more fundamental – the very source of the educator's imperative to research. It reaches for an understanding of why research matters which goes beyond the instrumental and seeks to make sense to the educator as an educator. It questions how we think about research in order to better appreciate the research educators routinely engage in. It works towards preparing student teachers as research-based reflective practitioners for reasons which make sense to them as future educators.

Care

> A good teacher knows it's not lessons they teach but students.
>
> Jackie Kay, Scottish Makar
>
> (Cooper et al., 2021, p. viii).

Everywhere in education we are in relation. The educator begins in relation to their subject matter, students, colleagues, the educational system, and themselves. Every aspect of their lives starts with a call to relate to a person or an idea. Recognising the call to relate as a beginning raises the question, "where to from here"? This is a difficult question. Relation challenges us to feel and to think about that feeling. However, contemporary systems of education call on educators to respond in functional, explicable, and measurable ways. The conflict between these two rarely comes down on the side of messy, risky, unpredictable relation. In this chapter I suggest that not only is it possible to centralise relation and to value feeling by foregrounding care as a central capability of the educator, but that this approach is fundamentally educational and not in conflict with the functional. In order to make this case it is first essential to understand Care, and in particular the care ethic of Nel Noddings. Noddings' Care holds particular richness for a consideration of research as it foregrounds ethical relation and thoughtful attention.

Care and care ethics is a broad and rich field engaged in social, political, personal, medical, environmental as well as educational spheres (For comprehensive overviews see Held, 2006; Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017). It is generally acknowledged to have begun when Carol Gilligan, prompted to respond to the work of Laurence Kohlberg, undertook to introduce a different voice to the discourse on moral reasoning (Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1971). Gilligan's different voice, the voice that was not heard in Kohlberg's work, was the female voice and it differed in its starting point for ethical consideration. Kohlberg aimed for a lofty position of abstract moral principle, one by which to view the world from a distance. Gilligan, and the ethics of care which have developed from her work, see relation as the beginning, the means, and the end of moral reasoning. Virginia Held wrote that the purpose of developing an ethic of care is to "try to understand, evaluate and guide" human relatedness (Held, 2006, p. 30), and emphasises in her philosophy the effort involved in working towards such understanding. This

work is both pertinent and ongoing today (For example, Murray et al., 2020). In constructing "the moral problem" as one of an ethic of care, Gilligan, and later Noddings, rejected universalizability and the suggestion that "who we are, to whom we are related, and how we are situated should have nothing to do with our moral decision-making" (Noddings, 2005, p. 21). In this way, an ethic of care reduces the distance between people. It calls for a stepping back to see the big picture, while keeping the small details of lived reality always in view.

Care ethics is not entirely dissimilar from virtue ethics. Both turn away from standards, rules and principles and "rely more on the character, attitudes and moral resources of moral agents" in making moral decisions (Noddings, 2007, p. 226). Contemporary virtue ethics suggests that virtue in an individual can be seen in "certain habits of perception, desire and choice" rather than the "conscious and conscientious attention and obedience to universal moral principles" (Noddings & Sloate, 2003, p. 343). This could be said of care ethics too. The detail matters in both care and virtue ethics, each valuing the situated and concrete rather than working towards the abstract.

They diverge in the focal point of their concern, as "care ethics concentrates more on the relation, virtue ethics on the moral agent" (Noddings, 2007, p. 226; Noddings & Sloate, 2003, p. 347). Thus, for care ethicists in the vein of Gilligan, Noddings, Michael Sloate and Virginia Held, care exists in the relation between the carer and the one cared for and is not an attribute of either party. Both virtue and care ethicists agree that conscientiousness plays a part in the moral life. For virtue ethicists it depends upon the virtue in question with, for example, kindness being spontaneous while justice is ideally thought through. For care ethicists it depends upon the nature of the relation, with closer connections showing spontaneity of response while caring for those we encounter who are not dear to us may call for us to draw on our ethical ideal.

Caring, Noddings holds, is to hope nothing gets in the way of the other which is cared for. The relation between student and teacher in this extract from Rebecca Lynne Fullan's poem *How to be a Teacher* brings Noddings' caring to life:

When one of them tells you he cannot write,
ask him to draw. And when he draws a fish,
look at the fish. And when he writes about the fish,
take what you know about him now, as mysterious
as what you did not know before, and hold it.

Rebecca Lynne Fullan
(Cooper et al., 2021, p. 18).

This teacher cares meaningfully for their student and for their student's education, for the person as well as their projects. I imagine that the task at hand was to write about fish. The student resists and the teacher begins a cycle of listening, displacing her motivation and responding to him which overlap in complex ways but are always focused on holding him in relation. First she listens when he tells her "he cannot write", displaces her motivation to look at the moment through his eyes, and responds by asking him to draw. In the asking she is listening again, wondering what the problem might be (the topic of fish or the medium of writing or both or neither?) and what shift might help. She looks at the fish through her eyes as an educator, listening again. Was it drawn in anger to push back against her again, or in relief at "being allowed" to draw instead of write? She does not know, but looking at the fish is an act of care for his education, an act of response expressing her educational care for him. When he writes, "he writes about *the* fish" (emphasis added), his fish. Perhaps distance from the task at hand was the source of his initial resistance, but now that the fish is *the* fish he drew, he can write. The teacher does not know for sure but they do now understand a little better the mysteries of this other person who could not and now can write. Noddings' ethic of care is neither theoretical nor practical, but emanates from a life lived and aims to serve it (Noddings, 2007). The educator listened, displaced their motivation and responded in order to care for the student and his education, and in order to understand him better. They learned because they were open to being taught by him. The delicate balance between knowledge and thoughtfulness described here is care, and it is educational research.

In Noddings' ethic of care there is openness and choice, as well as obligation and responsibility. There is a recognition that caring is not easy nor guaranteed, nor is it limitless.

Caring needs support and the individual who would care should understand their motivation to care. Two feelings underpin caring (Noddings, 2013). There is a caring which is natural, arising almost without thought, due to the proximity of the carer to the one they would care for. This natural caring is instinctive, "the motive to care… arises on its own; it does not have to be summoned" (Noddings, 2007, p. 222) and is typically the caring of our innermost circles. In flawed intimate relations it may annoy us that we instinctively care and are put in the position of choosing either active resistance or acquiescence to an instinct we would rather did not arise. Natural caring is rarely drawn on in educational contexts unless extraordinary circumstances arise, such as immediate danger or profound need. In these cases, the care is for the welfare of the student and is outside the scope of this work.

But there is also an ethical caring, a more measured and reserved care which needs to be thought through and decided upon. Ethical caring requires effort, and is informed by the memory of natural caring (Noddings, 2013). In Noddings' words, ethical caring "depends not upon rule or principle but upon the development of an ideal self. It does not depend upon just any ideal of self, but the ideal developed in congruence with one's best remembrance of caring and being cared-for" (Noddings, 2013, p. 94). Beyond a gentle reluctance to go out of one's way, ethical caring may be a call which rouses resistance and causes mixed, conflicting feelings in the one addressed. To draw on an ethic of caring, to become capable of caring when it does not come naturally, calls for an awareness of our inner struggles, as well as our ethical self and the ideal that self aspires to. These various strands are reconciled in the carer as an ethical person but do not guarantee that they will respond with care:

> In caring, we accept the natural impulse to act on behalf of the present other. We are engrossed in the other. We have received him and feel his pain or happiness, but we are not compelled by this impulse. We have a choice; we may accept what we feel, or we may reject it. If we have a strong desire to be moral, we will not reject it, and this strong desire to be moral is derived, reflectively, from the more fundamental and natural desire to be and to remain related. To reject the feeling when it arises is either to be in an internal state of imbalance or to contribute wilfully to the diminution of the ethical ideal.
>
> (Noddings, 2013, p. 83).

A commitment to relation, thoughtfulness, and awareness is foundational for the caring educator. Care cannot be demanded or mandated. Where the requirement to care is imposed without the chance for full consideration, the would-be carer's response may shift "from "I must do something" to "Something must be done"", putting the impetus to care back on the system, distancing the one who would care from the moment and rejecting the possibility of relation (Noddings, 2013, p. 81). A HEI tutor, if told at a staff meeting that they were required to care for the students whose progress they monitor, might deflect the call to care, insisting specific requirements be defined or that students be instructed during lectures in resilience and self-care. In this instance, the imposition of external requirements has distanced the tutor from their student and the opportunity for relation is lost.

Ethical caring calls on the one who would care to attend to themselves and to the other in contrast to the turn to principle which moral reasoning based on ideas of justice aspires to. The pinnacle of Kohlberg's model was a person who could cleanly encounter moral problems and their solutions entirely in abstraction (Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969). While Noddings and many other care ethicists do not discount a role for such principles, they see their value and use differently. Noddings writes that standards and rules can be helpful in relieving pressure on educators and providing a touchstone – ideas which contribute to ethical thinking and problem solving based on the concrete (Noddings, 2013). Principles, she suggests, are like a shorthand to remind the carer of their responsibilities to the caring relation. However, it is inappropriate for judgement to be passed based on principles, standards and rules alone as they are outside the relation and do not take the concrete into account. Rather, the benefit such structures represent lie in their potential to support the caring relation. Rules and principles set useful limits which when encountered invite questions to be asked and alternative answers sought. They are, in other words, *a basis for research* rather than its aim.

The ethical self wants above all else to understand the other better, and through this striving comes to a better understanding of themselves. The ethical self is not necessarily an ideal or perfect self. While we can claim to have an ethical ideal it is akin to a North Star; we are not there, rather it is our guide, our touchstone and the push we may need to "fetch [the "I must"] out of recalcitrant slumber when it fails to awake spontaneously" or if it will not wake to remind me that "I ought". (Noddings, 2013, p. 84). Thus, the commitment to the other and to

the self motivate the carer to care when it is not instinctive to do so. The choice to care matters to the carer, and changes their future be it ever so slightly. In maintaining a caring attitude they fulfil their obligation to care by meeting the other as one-caring, and their obligation to strive towards their ethical ideal (Noddings, 2013). In this way, reference to the ethical ideal in caring helps us to stay true to ourselves and to others. It allows a moment of pause, a respect for resistance and puzzlement, a recourse to question the scenario and the call for care, all while preserving the relation.

The response of the individual called to care affects them as well as the one who seeks their assistance. How they respond to the feeling of resistance changes the relation they have to their ethical self. When called to care we are faced with "this person with this perceived need to which is attached this importance. I must put justification aside temporarily. Shall I respond? How do I feel as a duality about the "I" who will not respond?" (Noddings, 2013, p. 84). When the moment has passed, the encounter and indeed perhaps the relation has dissipated, the one who was called to care is left with a new memory. This time it is the memory of how they responded to a call to care, and it needs to be reconciled with their ethical ideal.

Carol Gilligan wrote that the ethic of care, "which reflects a cumulative knowledge of human relationships, revolves around a central insight, that self and other are interdependent" and that "the activity of care enhances both others and self" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 74). In caring for others, the carer becomes "more honest about her relationships and more responsive to herself" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 126), and, as it is envisaged that everyone would care to some extent, all relationships and all individuals would benefit. A care ethic keeps both the self and the other at the fore, drawing on the life lived and aiming to serve it. As such, care is a research-based and responsive ethic committed to better understanding the self and others.

Research

In turning to research the educator acts on the desire to better understand themselves, their students, and the lived reality of the school in the context of contemporary education. There may be myriad motivating factors in the moment (an inspirational student, a new curriculum, an unsettling policy shift) but it is the underlying motivation, the force which animates the educator's turn to research specifically, which interests me here.

In this chapter I consider research as foundational to the educator's everyday life. The experience of turning to research during initial teacher education sets the tone. How student teachers engage with research practices is important, but how they *understand* research in their life and in the world of the school, the reasons they encounter and adopt to understand why research matters to them as an educator, is paramount. In this section I will explore what is meant when reference is made to research or to educational research during initial teacher education. I will consider how the student teacher encounters research, drawing on personal experience as a teacher educator and a case study from another Irish teacher education programme. Throughout, I turn and return to consider what research *might* mean, and argue that considering Care as motivation to research changes both what research is and how it proceeds in the life of an educator.

There is a dual sense to 'Research', communicating both a way of looking and what is seen when we look in this way. From the French *rechercher*, comes a focused, directed sense of research as "to seek" or search closely, while the Latin root *cicare* provides a sense of openness in "to wander", and of wonder and respect in "to circle" (Etymology Dictionary [online], 2021b). Both the French and Latin senses are dynamic, and in neither is it implied that this seeking or wandering or circling will end. Through consideration of the evolution of the word, it is clear that in turning to research the aim is to approach and appreciate the world in a particular way, unlimited by false promises that words like "conclusion" communicate.

In contemporary definitions of 'Research' diligence is implied; inquiry as research is not haphazard or half-hearted, but described as "scientific", "studious" or exhaustive (Merriam-Webster [Online], 2021). In considering the character of educational research, Laurence

Stenhouse suggested that “research is systematic self-critical inquiry” made public, characterised by a sustained and patient interest, an awareness that all may not be as it seems, and that the educator’s own ideas and perspectives are as open to challenge and change as any they may find (Stenhouse, 1981, pp. 103, 111). Winch et al. (2015) added “whether or not it carries direct practical implications” (Winch et al., 2015, p. 203) to Stenhouse’s definition in order to communicate the importance of both the “solution-oriented… and non-instrumental research [to] a healthy ecology of research and development in teacher education” (APT NOKUT, 2020, p. 105).

If the intention behind student teachers undertaking research projects is to develop the teacher-as-researcher, capable of the sort of “intelligent problem solving and analytic decision making” (Hall et al., 2018, p. 36) characteristic of the contemporary classroom, then the research undertaken should be clearly applicable and sustainable throughout their career. The student teacher’s engagement in “the organised pursuit of curiosity” (Stenhouse, 1981, p. 103) should make sense to them as an educator and in the context of their lived reality, that of the school.

During a review of the structure of ITE in Ireland in 2012, the panel looked at a number of what they termed “General Considerations” (Sahlberg, 2012, pp. 18–24). One of these was the confusion regarding, and the need for attention to be paid to, research-based teacher education and research-based education in schools (Sahlberg, 2012). Firstly they pointed out that the various institutions did not speak the same language: "The Review Panel noted that there is a lack of common understanding by HEIs with regard to the research terminology, i.e., research-driven, research-led, research-active, research-informed and research-based assume different meanings in ITE" (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 21). As such, to be research-based in one university might equate in its usage to being research led in another. It might mean the same thing in practice or not.

The Finnish model of research-based teacher education was described as an example where “student teachers are prepared through a research-based approach led by researchers” as “those teaching in ITE are actively involved in research and use their research-based knowledge to inform their teaching” (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 21). In this way “a ‘virtuous circle’ of

reflective practice" is created, tracing critical reflection through all levels of education (Ibid.). As the Panel saw it, “the teaching profession [in Ireland] needs to model an approach to learning that it wishes pupils to adopt - enquiring, engaged and critical" (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 21). When the team returned in 2018 they commended the progress in faculty and student engagement in research (Sahlberg, 2018). However a different and, I would argue, more insidious problem was identified. Student teachers were actively engaged in research projects, producing posters and papers to a high level, but they did not understand why (Ibid.). The following observations are worth quoting in full:

> As regards research-based ITE, while recognising developments since 2012, the team recommends that all centres should make extra efforts to ensure that students understand not just how to read and do research but also how to think as researchers when working in or with schools and why it matters.
>
> (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 7).

> …the review team was not convinced that all students really understood the value that a research approach would have in their future positions as teachers. The review team thinks that it is important that as ITE becomes enriched by research undertaken more often by students and academic staff, all students prior to their graduation should have consistent and mature understanding of how and why teaching should be a research- based profession.
>
> (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 28).

These extracts describe student teachers engaged in the ‘busywork’ of research and reflection without an understanding of why it is important or valuable to them in their chosen career. I argue that this is a significant concern for at least two reasons. Firstly, research *is* valuable and important in education (Winch et al., 2015), and far richer and more natural than these activities would have a student teacher believe. Thus the manner in which research is being presented to student teachers is inappropriate. Secondly, what student teachers engage with *as* research informs what they understand research to be, and *how* they engage with that research informs their understanding of why research matters.

It is suggested that initial teacher education programmes should have “a strong focus on research as a basis of teaching and learning” with a view to educators internalising this approach and replicating it in schools (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 25). Educators should “interrogate their own and others’ practice to enhance the quality of their students’ experience and to make decisions based on evidence and analysis”, seeing reflective practice as research and integral to their professional identity (Hall et al., 2018, p. 36). Initial teacher education programmes in Ireland echo this notion of systematic enquiry towards student attainment. Engagement with research during their studies is intended “to improve pedagogy and school practice” (Hibernia College - Research [Online], 2021) towards “contributing to their school as a learning community” (Brennan, 2019, p. 48).

Research in this sense is focused “in a rather ‘technicist’ sense on improving ‘learning outcomes’ by *improving teachers and teaching*” (Biesta & Stengel, 2016, p. 50, authors' emphasis). Understanding research in this way has influenced how student teachers engage with research during initial teacher education. When it comes to student teachers undertaking research projects, the empirical mode dominates (APT NOKUT, 2020; Rutten, 2021). Depending on the research capacity of the programme “the student experience varies from performing a literature or policy review, to collecting and analysing primary data” (Brennan, 2019, p. 46) and it may be undertaken individually or in groups depending on programme resources. Thematically, it is expected that the student teacher, “during at least one school placement module… [engages] in research on their own practice that demonstrates the connection between the sites of practice (HEI and school)” (The Teaching Council, 2020, p. 13). If the task of empirical researchers is taken to be “the generation of true and useful (that is, guiding, explanatory, and/or predictive) knowledge about the natural and social world” then it is possible to see what the student has undertaken to do and whether they have done it (Biesta & Stengel, 2016, p. 9). Thus, a data-generating project makes sense in the current conceptualisation of research for student teachers. A “traditional linear approach to instruction” can be taken and followed with relative ease, and the student assessed for their “research literacy” (Brennan, 2019, p. 48).

This simplification belies the fact that empirical research in education is “an interpretive endeavour from beginning to end” (Biesta & Stengel, 2016, p. 13) embedded as it must be in

the human and the relational. This turn to empiricism creates a sort of "common sense" narrative, so that "a small number of themes, issues and messages" come to frame what educational research is expected to be, what it is for and what counts as (good) educational research (Biesta, 2020a, pp. 1–2; Winch et al., 2015, p. 212). The appreciation of educational research becomes so narrow it collapses in on itself; on this restricted model, only data will do.

Inclusion of empirical studies in initial teacher education curricula are important and student teachers should be encouraged to engage with such studies for at least two reasons. Firstly, because scientific approaches to educational research can help to describe the context of practice or indicate possible outcomes to specific approaches. Secondly, to understand that these studies "strengthen, but do not supersede, common sense" (Stenhouse, 1981, p. 105), informing the educator in their position of responsibility rather than divulging them of it.

It is important that student teachers understand all branches of research. For example, in the current model there is no space for Philosophy *as research* by student teachers, as any student or faculty member would balk at their being capable of "doing Philosophy" given the limitations of their experience, which is to insult the social sciences further, and to limit what students have to call on as their research base. Furthermore, there is a living interplay between empirical and philosophical work, a "permeable membrane", where insights from the former and frameworks from the latter enrich the overall field of educational research (Biesta & Stengel, 2016, p. 10).

Broad and diverse experience of research aids in supporting the student teacher "to discriminate autonomously between good sense and common-sense", contributing to their technical knowledge base and the capability to interpret their educational world (Winch et al., 2015, p. 213). It might be comforting to derive rules and principles from educational research but not necessarily appropriate: "its relevance to practice is rather in defining ground rules than in discriminating action. It draws attention to some of the variables at work in a complex multi-variate situation, but it does not enable us to predict outcomes in such situations" (Stenhouse, 1981, p. 106). Referring to research of this kind tells the educator what they might do, not what they must, and indicates what may happen if they follow the

path described, never promising a given outcome no matter how watertight the results may sound. Thus a key capability of the educator is to remain uncertain in the face of data, emergent theory and generalisation.

In her recent paper, Aimee Brennan outlines the experience of engaging with research of the postgraduate student teachers under her tutelage at Marino Institute of Education, Dublin, and the initiative she launched to introduce the opportunity for her students to engage in "co-creative research dialogue" (Brennan, 2019, p. 68). Research methods lectures, supported by small-group supervision, spanned four trimesters and culminated in the submission of individual theses by students on topics of their choosing "often inspired by the professional experience, personal biography or prior educational experience of the individual student" (Brennan, 2019, p. 48). The students are described as having "generating their own individual research question, performing a literature review to better understand their topic, ethically and responsibly gather data and rigorously analyse that data to address their question", thus demonstrating their research literacy (Brennan, 2019, p. 48).

While there is without doubt a great deal of potential for richness in this experience, it is a prime example of the chasm between teacher-as-researcher and teacher-researching-as-teacher. Brennan goes on to address the trouble teachers have in seeing research as relevant to their practice, echoing the findings of the Sahlberg panel quoted previously. She suggests that, for students who struggle "to appreciate the value of research to their professional roles", sharing the findings of these projects through networks such as the Irish Higher Education partnership project Student Teacher Educational Research (STER) may be helpful in recognising the value of research in education (Brennan, 2019, p. 50). The student participants emphasised the importance of community, how it helped them better understand educational research and become better researchers, as well as encouraging them towards further study (Brennan, 2019). These are wonderful outcomes, and the programme is to be congratulated on its innovation and its commitment to positive research experiences for student teachers. However, it begs the question whether the significant educational value for student teachers lies in the professional dialogues around research, through such initiatives as STER, the Teaching Council's Collaboration and Research for Ongoing Innovation (CROÍ) Research Series and the Teacher's Research Exchange (T-REX),

rather than in the "doing" of the projects themselves? As one participant observed, "You sometimes find you're asking yourself is anyone going to read this [dissertation], what difference will this make? STER gives you the opportunity to bring your research to life. It gives you a purpose", or in the words of their peer: "The real value of research is recognised when it is shared" (Brennan, 2019, p. 67).

The relationship faculty and students across higher education have with research has garnered a lot of attention in the past decade. Research by faculty is cited by Ireland's National Strategy for Higher Education 2030 as the vehicle to enhance student learning across every sector at postgraduate level (Department of Education and Skills, 2011). This strategy linked research and teaching towards developing a "research culture" wherein "a spirit of enquiry and questioning prevails and where staff and students are committed to an evidence-based approach to their work" (Sahlberg, 2018, p. 9). In education specifically, a National Policy for Research has been suggested while the Teaching Council recently updated their Research Strategy towards "embedding a culture of research in the [teaching] profession" (The Teaching Council, 2016c, p. 1). In initial teacher education a cascade effect is envisaged whereby teacher educators are research-active, which informs the research activities of student teachers. As graduates these educators are then "capable of applying research to their work in a constructive and reflective way", in turn positively influencing the education of school students towards developing as critical thinkers (Sahlberg, 2012, p. 13). While appearing at first glance to be a very positive development, there are myriad problems with this model, not least a lack of clear, unified understanding on what research means in the Irish initial teacher education context.

This consistent understanding of research as an extraordinary endeavour or supplementary source overlooks the orientation of seeking and wonderment in relation which informs and sustains educators every day. When the student teacher asks why they should be research-informed or research-based the reason given appears to be because you are a teacher. Not recognising the everyday as research, delineating reference to texts and reference to colleagues, risks also separating the application of reflection and critical thinking.

Since the first formal appearance, in the Irish ITE context, as an adjective to describe a teacher (Department of Education, 1995), "reflective" has become a defining characteristic of the educator as practitioner and a ubiquitous aspect of initial teacher education (Hall et al., 2018, p. 14). Fostering the student teacher as reflective practitioner is one of the seven core elements of initial teacher education in Ireland and a priority for HEI staff development (The Teaching Council, 2020). Attending carefully to the community and the context of education returns the educator to an engagement with themselves. To be capable of attending well to those around them the educator must spend time in awareness of their own feelings, to receive themselves and look again at what they have received from the world and the other (Noddings, 2013). The teacher is "[envisioned]… as a reflective practitioner" (The Teaching Council, 2016a, p. 4) who can "respond effectively to major changes" (Department of Education, 1995, p. 135), engage their "professional learning" to reflect on "the complex ways [it] can benefit their students" (The Teaching Council, 2016b, p. 10, 2020, p. 6) and engage reflective practice to enable them "make the best decisions in the interests of their students" (The Teaching Council, 2018, p. 3).

Research undertaken by student teachers should "inform and refine the student teachers' understanding of their own pedagogical and reflective practices", thus giving the student teacher an opportunity to better understand their own capability for reflection (The Teaching Council, 2020, p. 19). Reflection is described as a "key mechanism for integrating theory and practice, for enhancing and moving to more nuanced practices, for attending to and understanding learner responses, for appreciating the role of evidence in decision making, and for beginning the action research journey as a professional from which more than they themselves can benefit" (Hall et al., 2018, p. 14). This is a complex and interesting description, suggesting that reflection both *is* research, "attending… understanding… appreciating", and, as the start of "the action research journey", reflection is *towards* research (Hall et al., 2018, p. 14).

I have argued throughout this section that these current understandings and framings of research in an ITE context represent a missed opportunity. Specifically, these discourses represent a missed opportunity *to consider the basis of research as Care*. The patterns of Care, namely listening, motivational displacement and response, naturally characterise the

research educators undertake every day. They are not valued as *research* in a project-based approach, which privileges results and conclusions over discussion and understanding. It is research, but not as an educator practises educational research every day. Interpreting research in this strong, outcome-focused way is not Care for the education of student teachers. This model potentially undermines the opportunity for student teachers to meaningfully encounter research and impedes their education towards becoming a research-based educator. An opportunity to nurture the student teacher's capability for Care and for Research arises however when we recognise the place of research at the heart of Care, and Care as a reason to research.

Listen

To Care is to listen and receive what is said, to explore rationally and plan, and in doing so to support the other. It incorporates a fundamental respect for the other, be they a person, an idea, a community, or a world such as the school. A caring openness "maintains and enhances the relatedness that is fundamental to human reality… [the] receptive capacity" (Noddings, 2013, p. 59) as both a personal capability and a characteristic of the educational environment. The first step to caring lies in recognising that care is not possible without the input of the one who would be cared for. Only by engaging the purposes and energies of the student is genuine education possible (Noddings, 2007). Caring as a virtue is not something the carer can have or claim to have. It is also not possible to independently determine how to care. The carer must listen to the would-be cared for first. Listening, in this sense, is not just hearing. To listen is the first activity of care and the first activity of research. The attitude of the educator is not one of pure acceptance; rather "it questions, it responds, it sympathizes, it challenges, it delights" (Noddings, 2013, p. 67) in the student's perspective. The carer begins from a feeling and engrosses their attention in the other in order to "really hear, see or feel what the other is trying to convey" (Noddings, 2005, p. 16). The educator "establishes a climate of receptivity" (Noddings, 2013, p. 60) through co-construction of possibilities.

Consider the following scenario:

A student teacher, in consultation with her university tutor, decides to focus her research project on an area of personal challenge in her in-school experience so far. She chooses to address "classroom management and establishing her authority", as she expresses it. Her tutor invites her to choose a few specific examples of interactions with students or classes and explore the position of the student, to "feel with" them and try to inform her gaze by seeing the interaction from their perspective. The tutor suggests that the student research each of these encounters in this way by using the lens of Noddings' ethic of care. The starting point, her tutor advises, is to approach the encounters with her key motivation being to better understand her students.

Our student teacher discovered early in her work that "there is a characteristic and an appropriate mode of consciousness in caring" epitomised by the listening mode (Noddings, 2013, p. 33). As she wrote and rewrote the scenarios of concern she realised that approaching them as data was impossible. The same scenarios were too complex, too variable and too situated for abstraction. Her tutor was right – the only thing to do was to listen to the students and be open to the possibilities they suggested. In this way, the teacher found herself in a mode of rational objectivity, "a thinking mode that moves the self towards the object" (Noddings, 2013, p. 33), refusing to let the researcher keep a safe, clean distance from their sphere of interest.

In a future meeting the student teacher and her tutor discuss the experience, and in particular the shifts which occurred. The student identified a change in her thinking as a result of her source of motivation. Researching these encounters with a view to better understanding her students was profoundly different to her previous attempts to find ways to better manage the classroom or assert herself. Positioning herself in relation to particular students did not require she know their backstory. In focusing on the relation she could see where the fractures lay and be more aware of caring for relation going forward.

As Noddings points out, every encounter is an opportunity to care, to be "totally and non-selectively present" in relation, and so to try to understand ourselves and others better. It colours the quality of the student teacher's presence in the educational community. In this way, the student teacher is encouraged to return to the feeling which prompted their commitment to care, the feeling which brought them into relation with the students in the first place, and to remember that it is not answers they seek but understanding. Care is "naturally other-regarding" and as such recognises the contribution of the other to the care relation (Noddings, 2007, p. 234, 2013, p. 99). Listening "allows us to receive the object, to put ourselves quietly into its presence" (Noddings, 2013, p. 34) without imposing ourselves upon it. As such, this way is frustrating, slow, weak and essentially educational.

Listening is respectful:

> We receive what-is-there as nearly as possible without evaluation or assessment. We are in the world of relation, having stepped out of the instrumental world; we have either not yet established goals or we have suspended striving for those already established. We are not attempting to transform the world, but we are allowing ourselves to be transformed. This is, clearly, not a degradation of consciousness, although it may be accompanied by an observable change in energy pattern.
>
> It is a lateral move of some sort.
>
> (Noddings, 2013, p. 34).

In listening, as Noddings conceives of it, the carer is not focussing on the places where the cared-for may land, but on the process between where they are now and where they want to be. This is the creative process, and listening is "a precreative mode" (Noddings, 2013, p. 34) calling for sincere attention to the expressed desires of the other. By contrast, an assimilative mode would move to judgement, and would refer to principle or rule. The assimilative mode is reflexive rather than receptive, turning to a response which was generated prior and without reference to the relation. For example, if the student teacher were in an assimilative mode she might listen to the desire of the student to be excused from not having completed their homework by citing the rules of the school relating to homework submission. The student objects and the teacher, if committed to the abstract, must stick by the hard and unyielding path they have chosen. In a receptive mode, on the other hand, our educator might see the tiredness in the student's eyes and suggest they complete this task over a few days rather than one evening. They do not need to know why the student is weary (Up late playing video games? Losing sleep from worry?); the educator's commitment is to meet the student in relation now and listen to them as a human being. The listening, "the receptive mode is at the heart of human existence" where to exist includes "an awareness of and commitment to what we are doing, what we are living" (Noddings, 2013, p. 35). The care approach does not claim to necessarily be more effective. Indeed there are times when recourse to structure is appropriate, "but what seems to be crucial is that we retain the ability to move back and forth and to invest the appropriate mode with dominance" (Noddings, 2013, p. 35), which calls the

educator to listen first. Only in encounter characterised by care is the relation maintained and enhanced.

It is clear from considering this particular scenario that the student teacher needs significant support in order to be receptive and not to become overwhelmed by the world of the school. Through engaging with the other in a receptive mode the carer is altered. The student teacher committed to an ethic of care appreciates relation as "both self-serving and other-serving", and is motivated towards receptivity in their efforts to better understand (Noddings, 2013, p. 99). In these contexts, the narrative of the other *matters* to the student teacher who is committed to care as a mode of research. This student teacher is open to feeling, receiving stories, and being moved – to a living, dynamic receptivity, and the change it will bring to their educational self. They know more and differently, having gained the perspective of the other while holding their own. Now that the carer can see "clearly what [they] have received from the other… [they] must decide whether to proceed in a state of truth or to deny what [they] have received and talk [themselves] into feeling comfortable with the denial." (Noddings, 2013, p. 35).

A key question presents itself here: Will the student teacher move forward unilaterally or in relation? We might suggest that having heard the other in receptive mode, the student teacher (as carer) understands the possibilities of the other's reality as possibilities for themselves and begins to incorporate them into their picture of reality (Noddings, 2013). Undoubtedly, this can pose a profound challenge to their reality and may be difficult to acknowledge. Denial can be as simple as giving no outward indication of having heard the call to care, or as impactful as an outright refusal of that call. Noddings suggests two ways to discuss maintaining and enhancing one's capability to listen, seeing the receptive mode as a source of both support and joy. The receptive mode embraces seeking and wondering as characteristic of the educator: "We may have ceased manipulative activity and fallen quiet; we are listening. We are not trying so much to produce a particular product or answer as we are trying to understand, to see" (Noddings, 2013, p. 145). This is listening, it is research, and it is education open to surprise. It involves moving from a place of feeling "baffled, stymied" without turning to the strong path of "controlled, contrived, and constructed" explanation and answers (Ibid.).

To be capable of care is to understand and find joy in understanding that "it is not something we do that produces the light, although things we have done undoubtedly contribute to the event, but it is something that happens, something that is revealed to us." (Noddings, 2013, p. 145). To suggest that educators should always be in receptive mode is impractical, and as such Noddings envisages receptivity as proceeding in cycles. Rather than a constant demand or drain, cycles of receptivity support the listening educator. The educator moves through phases of listening, attending, and ultimately towards understanding "what-is-there in relation to what-is-here" (Noddings, 2013, p. 60). The next step involves deciding what to do. If it is still appropriate to care, the educator moves into a mode of *motivational displacement*.

Displace Motivation

If listening invokes sitting quietly in the presence of the other, motivational displacement invokes sitting quietly in the presence of ourselves. The student teacher considered in Listening above engaged openly and enthusiastically with Noddings' ethic of care and saw its potential as an approach to research by the educator in the everyday world of the school.

While acknowledging that this experience of research had been beneficial and worthwhile, the student expressed her overarching sense of frustration with the care approach. She struggled with the idea of how to integrate a care and research-based approach in response to every educational encounter. Her tutor tried to understand the detail of the student's position, recognising themselves as in the position of carer in this encounter. While holding their position as guide and as assessor, the tutor turns their motive energy towards the student's conundrum. It is not enough to say that it is required to care, or to judge them for not meeting this requirement. Having listened, the tutor committed to care approaches the student's problem as if it was their own. In 'feeling with' the student, the tutor sees they lack a clear fundamental source to refer back to in every caring encounter. The tutor prepares to discuss with the student teacher Noddings' concept of the ethical self.

In the above vignette, our imagined tutor saw their student's frustration and wanted most of all to respond in a way which would use that frustration towards bolstering their capability to care. The desire to help, to put my energies and attention in the service of others is a characteristic of Care which Noddings names "motivational displacement"; this term describes the important sense in which "our motive energy is flowing towards others and their projects" (Noddings, 2005, p. 16). Comparable to assuming an attitude of engrossment, the carer does not abandon their sense of self. It is not a giving up of one's own projects or concerns, rather a shift in motivation towards the projects and concerns of another. As such, assertive action does not necessarily come out of motivational displacement. Noddings uses the example of watching a small child tie their shoe laces and noticing "our own fingers moving in sympathetic reaction" (Ibid.); here, we are not intervening or interfering in word or in deed, but rather interested in the other's endeavor as if it was our own.

In this simple example there is also the sense of knowing the other; we should know this child well enough to sense whether and when they might need our help, or how they might feel if they see us watching (Rushed towards completion? Judged as not proficient? Pleased to show their skill?). This knowledge is gained through a prior phase of listening. The carer does not need to know anything else about the child in order to display motivational displacement towards them. That is not to say that by watching and listening to the child the carer will get it right – a child offered help may respond indignantly that they wish to try for themselves, and another who seems to have it under control may burst into tears with frustration. Similarly, our student teacher, invited to engage further with Noddings' philosophy, may not welcome the suggestion. The point is not perfection of response; such a priority would point to *principle* which Care resists. Rather, the point of motivational displacement is to value the relation and prepare to respond respectfully. The carer who has listened and responded inappropriately graciously admits their mistake. The caring element lies in relation, in asking what each child wishes and acknowledging that desire. The frustrated child, for example, may not want help. They may wish to know that help is at hand, to be reassured and to feel supported. Rushing in, drying tears and tying laces may lead to a tantrum! Similarly, the student teacher may be overwhelmed by the detail of Noddings' philosophy or it may be the reality of the world of the school that has shaken them. Having listened attentively the tutor will put themselves in the student's position and respond in a manner which shows they care. As such, the educator capable of motivational displacement is open, honest, humble and committed to meaningful relationship.

What is it like to experience motivational displacement? As a carer, in "experiencing motivational displacement, one begins to think" and to think as carefully as they would in service of their own ends – planning and reflecting in response to the expressed needs of the one cared-for (Noddings, 2005, p. 16). Luce Irigaray captures this sense of thinking as "an everyday task for each one. Thinking is the time of turning back to the self" which is joyfully, necessarily never completed (Irigaray, 2008, p. 234). The mode of thought is "not only abstract, logical and technical, but rather a living thought that the heart inspires and guides" (Irigaray, 2008, p. 235). The one-caring thinks with the expressed needs and desires of the other "completely and nonselectively", without abandoning their sense of self or their own ethical ideal (Noddings, 2013, p. 176). The carer takes the cared-for as they find them and,

having listened, considers their call for care without judgement or recourse to external standards or principles. In Biestian terms, the subjectivity of the cared-for is foregrounded and they are met with respect for their uniqueness in the world.

Noddings gives the example of a student who responds to a question asked in class, describing how the educator listens to more than the answer itself. They displace their motivation and come to a better understanding of the student as unique subject in the world of the school. This position of engagement is achieved by consciously prioritising "the involvement of the cared-for… The student is infinitely more important than the subject matter" (Noddings, 2013, p. 176). The educator engages in motivational displacement as research, a sort of hypothesis testing whereby they try different avenues to address the care-needs of the student while in relation.

In the moment of motivational displacement – in the pause that it insists upon – care becomes about the cared-for *and* the carer, while research becomes about the student *and* the educator. Without this motivational shift the educator stays viewing the student and their concerns through their own eyes and focusing on their own understanding. To rise above this functional responsibility and to foreground relation in its place, it is necessary to displace their motive energies into the service of the student's expressed needs. In this way, the one-caring puts their motive energy at the service of the other without taking their place or relinquishing themselves.

Noddings is keen to point out, however, the particular type of imbalance that characterises such relationships. In the context of the school, we might say that the educator meets the student "directly but not equally" as the educator is authorised to help and this obstructs the development of a mutually caring relation (Noddings, 2013, pp. 66, 177). Furthermore, the student's need for help in fulfilling the projects or in achieving the aims they desire imbalances the relation. The structure and the nature of the teacher-student relation call on the teacher to find a way. Noddings draws on the work of Martin Buber to describe this particular phenomenon of seeking (Noddings, 2013). Buber's concept of "inclusion" describes a duality where an individual is simultaneously in their own and in another person's position (Noddings, 2013, p. 63). Thus the educator works to see through the student's eyes and

include this perspective without abandoning their own position or identity. It is how and why the educator cares, not in spite of but precisely because of the imbalance between their position and that of the student. In this attitude, the student can tell that the educator is still their teacher but is also seeking an understanding of the view from the student's eyes. By holding dual perspectives they can put their motive energies in service of the relation without committing themselves to working towards an outcome they are not in a position to support.

Say, for example, a student expresses the desire to move from one level of study in a given subject to another. Their teacher may be personally relieved; perhaps the class is overcrowded or this particular student is disruptive and impinges on the education of others. As carer they must listen, and displace their motivation into the student's expressed desire but not necessarily respond in affirmation. This individual is a strong student, with the potential to do well at their current level of study. They are work-shy, however, and have little support or encouragement at home. At the same time, they have expressed hopes to attend university. It is incumbent on the educator to consider the whole student, taking into consideration all they have gained through attentive listening, and to think through the scenario as if it was their own and plan to respond as an educator committed to care.

Feeling with the student is not feeling for them. That is to say, the educator has a responsibility to resist taking motivational displacement to an extreme, to remain present as self and not make the new motivation their own. The educator can present the "effective world" to the student, only while realising that "that the student, as ethical agent, will make [their] own selection from the presented possibilities and so, in a very important sense, [the educator] is prepared to put [their] motive energy in the service of [the student's] projects" (Noddings, 2013, p. 176) while remaining open to the choices and directions the student may take. As Noddings insists throughout her work, there is no care without openness. This very openness leaves the educator exposed to the possibility of the rejection of their care, and vulnerable to being hurt if the student abandons their ambition (Noddings, 2013).

In listening, the educator works to see through the student's eyes, and in displacing their motivation they work to imagine the student's experience. If our student sticks to their assertion and changes to the simpler course, the educator's heart may drop a little.

Approaching research through the lens of care does not make it easier, and it is possible to imagine how an educator striving to care might be strained by such frustrations and turn away in an emotional response. Turning to the ethical ideal may help to harness this feeling, and encourage the carer to instead turn towards their frustration in interest, to think not against but in communion with their struggles.

Such an ethic of care understands complexity and challenge as essential and desirable in human relations. This approach invites pause. It is an invitation to sit with the trouble a little longer. Through this relational process of adopting a dual perspective in the world, the educator resists speculating on the student as an abstraction. The concrete reality of the student becomes part of the educator's reality for a time, and this experience will help the educator better care for future students in the chain. The last element of care, in fact the definitive one, turns to the eventual response of the carer and the cared-for.

Respond

As I have argued throughout this chapter, to espouse an ethic of care is to be committed to receptivity, to listening to others and trying to address their legitimate expressed needs. Thus, even if there is a power differential in the relation, caring is possible, as it relies on response not mutuality. Caring falters, falls or fails on the integrity of the relation between those who would care and those they would care for. When students claim that teachers who are hardworking and deeply concerned *do not care*, Noddings attributes this to the teachers' inability "to make the connections that would complete caring relations with their students" (Noddings, 2005, p. 2). The relation is there but it is not a caring relation. The teachers do want to care and are acting to some degree on that desire, and the students are benefitting from their dedication, but the relation is flawed so the sense of care is not received and so cannot be acknowledged.

One can imagine the student teacher we encountered previously as well-prepared and excited to work with their students but afraid of the unpredictability of the classroom. In response to that fear, she has built walls using prescribed approaches such as "classroom management" techniques, and restricted the modes of response from students, shutting down avenues for their curiosity. These interventions are well-meaning efforts to establish her authority, but inadvertently they sell short her students and herself. For example, though asking questions spontaneously can be disruptive to the flow envisaged for the class, it can provide invaluable insight for the educator. This is where the students' misunderstandings and problems emerge, and where they share what interests them and the connections they are making. In short, spontaneous communication is where the *education* happens amidst all the teaching and learning.

In the liminal space of present student and future educator, the student teacher is uniquely positioned to come to understand the role of response. An ethic of care "calls on people to *be* carers and to *develop* the virtues and capacities to care, it does not regard caring solely as an individual attribute. It recognizes the part played by the cared-for. It is an ethic of relation" (Noddings, 2005, p. 21, emphasis added). The student teacher is in the position of carer, to their students and school community, and cared-for, by their programme, mentor and tutor.

Through supported experiences in school, they can come to understand that receptivity and response characterise the caring educator and are modes of research too. Instrumental and rational thinking are useful in the phase of motivational displacement where the educator is deciding what to do and how to respond (Noddings, 2013). It is worth quoting in full Noddings' own description of the lateral shifts of thought during response:

> … we, in caring, must respond: we express ourselves, we make plans, we execute. But there, are, properly, turning points. As we convert what we have received from the other into a problem, something to be solved, we move away from the other. We clean up his reality, strip it of complex and bothersome qualities, in order to think it. The other's reality becomes data, stuff to be analyzed, studied, interpreted. All this is to be expected and is entirely appropriate, provided that we see the essential turning points *and move back* to the concrete and the personal. Thus we keep our objective thinking tied to a relational stake at the heart of caring. When we fail to do this, we can climb into clouds of abstraction, moving rapidly away from the caring situation into a domain of objective and impersonal problems where we are free to impose structure as we will. If I do not turn away from my abstractions, I lose the one cared-for. Indeed, I lose myself as one-caring, for I now care about a problem instead of a person.
>
> (Noddings, 2013, p. 36, emphasis added).

Response, as such, is more than a turning back to the other. It calls for a turn inward to the ethical self and outwards to the context and lived reality. Care needs space and consideration as well as detail and a firm sense of the lived. It moves from principle, definition and the desire to fix or solve, towards detail, the concrete, and a desire to relate. In responding in this context-sensitive mode, the carer orients themselves towards the cared-for in understanding, integrating and moving with the other in the world.

While respecting the role of standard and principle, "in interpersonal reasoning, one seeks an appropriate response to a living other, not to an argument" (Noddings, 2005, p. 232). What fundamentally matters in every attempt at dialogue, as Noddings highlights throughout her philosophy, is the quality of the relationship between self and other. Characterised by a caring attitude, the primary concern of interpersonal reasoning is this relationship, and the primary aim is its promotion. It is not a competition or debate, nor does this form of reason orient itself towards solution. Rather, as previously discussed, "it asks the other, implicitly or

explicitly, 'What are you going through?'" (Noddings, 2005, p. 232). The essential variability of the response of the one-caring is part of its authenticity. The one-caring does not generalise towards judgement by some predetermined rule or principle as, in Noddings' words, "this move to abstraction… tends to destroy the uniqueness of the caring itself" (Noddings, 2013, p. 33).

The carer seeks recognition of their care. This can come in the fruitful achievement of that project or end particular to the cared-for towards which they had displaced their motivation. The one cared-for is called on to recognise the carer, to exhibit an openness to receive their care and to respond, acknowledging this care in some tangible way (Noddings, 2005, p. 16). For caring to be the relation the response of the cared-for is essential, though it does not need to be directed towards the carer. They are responding to the care, so it may be delight in having achieved the aim towards which they were supported. The child might say that knowing the carer was there for them was instrumental in sucessfully tying their shoelaces independently for the first time (though likely they would phrase it in a different way!). As such they have responded in relation and completed the caring encounter.

This response by the cared-for is the carer's greatest support. By perceiving and acknowledging the relation as caring, the student gives the educator what they most need to continue to care, namely the identity of carer (Noddings, 2013). This may take the form of "direct response to the one-caring or in spontaneous delight and happy growth before [their] eyes… [or they] may respond by free, vigorous, and happy immersion in [their] own projects" (Noddings, 2013, p. 181). As long as there is a perceivable response acknowledging care the caring encounter is complete. It is appropriate that the student stay at the level of cared-for; mutuality is hindered by the educator's position as they are authorised to care, that is to research by listening and try to understand the student's perspective. If the student perceives caring and denies it (as opposed to rejecting it, as described above) they are lying to themselves and may damage the development of their ethical self (Ibid.). How the rejection of the claim to care is received by the carer matters. If it elicits distress and interest, then care was the nature of the relation. But if the carer reacts emotionally as one threatened then the nature of the relation may not have been caring. This feeling of threat indicates that the relation with the cared-for was not caring as the carer is primarily focused on themselves. The

capable educator will recognise this rejection as another opportunity to engage in educational research, engage the courage needed to grasp the possibilities beyond the hurt and recommit to care (Noddings, 2013). In order to keep the relation at the forefront throughout "we 'stay with' the other", (Noddings, 2007, p. 231). Action does not necessarily follow. For example, the carer may decide to let the other be and return to work on the relation. This "letting be" is not neglect or dismissal of their call for care, rather it is a recognition that at this time or in this case the relation is best served by the carer stepping back and letting the other be (Ibid.). It may be followed by further listening and a continued commitment to displace motivation towards their needs or desires, so that the carer will better understand the cared-for and are better placed to intervene actively should that be appropriate in future (Ibid.). Alternatively, letting the other be may herald a recognition that the relation is not, or not yet, a caring one and indicate the need for attention to be paid to the relation and its flaws first. An aspect of the commitment to attend is honesty, and the courage to be humble and move away when our efforts to relate fail. The caring relation is dynamic and evolving, and those committed to an ethic of care are necessarily committed to its improvement.

Just as the caring relation is a source of the "strength to go on giving" for the educator, it is also a "natural site of resistance", risk and growth (Noddings, 2013, p. 181). If the one I would care for rejects outright my claim to care for them then the courageous response is to accept that rejection and study it. This is the essential, definitive relational risk of caring: "as the one-caring is free to accept or reject the internal "I must" of caring, so the cared-for is free to accept or reject the attitude of caring when he perceives it" (Ibid.). What follows may actually constitute care depending on the reaction of the carer. If the carer responds to the assertion of the cared-for' by stepping back "thus freeing [the other] to embrace the absence [they] have chosen" then this is an example of the generosity of caring (Noddings, 2013, p. 19). The carer is caring by giving the cared-for space, and the relation may remain or end well. In this way the educator cares for themselves, showing the same compassion and interest that they have endeavoured to show the other. By working to better understand the commitment to care and the educational relations it relies on, the caring characteristics of relation and their absence, the educator also care for future students. These characteristics describe a relationship that is research-based, and deeply educational.

Attention

Like research, attention describes a mode of being and the preparation for that mode. We attend in order to pay attention. In attending there is a sense of presence, anticipation, and potential; it is the very essence of the *beginning* this work has concerned itself with. When Nel Noddings addresses attention, she asks how the educator is prepared to care in addition to how they *are* when they are caring. She draws on the philosophy of Simone Weil and its interpretation by Iris Murdoch to describe attention as a way of arriving and of being in relation. Noddings also writes of the receptive educator looking again, engaging a reflective mode which directs them back to themselves and their prior experiences. To look and look again is not as simple as it may sound, and I will here draw on writings and case studies in initial teacher education, as well as those voices who were inspirational to Noddings' philosophy, in exploring Attention as a capability of the research-based educator. I begin where Noddings rooted her concept of attention as engrossment, in the philosophy of Simone Weil.

In the 2005 introduction to her anthology of Simone Weil's philosophy, Siân Miles shares some of Weil's own correspondence. Though Weil held the position of Lecturer in Philosophy at the Lycée for Girls in Le Puy, France, in her letters she describes teaching a course entitled 'Method in the Sciences' (Miles, 2005). As the students knew nothing of where scientific knowledge came from she gave supplementary lectures in the history of science, beginning with the "duality" in the development of mathematics, which she described as "the attempt to deal with the continuous by means of the discontinuous" (Miles, 2005, p. 13). In the words of a former student, Weil was "too straightforward, too honest to 'cram us for exams' in lessons and keep her real thinking for other times" (Miles, 2005, p. 12). Her classroom had "a family atmosphere" where her students "made [their] first acquaintance with great thoughts in an atmosphere of complete independence" (Ibid.). Weil the person, the mystic revolutionary, and Weil the educator began from the same place, a mode of attention she described as "a method of the exercise of intelligence which consists of looking" (Weil, 1951, p. 7). Independent thought in this sense is thinking free of the imposition of external structures or the predefined. She was not against textbooks or rules, rather Weil, and Noddings in fact, saw them as one part of a picture to be considered without privilege over

any other. Furthermore, attention describes what we do when we are looking: ‘‘we do not obtain the most precious gifts by going in search of them but by waiting for them” (Weil, 1951, p. 112). Thus for Weil “attention consists of suspending our thought, leaving it detached, empty and ready to be penetrated by the object” (Weil, 1951, p. 108) both as we prepare to enter into relation and as we proceed in relation in the world.

Iris Murdoch borrows the term ‘attention’ from Weil “to express the idea of a just and loving gaze directed upon an individual reality” (Murdoch, 2001, p. 33) thus bringing Weil’s “looking” into relation with a *particular* other. Murdoch takes this mode of engagement as both normative and logical, moving away from the idea of a particular, elevated “moral vision” to the everyday way we see and the “will that moves within” our “ordinary vision” (Murdoch, 2001, p. 34).

Attention, for Weil, Murdoch and Noddings, then, is a feature of our lived reality should we choose to live sincerely in relation. Weil brought her attention, her thinking, into the everyday classroom and Murdoch would see the “just and loving gaze” engaged through a continual commitment to moral imagination and moral effort (Murdoch, 2001, p. 36). For both, attention as a normative concern preserves openness and relation, a defence against unhelpful “states of illusion” (Ibid.), of turning a blind eye, which can arise if moral engagement is considered in terms of problem-solving moments rather than a prior commitment.

Building on Murdoch’s bringing Weil’s attention into relation, Noddings interprets attention as “what characterizes our consciousness when we ask another (explicitly or implicitly) ‘What are you going through?’” (Noddings, 2005, p. 15). She terms this relational attention “engrossment… an open, nonselective receptivity to the cared-for… essential in moral life… [and] at the centre of love for our neighbours” (Ibid.). Echoing Murdoch’s assertion that the important part of moral life is the time inbetween explicitly moral decisions, for Noddings all educational engagement is moral education. She names the essential elements to be modelling, dialogue, practice and confirmation while holding throughout her position that all education is towards the promotion of moral, caring people (Ibid.).

Engrossment is a feeling but not an entirely emotional feeling. It is rational, in that it is carefully thought out, and non-rational, in that it is unreasoned, free from judgement or justification. The rational side of engrossment is "a thinking mode that moves the self towards the object", a mode of conscious objectivity where "the one under her gaze is under her support and not her judgement" (Noddings, 2013, pp. 33, 89). The non-rational "receptive-intuitive mode" (Noddings, 2013, p. 34) opens the carer up to receive the object of their care without intrusion or interrogation, in a mode akin to Weil's "looking" as we place ourselves quietly in its presence. An attitude of engrossment places the carer and the one they would care for in the world of relation, making lateral moves between thinking and feeling modes without privileging one over the other. "The receptive state can happen by chance when our manipulative efforts are at rest" (Noddings, 2013, p. 30) and is as such possible to nurture by encouraging the educator to consciously relax their manipulative reflexes and spend time in the educational relation. Such engrossment is "characterised by outer quietude and inner voices and images, by absorption and sensory concentration… listening, looking, feeling" (Noddings, 2013, p. 34). The caring educator works to "feel with" the student, to better understand this student's perspective towards improving their capability to attend to them and to future students. In short, to be engrossed is to do educational research and resist the urge to reflexively act.

In an educational environment committed to an ethic of care, the commitment to students, to attend to them and address them genuinely, is prior. The educator has been called upon, in a not-rational but profoundly thoughtful way, to strive for a better understanding of every student they encounter. In their caring they will undertake rational acts and make rational decisions but "the commitment that elicits the rational activity precedes it and gives it personal meaning" (Noddings, 2013, p. 61). Similarly, the attitude of the carer received by the cared for is not rational or reasoned, nor is the fundamental awareness of their relatedness (Noddings, 2013). An imbalance towards the rational or non-rational voids the caring relation. It is to take the non-rational sense of attentive openness too far to believe that the educator can always be so engrossed or be so engrossed in everyone. Caring has a certain criticality which calls for the carer to be awake to the absence of relation or the impossibility of founding a relation. For example, while "caring about" in Noddings philosophy "always involves a certain benign neglect" (Noddings, 2013, p. 112), it is still attentive and, employed carefully,

it is in keeping with the commitment to an ethic of care. In caring about the future of initial teacher education I have a limited obligation to those students who are distant from me in time and space. A caring relation is impossible to complete as those students could never say that I cared for them.

Caring about "directs us to find what we *must* do in what we *can* do, and we are continually pulled back to the concrete, where we are challenged again and again not to justify our acts with reasons but to fulfil our obligations" (Noddings, 2013, p. 152). As such, when I encounter students in my mathematics class who express an interest in education as a career I care for them in that moment, I listen, displace my motivation and respond to their interest. I try to understand them better. These students link me to the future of teacher education by a chain of trust and I am called on to be prepared to care when I can in the ways that I can (Noddings, 2013). It is essential, however, that I do not confuse this with "caring for". I care for the student in relation to me, I care about the sense of possibility future educators hold, and I acknowledge my finitude with sadness and relief. I cannot do everything (Noddings, 2013).

The educator can, according to Noddings, develop the capability of Attention and nurture it in their students. As the ethical ideal grows, the individual becomes more capable of attending to others and to committing to care (Noddings, 2013). The ethical ideal supports and informs this capability. As student teachers care and experience being cared-for, they become better able to ask caring questions and to receive answers of various types and in various ways. They become better able to listen, to look and to be in the presence of others quietly without feeling a pressure to assert themselves. This is practice towards becoming capable of Attention. It is cognitive and affective, and it is linked to modelling and dialogue. On this dialogical model, the support of their tutor and mentor is essential in building an ethical ideal which is both strong and open.

Attending carefully to the community and the context of education returns the educator to an engagement with themselves. To be capable of attending well to those around them the educator must spend time in awareness of their own feelings, to receive themselves and look again at what they have received from the world and the other (Noddings, 2013). In the Irish ITE context, reflective practice has become an essential facet of the educator in responding

to change, professional learning and responsibilities to their students. As previously mentioned (p. 161), developing the educator as a reflective practitioner is foregrounded in recent policy documents (For example, The Teaching Council, 2020). Research undertaken by student teachers should "inform and refine the student teachers' understanding of their own pedagogical and reflective practices", thus giving the student teacher an opportunity to better understand their own capability for reflection (The Teaching Council, 2020, p. 19).

Reflection as an approach to research and a result of engaging in research is instinctively appealing. The reflective practitioner stops and thinks, approaching "teaching dilemmas by constructing and studying their narrative accounts and the narrative accounts of others" (Britzman, 2003, pp. 238–239) in an effort to try to better understand and to care for people and for ideas. Educators beginning their career with an appreciation of the professionalism of self-reflection and critical reflection is powerful. As Deborah Britzman argues, in the classroom, "sensitive practices" may develop through an awareness of "the specificity and contingency of the stories" and by extension the people encountered in everyday life (Britzman, 2003, p. 239). Thus, the subject-object relation between students and teachers, teachers and management, school communities and academic ones is usefully disrupted and reconceptualised as partnership (Ibid.). In short, fostering reflection suggests for the educator a rich, thoughtful, and considerate way of life in the world of the school.

What do student teachers see when they reflect? By reflecting as required during initial teacher education, it is possible for student teachers to perceive nothing more than the reflection of themselves as teacher through the standard processes and predictable challenges. Reflection is something outside, a "strict line… within a standardising context" (Galea, 2012, p. 256) to be followed as a pathway to qualification. The very strategies that Britzman describes as opportunities for student teachers to access "how practice makes practice" (Britzman, 2003, p. 239), to tap into the very essence of the in-school experience during initial teacher education, are "being levelled out by attempts at systemizing the practice [of reflection], of routinizing it, of removing the very possibilities for teachers in reflecting their practice in alternative ways as well as expressing their knowledge of teaching" (Galea, 2012, p. 246). Where attempts to promote reflective practices succeed the complexity of experience can be diminished by "'how to' manuals" and efforts to conventionalise

reflection towards accreditation (Galea, 2012, p. 246). On a local level, students may reflect only so far as to confirm their own prior beliefs or to fulfil the (perceived) expectations of their mentor or tutor, reflecting "sameness" and "systematizing systems" (Galea, 2012, p. 252). All this moves student teachers towards an impression that "reflection" is something one *actions*. It is a box to tick, a section of a lesson plan to complete, and it stands apart from "reflective" as a professional characteristic or an educational capability.

Reflection, like research itself, has a dual meaning in initial teacher education: the reflective practitioner reflects. It is both appropriate to think in this way and dangerous, as creeping oversight calls for evidence both of who the educator is and of what they do. This is now the case as teacher education programmes are required to integrate "reflection" into every aspect of what they do and so seek evidence of reflective practice from student teachers towards their qualification (The Teaching Council, 2020). Teacher educators are called to be capable of reflection, as there is always the danger of universalisation legitimising standardisation in the name of equity and replicability of experience. Assessment so conceived is a blunt-force measure of the instances of perceived criticality in required reflective assignments.

Anna, a student teacher in Malta who shared her experience of reflection during initial teacher education, drew attention to the danger of assessing reflective pieces as "proof of… professional development" (Galea, 2012, p. 256). Similarly, McGarr and McCormack, writing in the Irish initial teacher education context, describe the outcomes of initial efforts to regularise reflection as research. The students involved had extensive practice of reflection integrated into their programme as well as the opportunity to "explore reflective practice in detail and examine differing ways in which reflection takes place" (McGarr & McCormack, 2014, p. 269). The opportunity to reflect on issues outside their own practice, such as "social and cultural factors that influence schools" was provided, and criticality was encouraged, not least through grading criteria which reflected critical reflection as a priority (McGarr & McCormack, 2014, p. 269). However, it was the formal requirement to reflect during their final in-school experience which was considered here. Towards assessment of their in-school experience, the student teachers were "required to reflect on their teaching/experience and record their reflection in written form as part of a teaching portfolio", and were also asked to

explore and critique "the school as a learning organisation" as a separate but related assignment (McGarr & McCormack, 2014, p. 269). In an effort to shift student reflection from the typical descriptive/narrative to a critical mode, new "reflective writing guidelines" were introduced, and the number of reflections required reduced (McGarr & McCormack, 2014, p. 270). The authors were guided throughout by Stephen Brookfield's conceptualisation of the critical teacher (Brookfield, 2017). For Brookfield the critical teacher has built into their practice "the habit of constantly trying to identify, and check, the assumptions that inform [their] actions as teachers", primarily in order to "help [them] take more informed actions" on behalf of their students (Brookfield, 2017, pp. 4–5). This educator looks and looks again, at their community and context, and back at themselves, in order to proceed educationally. They are capable of attending without and reflecting within.

Inadvertently, the results of this study exemplify the point – the warning perhaps – that Brookfield makes on the opening page of *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. Here he writes that there is always the potential for teaching to reify the status quo, "by strengthening whatever mechanisms of social control are in place and deepening students' apathy and conformism" (Brookfield, 2017, p. 1). The aim in reforming reflective practice in this ITE programme, at least according to McGarr and McCormack (2014), was greater criticality and depth of reflection. To this end the students were given more time and more guidance. Far from the criticality hoped for, however, generic rubrics generated generic responses. The students' reflections showed that they understand the in-school experience during ITE to be their opportunity to learn *to* teach, in contrast to the programme elements outside of the school where they learn *about* teaching. Their dual experience of teaching, being taught by the environment and teaching themselves, made integration and conformity within the school the aim and directed their criticality away from themselves and from the world of the school (McGarr & McCormack, 2014).

While the student teachers' narratives of coming-of-age and survival are real and important, they are a superficial and performative interpretation of reflection and show a lack of understanding as to why reflection as research matters to the school community. They show that students work hard to understand the world of the school and to do well in it. They strive to fulfil their responsibilities to their students, colleagues and to themselves, expressing hope

and commitment in the face of complex challenges (For example, McGarr & McCormack, 2014, p. 273). McGarr and McCormack (2014) wonder whether the nature of their prompts were at fault in not eliciting reflections they consider to be critical, if the context of the school is an inappropriate moment to encourage criticality, or whether initial teacher education is too early in an educator's trajectory for reflection of the sort desired. They suggest that the presence of "the assessor" (McGarr & McCormack, 2014, p. 277) could have inhibited students, or could it have been the written medium; might they have been more critical in interviews separate from the structures of their programme?

Though these questions are all worth thinking about, I would argue that they mask a deeper, normative consideration which is hinted at in the authors' suggestions for future research. Such work might comprise "conducting interviews with student teachers in order to gain an understanding of their perspective on the reflections, *what they view the purpose of the reflections as*, who they are writing for, and how comfortable they feel being fully open and honest within the written pieces" (McGarr & McCormack, 2014, p. 278, emphasis added). Clarity on the purpose of "the reflections" is one thing, but I would suggest further that a more pressing concern is gaining perspective on what is understood by all involved as the purpose of reflective practice in the life of the educator. The students are to be commended and the reforms were important and had good intentions, but both were fundamentally undermined by the absence of a clear, educationally meaningful reason underpinning the enterprise. I would argue that these problems will persist as long as student teachers do not understand why they, as educators, should be capable of research as reflection.

My key point here is that a rethinking of reflection as *capability* (something the educator is rather than something the educator does) is paramount. Where contexts and practices are clearly educational, the iterative, open, interested qualities of reflection are encouraged, and the struggles, tentativeness and essential incompleteness of teacher education are worked with rather than against. This suggests a different type of criticality. It is a shift from critique to commitment, something more akin to Maxine Greene's "wide-awakeness" (Greene, 1977, p. 121). Done well, the cyclicality of the educational task is reflected in approaches to research such as reflection, resisting efforts to complete, fix or linearise.

Simone Galea, drawing on the philosophy of Luce Irigaray, suggests that reflective practice which has become a mirroring, or a perpetuation of sameness can be reinvented by using it "against itself" through cyclical patterns of repetition (Galea, 2012, p. 254). By taking the reflected and re-reflecting the details and differences, eliminated by once-off systematic approaches which seek uniformity, have an opportunity to emerge. Galea's is a feminine, non-linear approach, akin to Noddings' insistence that care is not completed until the cared-for reflects their acknowledgment of care back to the one who strives to care. In other words, to revive reflection as capability calls for an openness to the habitual and the routine, and a striving for depth and honesty over fulfilment of systemic expectations. It speaks to Maxine Greene's assertion that asking students "to tell their stories, to pose their own questions, to be present – from their own perspectives – to the common world", calls for sincere listening and "imaginative action many times" from those asking (Greene, 2000, p. 34). In both cases, reflection is a repeated relation, a cycling back to the self and the other from an orientation of appreciation.

Research, as listening but particularly as motivational response, is a capability of the reflective practitioner. In the studies I have focused on here, the power of student biographies, school norms and programme expectations are recognised as impinging on the student teacher's capability to reflect. Deborah Britzman suggests that in order to push back against what she terms as "institutional biography" the student teacher must learn "skills such as observation, taking on the perspective of others, identifying one's own deep investments in relation to others… raising questions" (Britzman, 2003, p. 239) which echo strongly the phases of listening, motivational displacement and response constitutive of Care. Considering themselves as a researcher shifts the teacher from the impossible position of expert to one of inquirer, employing methodologies which include the entire school community and open the world of the school, allowing "everyone involved [to] imagine who they are becoming" (Britzman, 2003, p. 239) and live as reflective practitioners.

Galea writes of her students encountering "viscous" educational contexts, offering a balance of richness and fluidity to "refract teaching rather than merely reflect it" through the provision and encouragement of varied reflective practices (Galea, 2012, p. 256). She gives the example of Anna, who we met earlier (p. 182), an undergraduate student teacher in her

final year who has become capable of reflecting both on her practice as a student teacher, and on her practice of reflection itself through thinking and writing reflectively. Anna's doubts "were not only concerned with the limitations of imposed forms of reflection but also to the possibilities of articulating the limitations. Would she take the risk of being considered against reflection?" (Galea, 2012, p. 256). Clearly Anna's criticality of reflection reflects her capability as a reflective practitioner but her fears are well founded given the high status the process of reflection has in initial teacher education today. To foster this capability, the educational space explicitly valued a diversity of views on and understandings of the reflective, and yet it was only after graduation that she felt comfortable penning her thoughts.

Through open spaces, inclusive attitudes and reflective research "it becomes more difficult to take the dynamics of classroom life for granted" and the educator is challenged to articulate reasons for the previously inarguable or obvious (Britzman, 2003, p. 239). Linking to my previous chapter (p. 111), I would suggest in this context that their Biestian *subject-ness* comes to the fore, as the educator recognises their own significance as interpreter and theorist of their own assumptions and the systemic norms they perpetuate. Life is lived "wide-awake" and the fact that "things are always more complicated than they at first appear" cannot be ignored (Brookfield, 2017, p. 2).

Britzman highlights the extent of support student teachers need in order to work towards becoming personally and professionally reflective researchers, and beginning to engage theory to better understand the lived reality of the school they are grounded in. As such, student teachers and teacher educators need both a clear understanding of why becoming capable of reflection as research is encouraged, as well as a clear conceptual path to follow. Such a path is open enough to allow for potentialities, for "questions that attend to the possible and acknowledge the uncertainty of our educational lives" (Britzman, 2003, p. 241). Going beyond the ubiquitous functional aims of creating critical, reflective practitioners in order to see better outcomes in schools, those interested and engaged in initial teacher education may come to a more appreciative orientation towards research and reflection as a capability of the educator. To do so, as I argue in the next section, educators need to nurture Uncertainty as an educational capability.

Uncertainty

First,
despair of what you know.
It will not be enough.
It is not of the right kind.
You are as unprepared
as you fear.

Rebecca Lynne Fullan, extract from *How To Be A Teacher*
(Cooper et al., 2021, p. 17)

Horatio: O day and night, but this is wonderous strange!
Hamlet: And therefore as a stranger give it welcome.
There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

William Shakespeare, *Hamlet* Act 1 Scene 5 lines 164-167
(Shakespeare, 1986, p. 66)

Throughout Nel Noddings' philosophy is a sense that to be capable of care is to be prepared in oneself to be open to the other and to the world. Noddings does not address uncertainty explicitly or use this word as a concept in her philosophy; however, *choice*, *possibility*, *the unanswerable* and *resistance to universalisation* are persistent themes (For example, see Noddings, 2013, pp. 5, 11, 77). In line with her expressed belief that shifts in vocabulary enrich our thinking and have the potential to "lead to more enlightened practice" as educators (Noddings, 2007, p. 207), I hope Nel Noddings would not mind my reading Uncertainty as a caring capability in her writing and foregrounding this term as central to her work.

Care, like shifts in vocabulary, does not solve our problems or tell us what to do. Indeed "much of what is most valuable in the teaching-learning relationship cannot be specified and

certainly not prespecified" and there is no need, in Noddings' conceptualisation, for care to be described in order to know that it has been the nature of the relation (Noddings, 2013, p. 19). Instead, care and caring relations support us, they "ground the possibility to enter [a] space of ambiguity and ontological flux", so that we might be capable of resisting notions of the certain or the fixed (Green & Gary, 2016, p. 60). Furthermore, to be capable of Uncertainty is to embrace educational research. Winch et al. (2015) identify "a widespread, popular expectation that educational research is only worthwhile when it produces certainty about what to do" as a particular challenge in articulating the significance and value of research in the life of the educator (Winch et al., 2015, p. 212). They highlight the importance of recognising the situated, fallible and contestable in educational research, and taking care before suggesting conclusions or evaluating impact (Ibid.). Honesty and reasonableness are called for in ascertaining the level of certainty appropriate in educational contexts, which implies that the research-based, reflective educator be capable of Uncertainty.

Etymologically, certainty is a question of confidence. Capability, also, is the intersection between confidence and competence. A person is "fully confident in [their] knowledge or judgement" if they are certain, while to be uncertain is to be "not fully confident" (Etymology Dictionary [online], 2021c). Uncertainty, then, is a state of partial or incomplete *confidence* in what we know or in a decision we are called upon to make. It is, I suggest, characterised by self-awareness and by pause. It is a moment of unsettled confidence, similar to doubting one's memory, which will be educative or not depending on our openness to the feeling. When I feel my knowledge or my judgement is not firm what do I do? Am I capable of Uncertainty, of living this feeling and using it to ask better questions? Or do I resort to principle, standard and abstraction to defend myself?

Consider the student teacher who excelled in their subject area at undergraduate level and is passionate about sharing that love in the classroom. Studying comes easy to them and their success translates challenges into puzzles to be worked out. Faced with thirty students in a mixed-ability classroom the student teacher emerges fazed. The simple variety of response to the lesson, the levels of interest and engagement, of warmth and hostility, leave our student teacher unsure what they will do in class tomorrow. While drawing confidence from

their knowledge and love of their subject, the students emerge as collectively and individually unknown and this has shaken the nascent educator's sense of certainty. Where to from here? It is possible to return to solid ground by staying with the abstract. The scheme of work is clear, so our student teacher has the choice to play by the book and overlook the complex reality glimpsed in the classroom. In choosing this prescribed, system-oriented approach the student teacher can be certain that they are, in a functional sense, fulfilling their role. However, as I have been suggesting throughout this chapter, this functionality on its own does not capture the potential of the educator. Rather, what is important is their capability to be interested – to respond to this particular classroom and the challenges it poses. This is the way of the research-based, reflective, and caring educator, capable of Uncertainty.

By valuing engagement with uncertainty, we may empower student teachers to live and work in educational worlds. This is a middle ground, developed out of care for the student teacher and their educational future. I do not believe that the appropriate response to a student teacher's sense of trepidation or hesitancy is recourse to strong principles or dismissal with reference to a future where they will be fine. Pushing through their worries does not help them become better at living in the educational world where they will encounter the worries of myriad others. Rather, in working to prepare student teachers for lives lived as educators, those interested and engaged in initial teacher education would do better, I suggest, to take seriously the tone of Rebecca Lynne Fullan in the extract from *How To Be A Teacher* quoted at the opening of this section (Cooper et al., 2021). It is in a humility and honesty such a Fullan's, "in the relaxation of the detached and objective self, in this engrossment, that the one- caring assumes her full individuality in relatedness" (Noddings, 2013, p. 60). In assuming this individuality the caring educator will need to think, and in order to think well they will need to seek and wonder, in short, to research. Rather than seeking strong answers the educator capable of Uncertainty strives to ask better questions and engage across a "wide range of fact and feeling" (Noddings, 2013, p. 25). Approaching uncertainty as a research-based educator is to care, and to appreciate the contribution to supporting student teachers Noddings' model of care can make.

In addition to the reasons to educate towards becoming capable of Uncertainty, uncertainty itself is educational. To consider the educative potential of uncertainty I turn now to the

writings of Richard Smith on “the virtues of unknowing” (Smith, 2016b). Smith’s unknowing individual is a “responsibilist… an active individual who is part of a community to which he or she has obligations and from which he or she derives norms and examples” (Smith, 2016b, p. 274). Additionally, in this community, it matters *how* this person is unknowing. Being capable of Uncertainty allows unknowing to be a natural, educative state. It is an embodied state of being, prepared to do the work of seeking understanding, having the patience to live life without answers, asserting confidently and with interest ‘I don’t understand what you’re going through, but I would like to try’. The one cared-for offers “an invitation to see things from an alternative perspective” as distinct from “a set of knowledge claims to be tested” (Noddings, 2013, p. 32). In each of these examples the individual prioritises relation, receptivity and research, giving value “to [living] with the mystery that is the other person” as an educative endeavour (Smith, 2016b, p. 277).

Smith writes of the seeming impossibility of living this way in the contemporary world of the school, where all learning outcomes are preordained and the educator can admit to no possible gap in their knowledge. All this is off the subject, but is still dangerous to the relation through its neglect, or worse, denial, that there is any relation for the educator to concern themselves with (Smith, 2016b). Yet care is a central principle of initial teacher education and ubiquitous in school ethos (The Teaching Council, 2020). Receptivity is not a claim to knowledge; it is a claim to feeling which is prior to and independent of assessment.

As Agamben points out, the art of living in relation is “the capacity to keep ourselves in harmonious relationship with that which escapes us” (Agamben, 2010, p. 114), as capable of Uncertainty. It might be difficult to imagine as a capability. How can uncertainty be part of who a person is in a positive sense? I would argue here that uncertainty is qualitatively different from not knowing or failing to ready oneself. Rather, when moving in an uncertain way, we are called to resist the allure of the strong, the risk-free, and be honest about the uncertain and complex world of the school. Furthermore, uncertainty is not the same as irresponsibility. The educator who bluffs is unsettling in a manner similar to the one who claims to know everything. Neither is capable of educational care. On the contrary the caring, interested educator committed to research accepts openly that there is more on heaven and earth than they have imagined. Uncertainty is imaginative and open to the realm of

possibility. Its imaginative nature defends it from accusations of ignorance, neglect or self-deception. Noddings writes of finding joy in receptivity and this joy as helping us to want to understand ourselves better, sustaining us in caring for others and revealing the basic reality of our relations in its emergence or failure to emerge (Noddings, 2013). In uncertainty the educator welcomes the "wonderous strange" drawing on their commitment to care towards developing a reflective research base, to try to understand better through listening, motivational displacement, and response.

Uncertainty brings research from authority to humility. A research-based educator keeps watch over their own knowingness. They keep stock, not only of what they know but of the sources they draw on and deem to be credible. This is important "precisely because our inquiry is not disinterested" (Florio-Ruane, 2002, p. 207); we research because we care, and in order to care better. The reflective practitioner thinks critically about their educational research:

> Critical reflection on our own practice as researchers helps us assume responsibility for the questions we ask, the investigative methods we use, and the answers we devise. This self-monitoring activity is important for responsible research in an applied field such as ours. It helps us to be modest and circumspect in our claims to truth and reminds us to balance rigorous search for knowledge with responsiveness to problems of practice.
>
> (Florio-Ruane, 2002, p. 207).

When we listen, displace motivation and respond we research, carefully mindful of the balance between what we know and do not know, and that which is unknowable. Research in a model of care proceeds self-consciously and requires the educator to be capable of Uncertainty and sustain a sense of self as they try to better understand others and the world.

It is *faith* Noddings calls on to describe the capability to believe in that of which we are uncertain (Noddings, 2013). For example, the carer needs to have faith in the response of the cared-for. The essential variability of response is part of its authenticity. It is this "free response that represents a major intrinsic reward of teaching" and its elimination through the imposition of rubrics may well, Noddings suggests and I would agree, contribute to teacher

anxiety and burnout (Ibid.). Without spontaneous and spirited response the classroom is a lonely place. Openness to uncertainty of response is essential to maintain the carer in that position and in relation, and to renew them.

The transformation which caring brings about may be difficult to put into words and "in a relationship of genuine caring there is no felt need on either part to specify what sort of transformation has taken place" (Noddings, 2013, p. 20) The one caring does not generalise towards judgement by some predetermined rule or principle as "this move to abstraction… tends to destroy the uniqueness of the caring itself" (Noddings, 2013, p. 33), rather they respect the reality of the cared-for's reception of their efforts to care as a sphere of uncertainty, and have faith. In this way Noddings pushes back against the forces of assessment in education which would look for ways to measure receptivity and care. Noddings uses "traditional" to describe educators who advocate "classical (or disciplinary) education and to the current proponents of test-based accountability" (Noddings, 2005, p. xiii). The distinction Noddings makes is between these educators and progressive educators who believe that education should be expansive, and be responsive to the student, their context and the world they live in. It is not a matter of choice between accountability and responsibility, rather a question of which is the motivating factor. Noddings holds that "the responsiveness characteristic of caring" should be "more basic than accountability" in educational systems and thinking (Ibid.). The caring educator "may ultimately decide that some things in life, and in education, must be undertaken and sustained by faith and not by objective evaluation" (Noddings, 2013, p. 22), and these include caring and creativity.

To be capable of Uncertainty is to view not fully knowing as an opportunity. Recognising anxiety and resisting denial, the capable educator approaches uncertainty in curiosity. They will employ this capability to steady themselves as they move through the phases of care. Being capable of Uncertainty is to value research, to see the gestures of seeking and wondering as characteristic of the everyday life of educators rather than the remove of formal educational research. They recognise the danger in certainty, the impossibility of being fully confident in one's knowledge or judgement. More than this, they see value in being uncertain, recognising that "the epistemically admirable person - one who stands well with regard to knowledge and related goods—may sometimes be one who does not know" (Smith, 2016b,

p. 276). Uncertainty as an educational capability is open, generous, and kind to the self and to others. It is inherently humble. And it is not afraid of being proven wrong or of the hard work of care for the self and others in the complex educational world.

Section 3　In Place of Conclusion, Culmination

Chapter 6 The Capability of The Ordinary

Introduction

> The wish to be extraordinary, exceptional, unique, thus reveals the wish to be ordinary, everyday... One can think of romanticism as the discovery that the everyday is an exceptional achievement. Call it the achievement of the human.
>
> (Cavell, 1979, p. 466).

There is a significant moment of convergence in the philosophies of Gert Biesta, Stanley Cavell and Nel Noddings. All three call on us to live together in the here and now, the real world, the everyday. They value language as it is lived and privilege humility over authority. Cavell labels this space – this phenomenon – as 'the ordinary' (Cavell, 1988), and in this final chapter I will claim The Ordinary as a distinctive capability of the educator which draws together the guiding themes of Voice, Risk and Care. To be capable of The Ordinary calls on every resource I have thus far discussed – Acknowledgment and Autobiography, Imagination and Interruption, Uncertainty and Attention – and invites the educator to live in a way that is oriented appreciatively towards the real world of the school.

Cavell has described the ordinary as one of the "main beasts in [his] jungle or wilderness of ideas" (Cavell, 1988, p. 153), beasts which typically roam unrestricted, untamed by definition. Throughout his body of philosophical work, he intuits "[the] ordinariness of human life, and of human life's avoidance of the ordinary" (Cavell, 1988, p. 154) as significant. The ordinary recognises that we desire to assert ourselves in the world, drawing on the power of being commonly understood, and that we despair of such an understanding which would allow individuals and communities to "word the world" (Ibid.) together. It is necessary, Cavell claims, to recognise the "forever fantastic" in the everyday, the ever-changing, unstable nature of humans, beyond philosophical interest. It is a living concern, and so a concern of education. It is threatened by scepticism which Cavell formulates as "a relation to the world, and to others, and to myself, and to language" which is melancholic, desperate, and without interest (Cavell, 1988, p. 155). I recognise in Cavell's descriptions of the ordinary a call to be capable of life's complexity, and to be capable of hope as a response – a defence perhaps – against this sceptical relation to the world.

This narrative of complexity resists the either-or, the idea that educators have to choose between openness and control. This is not to say that control is absent. Rather, in a system respected for its complexity, control is dispersed and it appears in myriad forms. There is the opportunity for disruption, interpretation and newness. Relation is paramount and as such "it is not centralised direction that furnishes the system with any level of coherence, but the competition and co-operation among the economy's constituent agents" (Mason, 2008, p. 42), which encourage research, Acknowledgement and Imagination. I have previously drawn on Simone Weil's philosophy, the reverence for trying to understand and for respecting the essential incompleteness of our understanding central to her thinking. In the face of limitations and the unknowable, the educator is guided towards "deliberation, compromise, solicitation, even retreat" but never tempted to put principle before people (Noddings, 2013, p. 110). In order to relate educatively, this essential unknowability is to be respected. Cavell writes that "there are special problems about our knowledge of another… And these problems can be said to invoke a special concept of knowledge, or region of the concept of knowledge, one which is not a function of certainty" (Cavell, 2002, p. 238). In contrast to training or reproduction, education is an event which may or may not happen, and if it does it may or may not proceed as planned. This is what Gert Biesta terms the "beautiful risks of education" (Biesta, 2020b, p. 101), namely that in educational engagement the progress of students, the outcomes of experience and the educator themselves are all at stake. These risks are necessary and desirable, and they are beautiful, because in their absence education is reduced to 'systems of strength' where functional, input-output models prevail. The weak is life; the strong is the structure imposed upon life.

There is of course a role for strong systems. However, without dimensions of the weak, the risky and the unpredictable education remains at a remove from its human nature. Efforts to do away with Risk amount to wishing our educational reality away, exhibiting "a fundamental misunderstanding of what education is and what makes education "work", and a "misguided impatience that has resulted in the medicalization of education" (Biesta, 2013, p. 3). This is exemplified by privileging guidance over mentorship, establishing clinical schools, and the administration of research as panacea. In place of this impatience, I would argue, educators need to find a way to be curious and to be spacious, to be capable of asking different

questions, including asking questions of themselves, and to seek response in a more careful way. I term this the capability of The Ordinary, and invoke complexity and hope as key.

To open this consideration it is necessary to understand Cavell's 'ordinary', the delicate balance of ecstasy and *ennui* it describes (Cavell, 2012), the freedom everydayness affords, and the risk that life is overlooked as it is lived. Cavellian scholars Sandra Laugier and Naoko Saito will be central here. I turn then to complexity and its reduction, as explored particularly in the work of Gert Biesta and Deborah Osberg, and to hope, in conversation with Paolo Freire. Care as a prior commitment runs throughout and so will the influence of Nel Noddings. To close I consider a number of moments in language and in life where initial teacher education reform has come to infringe on the student teacher's development towards becoming capable of The Ordinary. These are moments where the words and lives of those interested and engaged in initial teacher education are incomprehensible to each other. I hope to suggest ordinary ways to make sense to each other.

The Ordinary

The ordinary is "hidden by being kept in plain view, as if a little too self-evident, a little too plain to notice, as it were beneath notice, say under the nose" (Cavell, 1988, p. 164). These are the features of life which are both obvious and difficult to pin down. As such, we might say that Voice, Risk and Care are all ordinary concepts in initial teacher education. In the case of Care, for example, it is inarguable that teachers should care in an appropriate way, but describing educational care is slippery. Cavell writes that the ordinary makes sense of the world for us and makes sense of us in the world; it is that on which our own sense depends (Cavell, 1994). Following this understanding, we might say that a student teacher develops a sense of the world as an educator, and a sense of their educational self in the world during their time in school. They begin to experience the norms, language and relations which are everyday to an educator and over time become ordinary to the world of the school (Cavell, 1994).

Ordinary language philosophy insists that the speaker "must stand behind or be present in [their] words", resisting "systematic suppression by the foregrounding of impersonal third-person utterance" (Saito & Standish, 2014, p. 3), of impersonal assumptions or engagement distanced by rubric and the prescribed. Their words must make sense to them and be sensible in the world. This is an insistence that we think for and speak for ourselves, in community. Everyday problems and questions are encountered as needing consideration, cycles of solution and re-solution which demand commitment rather than efficiency. Ordinary life is difficult to live, challenging us to return and re-return to that which is so close to us it is "beneath our eyes" (Laugier, 2015a, p. 1044; Mahon & McHugh, 2016, p. 461).

Supporting student teachers to be capable of The Ordinary develops the individual educator and the educational community, bringing them into relation – as I have been suggesting throughout this thesis – with their educational self and the educational world. In school there is the opportunity for student teachers to be taught and to learn "to hear ordinary language, and thus, to speak it – *to mean what we say*… to be the subject of one's words – which is the ability to speak common language and to enter or inhabit the human form of life" (Laugier,

2015b, p. 68). Such an achievement is both very simple and immensely challenging. It is impossible to assess conclusively and dependent upon respect of this impossibility.

As Cavell might argue, expressing ourselves and owning that expression means allowing ourselves to be comprehended. We can deny this comprehension, of course, but in this denial we risk giving up our subject-ness (Biesta, 2013; Cavell, 1979). What this might mean in practice is a certain level of openness to those around us. It might mean showing our vulnerability in public. Instead of defaulting to rules or standards, the student teacher stays with both the particular and the general as facets of the ordinary. They work to better understand, with a view to making this ordinary *their* ordinary and this world *their* world. The tension between the functional and the concrete does not disappear. It instead calls educators back to take responsibility for their voice in the world, to be awake to the sources and forces that act upon them. This taking of responsibility – this refusing to take for granted that meaningful relationships will be achieved without profound effort on behalf of the self – goes to the very heart of Noddings' work, and to the work of Biesta and Cavell.

The ordinary is lived, as we stand, in the attempt to understand and to take seriously life, language, and the other as they present themselves. On this understanding, we come to better know the ordinary and ourselves through careful attention. Existence in any other sense is functional, lacking the richness of the ordinary world; "morality is that world, and so are force and love; so is art and a part of knowledge (the part which is about the world); and so is religion (wherever God is)" (Cavell, 2002, p. 40), all these elements of the world which are rooted in relation, in Voice, Risk and Care. For example, Noddings' commitment to Care, which is always understood as prior, or as coming before, is rooted in the ordinary. The commitment is not reconsidered or interpreted when the call to care arises; rather, as prior, the commitment to care is ordinary.

Coming to the school from an ethic of care echoes an ethic of alterity as "we seek to enhance the other's growth but we do not threaten the other's Otherness, and we do not define for another exactly what he or she must do or be" (Noddings, 2007, p. 234). An ethic of care opens up the experience of school in the life of the student teacher, so that they might seek an understanding in a supported but open and unpredictable sense. To this end, the student

teacher goes to school with particular points of reference established, their HEI tutor and in-school mentor, but without an agenda for understanding in the form of prescribed rubrics or hypotheses. Their mode of research is receptivity, beginning in care and opening to wonder in the educational context.

Naoko Saito writes that the ordinary is both personal and more than personal. It gives expression to the individual but only so far as that individual reveals themselves to be part of something bigger; in Saito's own formulation: "Cavell's ordinary language philosophy has the perspective of participation into language community, where the individual voice is embedded in 'our' voice" (Saito, 2004, p. 82). This is a voice both ordinary to me and comprehensible to you in your everyday life. Thus, Cavell's ordinary language draws together voices and commits them to communities of meaning. His philosophy proceeds from "When we say… we mean…" rather than individual or argumentative formulations (Cavell, 2002, p. 3). To find our voice we set out from home "'home' in the literal sense of the place where we live our ordinary lives, and 'home' in the metaphorical sense of what is most true to our heart" (Saito, 2004, pp. 86–87), from the place we may be found at a given moment in our lives. Again, what is in question here is an ongoing commitment to transparency – to *making ourselves understood by others*. Such commitment, for Cavell at least, embodies the only meaningful response to scepticism.

The student teacher arriving to school for the first time during initial teacher education sets out from the 'home' of their prior educational experience as a school-age student and as a student of education in the university. On arrival, they seek a voice capable of participation as an educator in the everyday world of the school. Saito describes how Cavell draws attention to the "crisis of the condition of voicelessness and hence the human capacity to be able to speak again" (Saito, 2004, p. 87). The communities of which they will be a part are necessarily yet to come. The ordinary exists in relation, in "the oblique and casual… the accidental, the contingent", and in education, as "it is only in this ordinary world that I can change, metamorphose myself", teach and be taught (Laugier, 2015a, p. 1047). The educator becoming capable of the ordinary lets the question hang in the air, resisting the urge to appropriate the space. They see the event of education, that risky moment of growth and change which may or may not happen, as bidirectional between teacher and student. Thus

educational engagement is appropriate to explore and describe, rather than delineate and prescribe.

In Cavell's rich understanding of the term, the ordinary is found in the intersection between the familiar and the strange, the life as lived and the language used in living. As "the ordinary is the search for a new land to discover and explore, then to describe" (Laugier, 2015a, p. 1042), it needs to be decided upon. In the moment prior to decision is a pause, a moment when the phrase under consideration as ordinary language is sent out into the world and made foreign. In that moment, where the ordinary emerges in relation, the phrase is not freed of its baggage but given a second chance to mean something in a given life. In other words, the emergence of the ordinary pushes back against jargon and universalisation. It insists that language is personal, and is personal to the individual life as it is lived. Cavell's ordinary has its roots in the writing of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau, their claim for America's right to assert itself and come to understand what it means, as a nation – rather than merely accept or inherit an understanding of itself and its significance.

Committing to ordinary language is uncomfortable. When what we say is important there is an instinct to seek a source external to ourselves, one more powerful perhaps or more permanent, which will back up our words or even speak for us.

In contrast, it is a signature claim of Cavell's work that we, as Sandra Laugier puts it, return all thought "to the categories of the ordinary - the low, the close, the next - which precisely stand in opposition to the great and the remote, and allow for "knowing the meaning" of ordinary life" (Laugier, 2015a, p. 1042). On this understanding, ordinary language calls for the capability of Autobiography and owning one's own voice, as well as the capability of Uncertainty, of resisting the sense that we are undermined by openness to the world. Laugier describes this dual disquiet as coming down to one question for Cavell: "the question of the connexion of the I (my words) to the real (our world)" (Laugier, 2015b, p. 71). Becoming capable of The Ordinary calls on the educator to bring their words into the world and bring the world to bear on their words.

This comes with the fear of inexpressiveness, of course. It comes with the fear that our voice will not be heard or will be heard and but mean nothing, and the isolation which would ensue. It addresses subjectivity as a concern of language, "the relationship between an individual voice and a linguistic community" where we seek to be understood and to be a part by claiming our validity of voice and striving to strike the "right" tone (Laugier, 2015a, p. 1040). This is a lifelong endeavour, an ethical encounter with the other calling on the individual and the community to mean what they say. Donna Haraway's consideration of cultivating "response-ability" is useful here as she endeavours to simultaneously communicate a process of development, an activity and a commitment to an open way of life (Haraway, 2016, p. 130). It is "mundane, earth-bound" (Ibid.), ordinary, as well as unending, risky and always at stake. Thus, the capability of The Ordinary is a shift from authority to humility. It is a shift from pinning features down and claiming them as common to valuing commonality as the basis on which we relate. The educator capable of The Ordinary recognises the impossibility of generalisation or correctness as the roots of relation. The ordinary is what we share, so becoming capable of The Ordinary brings the educator into communities of life and of language, in their complexity and their hopefulness.

A moment of complex conflict arises when programmes of initial teacher education, with the best interests of the student teacher at heart, prescribe rubrics for their interaction with the world of the school. These might be for use during interactions with their tutor, the school community or to interpret educational research, and vary in form from loose guiding questions to tightly structured scaffolds. The danger is that the fulfilment of such rubrics become an end in themselves.

Susan Florio-Ruane proposes "scaffolding" as a means to foster exploration, giving participants something to rely on as they build (Florio-Ruane, 2001, p. 125). This brings to mind the poem *Scaffolding* by Seamus Heaney (2016) as he writes that, though great care and attention are paid to putting appropriate supports in place at the beginning and maintained throughout the build, that ultimately, appropriately, "all this comes down when the job's done" (Heaney, 2016, p. 50). The poem can be read in many ways, but it appears important to me that Heaney is both aware of the importance of the sense of security gained when the masons "Make sure that planks won't slip at busy points/ Secure all ladders, tighten bolted

joints" (Ibid.) and the importance of ultimately letting those scaffolds fall. Heaney insists on having confidence in the scaffolding so that there will be confidence in the wall. Eveline Pye has written a poem also entitled *Scaffolding* (Cooper et al., 2021), where she brings these imperatives to the classroom. She describes the importance of students trusting that their teacher is really there for them, attending to their thoughts and confusions, walking with them step by step. Just when it seems that Pye is about to celebrate her role -

> Sometimes all I gift
> is one new thought like…
> "Dividing *can* make
> a number bigger",
> and it's as if I see
> their minds inflate

she makes a profoundly different point:

> It's like blowing air
> into someone else's lungs.
> You have to stop
> as soon as you can.
>
> You need them
> to breathe again
> - all on their own.

(Ibid., p. 60-61)

Scaffolding, rubrics and guidelines, live to fade away. They are not the point, and when they become the point those engaged are deprived of the opportunity to become confident and, thus, capable. Development stalls at qualification, fulfilment of requirements and competence. Scaffolds allow growth, they should support the mentorship relation in venturing further than it naturally or comfortably would have and then fall away. In this way, the student teacher is supported at the time by scaffolds, and in the future by the confidence

they gained in letting supports go. In this way, supports are put in place towards their redundancy rather than as requirements for fulfilment. One may rely on scaffolding in the moment but it is not intended to become a permanent fixture; the purpose of scaffolding is to support and as Pye puts it so beautifully "You have to stop/as soon as you can" (Cooper et al., 2021, p. 61).

When educators stop structuring stimulus, or response, complexity is given space. Florio-Ruane writes that when the book club she founded shifted from a formal structure led by an instructor and assessed, "hot lava topics became more common. In contrast to our early meetings, we now referred to them by this name and acknowledged their presence and difficulty" (Florio-Ruane, 2001, p. 141). Participants found new avenues in order to approach these challenging topics such as race and class, and more readily did so. It was also easier to differ. There was not the same drive for consensus or understanding which can lead to a 'glossing over' of difference, and a privileging of conclusion over interpretation. In other words, when a discussion is not pointed in a particular direction it can go anywhere.

Encouraging student teachers to experience the world of the school rather than master it develops their capability of The Ordinary and calls on them to resist claiming comprehensive knowledge or understanding. Reality is lost "when, because, we clutch at it"; the ordinary becomes available when we "give up on this 'cognitive rapaciousness'", this clutching and clenching, and the pursuit of generality (Laugier, 2015a, p. 1046). Of course, there is a balance to be struck between scepticism and the ordinary. Where scepticism threatens to distance the educator from the educational world, from the world of the real and the other, or to lose that world to them altogether, the ordinary brings them back, closer to look at things small again. Too much time at either vantage point threatens to warp the educator's view. They need a healthy respect for the abstract and the concrete.

I would argue that to become capable of The Ordinary we are called upon to become capable of complexity and of hope. Sandra Laugier captures this capability well when she writes of the achievement of the ordinary as an ongoing effort to be "expressive", to be "public" (Laugier, 2015a, p. 1050). In Laugier's own formulation: "It is by claiming myself that my obscurity, my opacity to myself, becomes political and my confidence in myself becomes confidence in *us*,

in a plural self, selves - *because* I give myself to be heard by others. We must discover ourselves; that is we must first make ourselves obscure to ourselves" (Laugier, 2015a, pp. 1050–1051, author's emphasis) in order to come into relation in the everyday. The aim of relation is to lose ourselves, self-consciously, repeatedly so as to be encouraged to self-seek and renew. Through these cycles of uncertainty and attention, we find the aspects of ourselves that are dissonant, the complexities in ourselves, others and the world with which we struggle and to whom we commit. Commitment to that struggle is a commitment to community and to relation. Noddings' commitment to care is prior and progresses through iterations of holding open our self and being open to the other, while striving towards a better, though essentially incomplete, understanding.

In becoming capable of The Ordinary the educator strives to see the visible, that which is beneath their eyes, so close it risks being overlooked (Laugier, 2015a). In the context of the school, those familiar concepts of 'ethos' and 'inclusion', 'wellbeing' and 'resilience' are no longer held aloft to go unchallenged. To be capable of The Ordinary is to face educational norms and assumptions in all their complexity and bring them back to the everyday through thinking experientially and improvising to develop new forms of attention to the lived reality of the school. The educator is called upon to see the personal in the professional and commit to a practice of making the authoritative humble.

Of course, understanding the ordinary in this way asks a lot of the educator. It is not easy or simple to be capable of the everyday, every day. John Dewey believed in "the potentialities of education when it is treated as intelligently directed development of the possibilities inherent in ordinary experience" when educators put their belief in such potentialities faithfully into practice (Dewey, 1938, pp. 89–90). This is "strenuous and difficult", dependent upon commitment and co-operation which are, Dewey claims and I would agree, more difficult than sticking to a prescribed plan (Dewey, 1938, p. 90). These educational practices call for the educator's capabilities of Attention and Autobiography, of commitment to education as an event which is always at stake and dependent upon its ordinary, risky and open nature.

Sustaining the student teacher and supporting them towards sustaining themselves is a key consideration for those interested and engaged in initial teacher education. While resilience and the ability to 'bounce back' are essential considerations, sustenance is prior. The image of a gymnast on the balance beam comes to mind. There is no doubt that a safety mat is essential, as is the crew of medics ready to respond should there be a stumble or a fall, but the gymnast's practice in staying balanced takes precedence over learning what to do if they fall. There is a profound need to prepare student teachers towards keeping their balance from the outset, and understanding how much of educational capability relies on their appreciative orientation to the ordinary world of the school.

Complexity of the Ordinary

Complexity has variously been understood as "a vocabulary, a metaphor, a theory, a methodology… an ontology" (Biesta & Osberg, 2010, p. 2). Here I would like to suggest that the notion of complexity is a key contributor to the capability of The Ordinary. My suggestion is that an appreciation of 'complexity', understood in a philosophical sense, is a key component towards living and working in the ordinary. The educator capable of The Ordinary recognises education as complex in its humanity and its systems. They recognise that becoming, and being, a teacher involves the responsibility to engage with the complex – to be open to the difficult, and sometimes the obscure.

The first consideration of complexity in initial teacher education addressed here arises when we think about how student teachers communicate with those they encounter in school, in particular their relationship with the school student. Student voice is generally understood as emerging from strategies to engage students on their experiences in school, based on the premise that "that listening and responding to what pupils say about their experiences as learners can be a powerful tool in helping teachers to investigate and improve their own practice" (Flutter, 2007, p. 344) as well holding potential to guide systems of education in their development (for example McIntyre et al., 2005; Rudduck & Fielding, 2006; Skea, 2017; Charteris & Smardon, 2019). Though drawing on student voice may seem intuitive, it is a relatively new phenomenon in Ireland (Skerritt et al., 2021). Structured opportunities such as student surveys and interviews have begun to inform discussion, spark student-teacher dialogue, and offer "an important starting point in developing the art of teaching" (Flutter, 2007, p. 344).

There have been innovative approaches taken to engaging the voice of student teachers during initial teacher education. For example, in Elizabeth Anne Hopkins' 2014 study the method of enquiry into the perceptions of pre-service teachers was chosen for its potential to then be employed by these teachers in engaging with the voice of students throughout their careers (Hopkins, 2014). Hopkins' study endeavoured to find questions which would be meaningful to both student teachers and school students, elicit insightful responses and

"prompt their sustained engagement" (Hopkins, 2014, p. 18). Rather than a one-off survey or interview, the focus here was on developing a culture of consultation. The student teachers were, in effect, learning to consult by being consulted. These are rich and important engagements, however calling forth student voice through such structured strategies or interventions is just that – a limited consultation whereby students are asked questions and their responses come to constitute data. But what about the student teacher's experience of school student voice apart from formalised structures? How might we think of student voice in an everyday sense as initiative, as ordinarily significant?

Such a consideration, I suggest, begins in acknowledging the complexity of the school student/student teacher relationship. In moving away from the instrumental understanding of student voice, focus shifts to the presence of the school student in the education of the student teacher, what they mean to the nascent educator and why the school student matters during initial teacher education. One way to look at this is to consider how communication between the student teacher and school student differs from that between the student teacher and their mentor. Communication in this sense moves beyond the technical and instructive to the everyday, understood as "radically open, undetermined" so that communication becomes a "process of meaning and interpretation" (Biesta, 2013, p. 26), and profoundly educational.

In Chapter 3 I wrote extensively about the co-operative nature of communication between the student teacher and their in-school mentor, and its significance in supporting the student teacher to become capable of Voice. For Stanley Cavell, in cooperating there is a value placed on "a certain kind and degree of participation and forbearance, in which the limitation of mutual involvement is paramount and well defined" (Cavell, 2005a, p. 173). This sense of cooperative parties interested in a well-defined shared pursuit describes well the mentor and the student teacher. There is a knowingness to co-operation, wherein the goals of a project and the means to achieve those goals are explicitly shared.

Co-operation, Cavell writes, invokes the idea of working towards a common project or being free to pursue one's own (Cavell, 2005a), which is quite different to the relation between school student and student teacher. They too have a project in common, the education of the

school student, but in the same time and space the student teacher is at least as invested in their own education. Neither are free to pursue their own projects independently as success for one is bound up in the efforts of the other. Their communication is more akin, in Cavell's philosophy, to conversation between friends. His is a particular understanding of both friendship and what it means to converse.

While potentially present in cooperative relationships, conversation is a different register of communication. It emphasises "the opacity, or non-transparence, of the present state of our interactions" (Cavell, 2005a, p. 173). The school student and student teacher are related in this way. While both parties are undoubtedly dedicated to the education of the young, their engagement is complicated by the ongoing and initial nature of the education of the educator. In conversation, "listening, the responsiveness to difference, the willingness for change" (Ibid., p. 174) are valued, bringing the phases of care together with the Cavellian idea of perfectionism, of trying to live in the world as our best possible selves. Student teachers are in the position of carer and cared-for. They care for the education of the school students they teach, as well as caring for their own education as an educator. Furthermore, they are cared-for by their mentor teacher and ITE programme. Thus student teachers are uniquely positioned to understand that we cannot achieve our best self alone. Rather, it is through caring conversation with a friend that "a perspective on our lives" and "who we have turned out to be" (Ibid.) can be gained to guide our perfectionist efforts.

In the world of the school the student teacher's relationship to the school student does not fit with the cooperative model described. This relationship is different. It emerges from the student teacher's arrival in the life of the school student *as an educator*. The school student is singular in relating sincerely to the student teacher in this way. They stand as the Other who confronts the nascent educator with their educational self, and reminds them of their ordinary commitments. The call may be as simple as asking "Are you our teacher?". Thus, the school student can be seen, in a Cavellian sense, as a friend to the educator , "a figure that may occur as the goal of the journey but also as its instigation and accompaniment" (Cavell, 2005a, p. 27). The friend is significant in relation, as it is through conversation with them "that the one in question makes [themselves] intelligible, to others and to [themselves]." (Cavell, 2005a, p. 42).

The student teacher desires to make sense of themselves as an educator and become intelligible in that role in the world of the school. For Cavell "perfectionism concentrates on this moment", recognising the confusion, the experience of uncertainty, inherent in such desires and "proposes that such muddles stand in need of the perception of a friend" (Cavell, 2005a, p. 42). The school student as Friend presents, and re-presents, the complexity of such desires. They highlight the intricacies of the educational self, the balance of responsibility and vulnerability it entails. Rather than solutions or resolution, the friend provides a presence that matters. Thus conversations with the friend are, or have the potential to be, significant "to get those eyes open" (Ibid.). To do so the school student requires standing in the eyes of the educator. This calls on the educator's capabilities of Acknowledgment, Interruption and Attention in particular so that the student teacher can recognise these "moments of encounter or challenge" (Cavell, 2005a, p. 43) as educational.

The school student matters to the student teacher in presenting the person of 'our teacher' as an "unattained but attainable self" (Cavell, 2005a, p. 32). Cavell suggests that it is the "possibility of my access to experience which gives to my desire for the attaining of a self that is mine to become, the power to act on behalf of an attainable world I can actually desire" (Ibid., p33). Thus, the in-school experience of interaction with student voice can arouse in the student teacher both the desire to come into presence as an educator in the world of the school and the capability, "the power", to do so. In these perfectionist encounters the student teacher's sense of self and of other, in the form of the school student, and the educational reality they are prepared to consent to, is at stake.

Beyond calling us into the world to cooperate, it is our *significance in the world* which the friend brings to light. The school student has a particularly important role in helping the student teacher to see why they matter, should they choose to engage conversationally. If, as Cavell writes, the ordinary makes sense of the world for us and makes sense of us in the world, then the school student plays a pivotal role in the student teacher's appreciation of their subjectivity. Viewing them as an educator, the student teacher is named by the school student as, simply, 'our teacher', and through everyday educational processes and practices are called to emerge as subject and acknowledge their significance (Biesta, 2013). Though

they may be unaware, the school student is an educator in their own right, promoting the independence of the student teacher in the classroom. They invite the nascent educator into "a relationship of responsibility" (Biesta, 2013, p. 19) where they are called into the ordinary commitment of listening and response with one who has questioned (Cavell, 2005b). It is the very everydayness of student voice, its complexity and hope, which call on the educator to become capable of The Ordinary.

Secondly, in becoming capable of The Ordinary, the educator is called upon to respect the essential complexity of the everyday educational world, its systems and structures. On starting their time in school, the student teacher joins a community and brings with them their school biography; there is no clean slate. Thus, it is key to recognise the everyday, lived complexity that when we do not know exactly how things are when we begin, we cannot know where they will go. The complex protects the ordinary, cautioning us "not to marginalise or dispense with what is apparently trivial or inexplicable", but instead insists we "[make] space for individuality, for the apparently marginal" as we try to better understand (Mason, 2008, p. 38). We are encouraged to value the banal, what Davis and Sumara term "internal redundancy" (Davis & Sumara, 2006, p. 139), locating commonalities as the overlap between individuals which allow us to communicate and work together.

A systemic response to the recognition of complexity in Irish initial teacher education has been the imposition of structure. Frameworks inform standards, and standards are enacted by specific learning outcomes (The Teaching Council, 2020). Looking at the initial teacher education documents of policy enactment and reform, the words "complex" or "complexity" recur (For example, Hall et al., 2018, p. 19; The Teaching Council, 2016b, p. 14, 2016a, p. 4, 2020, p. 10), and are followed by lists. Lists of standards and requirements which form codes and frameworks. Teaching on this model is something to be disciplined and brought into line through enumeration – thirty-three standards, six learning processes, three categories comprising sixty-eight learning outcomes (The Teaching Council, 2016b, 2016a, 2020). Here, 'complexity' is being used to describe a phenomenon to be managed and controlled.

A commitment to the ordinary, however, challenges initial teacher education to consider not only what student teachers learn but *how* they are educated; this involves, we might say, a

move away from narratives of the comprehensive to an honesty about the weak and open reality of the school. In coming into relation with ordinary communities, “it is more appropriate and important for teachers to adopt an inquiring stance… than to study lists of characteristics” (Florio-Ruane, 2001, p. 50) when familiarising themselves with a particular context. Florio-Ruane refers to Rand Spiro and colleagues’ theory that “people learn complex concepts and practices not as simple, linear content mastered once and for all and to be applied in new settings, but flexibly and by repeated examination of rich cases” (Ibid.). The response to this challenge may come from the nature of the in-school experience itself.

The reimagined in-school experience during initial teacher education responds to this call, providing, in theory, the opportunity for student teachers to traverse the contextual landscape of the school slowly on a variety of placements at different timepoints in their education (The Teaching Council, 2020). Each placement is complex in its own right and should be subjected to iterative consideration. Additionally, the placements conceptually overlap and can be, should be, considered together. For the student teacher to become capable of The Ordinary it is essential that such reflections be more than the application of rubrics or a cross-referencing activity, resisting the reductive impulse to privilege commonality over uniqueness. Susan Florio-Ruane suggests that this “surfacing and revising our stories” is a practice of flexibility (Florio-Ruane, 2001, p. 50). It “is transformative in that it forces prior, tacit knowledge into the light and changes its nature and content as new cases are encountered. This kind of learning prepares us to solve new problems” and ask new questions (Florio-Ruane, 2001, p. 51). Complex concepts “can and should be studied by teachers in the ill-structured domain of their practice”, through engagement with narratives both “distant, [and] so close to home as to go unnoticed” including their own educational (auto)biography (Ibid.). Orienting ourselves with interest across multiple contexts and iterative engagements, foregrounds the provisional nature of the educational self. Such practice of orientation is careful and committed. It reveals the essential everydayness of school life as an ongoing endeavour – as a *project* that all those engaged in initial teacher education are called to become capable of.

The limitations of brief in-school experiences are both to be respected and recognised as a challenge to the student teacher. Such limitations are emancipatory, freeing the student

teacher to try their best and strive to understand, and embody the risky education towards voice through research and care. Davis and Sumara use the term “enabling constraints” (Davis & Sumara, 2006, p. 147) to describe a perspective on limitation as attention to our commonalities and differences, what holds us together and what sets us apart. Living and working with limitations, seeing them as descriptive rather than definitive, depends on our capability of Attention. This capability is interested in living respectfully in the educational world, rejecting an either-or mentality when faced with seeming dichotomies of the strong or the weak, the measurable or the open, prescription or risk. This respectful existence involves a recognition also that any particular response must be a provisional one. As Paul Cilliers writes:

> When we have to solve a specific problem in the real world we cannot involve life, the universe and everything. We have to frame the problem in a specific way and use specific tools and methods. This process restricts the complexity of the problem by necessity, and therefore does not lead to a final, complete and objective understanding of the issues at hand. Our solutions and our understanding remains provisional.
>
> (Cilliers, 2010, pp. vii–viii).

Cillers suggests that on this basis we cannot neglect the normative, those ordinary concepts which underpin our approach to initial teacher education such as Voice, Risk and Care. Complexity is useful for thinking about the humanity of the school, giving us insights on continuity and change in many-layered contexts. The school is ordinarily a complex environment and as such “new properties and behaviours emerge that are not contained in the essence of the constituent elements, nor can be predicted from a knowledge of initial conditions” (Mason, 2008, p. 36). Emergence is ongoing and operates on multiple stages (the classroom, friendship groups among students or staff, management structures to name but a few) and between layers of elements on those stages (students interact with each other, the subject matter, the teacher or other adults in the room, and so on). These interactions change from person to person, and from day to day. It is almost too much to think about, and yet the school *faces* or presents itself to the student teacher; they are called upon to come into educational relation with it.

Hope of the Ordinary

For Cavell, a central aim of ordinary language philosophy is understanding the individual and her community. What is in question here is the difficulty (even the impossibility) of making ourselves fully understood by others, and the ways in which we strive towards this understanding every day. Although he never explicitly calls on hope, I cannot imagine how Cavell's ordinary world can proceed without it. While hope is never enough, it is necessarily prior. Without hope how can the student teacher be convinced that the risk of education is beautiful, as Biesta (2020b) writes? Or to pursue happiness as an educational goal for the educator and the student in Noddings' (2003) philosophy? I argue that central to the concept of the ordinary is the idea of hope. This is the positive, sustaining sense that we are working towards something without full guarantee that we will ever achieve it.

To become capable of Hope calls for an openness to questions independent of a search for answers. Cavell writes of humour and playfulness, of the dangers of seriousness and weighing our words down. In this context, Cavell links seriousness to the readiness to come to an end; to be serious is to focus on conclusion, a fixed meaning for our words, rather than recognising their, and our, "initial, medial, unfinished and undefined" nature (Cavell, 1994, p. 125). We are tethered to our words through our commitment to meaning what we say, while our words themselves are free. While the ordinary calls on us to mean what we say, it also fundamentally recognises that in using our voice we send our words out for the interpretation of others, and we can never be sure of such interpretation (Cavell, 1994). We can never fully know or fully understand what our words will come to mean to others or to the world, and this necessary, fundamental incompleteness represents a site of educational hope.

I imagine hope as a reason to continue, a sustaining force in living and working with the ordinarily complex educational world. It arises out of a feeling that there is something better, in this case a better level of understanding of ourselves and others. Freire holds that "hope is an ontological need" which demands "an anchoring in practice" (Freire, 1994, p. 2). It is a duality of what we feel and what we do in feeling. In other words, to have hope is to practise it in an everyday way. The sense of hopelessness arises when this force has lost its way; lost hope is literally "hope that has lost its bearings" and come away from the ordinary world

(Ibid.). Hopelessness is "both the consequence and the cause of inaction or immobilism" (Freire, 1994, p. 3). That sense of the everyday life of an educator as one of possibility, openness and risk has the potential to enliven or to worry, to invite a humble opening up or a defensive shutting down. Hope is thus something we need. It is a feeling that sustains us, and something we need to *engage with* on an everyday basis.

While hope exists in the individual, it operates in relation to others. If, as Maxine Greene suggests, "dialogue… cannot be carried on in a climate of hopelessness" (Greene, 2000, pp. 24–25) then hope is a prior concern for the educator committed to education towards Voice, Risk and Care. In this context, the educator might be aware of their incompleteness in the face of ordinary complexity, but they might still lack direction. What will they do with this sense of incompleteness? Where will they turn? One option would be to direct themselves inward, and in doing so make the world smaller so that the sense of being lost might diminish. This returns the educator to their own resources away from the concrete and messy lived reality of the classroom or the school. In terms of Voice, it makes the educator unable to relate, and in terms of Risk it makes the educator unable to imagine.

Serious, weighty words can also get in the way of Care. Such words can carry assumptions which impede both the speaker and the listener in listening; they can displace motivation, and narrow or even shut down avenues of response. 'Seriousness', or a commitment only to answers on Cavell's understanding, can impede our attempts to understand ourselves and others, making our own significance in the world more difficult to establish. The instruments of seriousness – systems of rubrics and prescribed outcomes – mediate dialogue by reducing the options for response. The conversation is strange, I would suggest, and the student teacher who masters this system is less capable of The Ordinary, the open and the unscaffolded. Formalising mentorship through such instruments is a misguided effort at complexity reduction, therefore. Such an effort turns encounters between student teacher and tutor or mentor into strong, functional exercises rather than weak, open educational events.

As I have suggested in my readings of Cavell, Biesta and Noddings, to have the vivacity to adapt and reroute one's plan in response to everyday educational reality, one must embrace

that reality in all its complexity. Becoming a capable educator in the world of the school takes *work.* It encounters resistance as it relies on an openness to "humanity's commonness, which is internal to its endless denials of commonness" (Cavell, 1994, p. 11). This difficult reality is the reciprocal relationship between struggle and hope, which recognises that the "hope" afforded by control is "a frivolous illusion" (Freire, 1994, p. 2) as only hope itself diminishes hopelessness. In setting boundaries around their world, I would maintain that the educator may find that they can chart a path forward for themselves, and feel less lost, less hopeless. But it is mistaken to believe that students following a prescribed plan is, by itself, educational. The event of education is not standardised, standardisable or standardising. Rather, it is human and insightful.

The nascent educator is called to look beyond themselves, and this transcendence of the self is key to the work of my chosen philosophical thinkers. Cavell's 'figure of the friend' draws the self forward in perfectionist journey; Nodding's 'one-caring' is always orientated towards the 'cared-for'; and Biesta's free and autonomous subject can only come into being in risky dialogue with the other. Freire locates hope in the roots of the incompleteness of each individual "from which they move out in constant search – a search which can only be carried out in communion with others", in the ordinary world (Freire, 2017, p. 91). Hope grows, then, from the recognition of the centrality of relation.

Choosing to turn outward is risky, of course The educator in a sense exposes their incompleteness and puts their faith for hope in community. Faith alone is not enough; this is mere hopefulness. Hope requires effort and calls on the educator to embrace the struggle to live in the school openly and vulnerably. Hope must strike a balance between the abstract and the concrete, being informed in both spheres so that educators coming to live fully in the world of the school as "people trying to be more fully human… [who] must be able to imagine something coming of their hopes" in the rich, real ordinary context of the school (Greene, 2000, p. 25). Hope in this sense is a helpful form of doubt. It moves us forward as open, responsible, and caring educators.

Paul Standish reminds us to "think also, more prosaically, of the way that we stay with the same relationships, though they cannot – and should not – stay the same. Think of the way

that we stay with ourselves" (Standish, 2020, p. 11). This sense of where we begin and what we decide to return to is perceivable in Cavell's formulation of the actual and eventual ordinaries (Cavell & Standish, 2012). Imagine the student teacher's thinking as a wave. It sets out into the world of the school from the 'actual ordinary' of the shore, and on its return encounters the shore again but this time as the 'eventual ordinary'. What is important here is that the shore existed before the actual ordinary, changed by previous waves and climatic conditions, and even in the space of one cycle neither wave nor shore stay the same.

The ideas student teachers start out with in initial teacher education are subject to interrogation by ordinary life as it is lived in the school. They are sent out into the school to be made visible, to see how they sit and how they breathe in the educator's reality. When the ideas come back to the student teacher, as they will repeatedly during the in school experience "marked by patterns of separation and return" (Standish, 2020, p. 11), those ideas will have been changed and the educator will have changed too. Reconciling these changed ideas with their educational self places them on "some boundary or threshold, as between the impossible and the possible" (Cavell, 1988, p. 183), between the held, the imagined and the lived. I am reminded again of the gymnast, of the need to have a force in our life which sustains and propels us forward. The student teacher needs a particular type of personal, professional support system to call on to be capable of The Ordinary risks of voice and care they will be called upon to encounter every day. This force, to my mind, is hope.

The actual ordinary is "what is there, the world into which we came as children, and with which for a time we enjoyed a kind of animal intimacy, and later the world we mostly take for granted" (Standish, 2020, pp. 10–11), that which is commonly understood as it is first encountered. The eventual ordinary is our return to this ordinary after life in the world where our conception of that ordinary has been subjected to doubt. The eventual ordinary is "an ordinary encountered with a sense both of new possibility and of intimacy lost" (Standish, 2020, p. 11); this is the hopeful ordinary we settle on, even momentarily, after having considered it in the world. Having these two ordinaries related by the wave of lived reality means that we have a say in what experiences require or endure "change in our ways of thinking and wording the world" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 134). Naoko Saito cites translation as an example of "the experience of "the extraordinariness of what we accept as the ordinary"

(Cavell, 2005b, p. 1); and the process of converting what [Cavell] calls the "actual" into the "eventual ordinary"" (Saito, 2013, p. 113).

The idea of 'teacher' during initial teacher education is one such example. Words come coloured with impressions and ideas, and with a sense of more to come (Cavell & Standish, 2012). For a student teacher starting school, how the teacher is considered by those who matter to them is significant. Maybe their unpleasant parent is a teacher, or their child has told amazing stories of the teachers they idolise at school. The student teacher holds their own ordinary interpretation of 'teacher', and still there is a gap, a sense of the unknown, as this teacher is yet to become reality. The actual ordinary of the idea of 'teacher' they hold on starting school will evolve over the years of their education to an eventual ordinary conception of the teacher from their perspective as a student teacher.

Following Standish's reading of Cavell, we can see how becoming capable of Hope calls for a certain lightness. Weighing down our words with seriousness encumbers them, limiting their journey to the other and back to us, so that I am less well-understood and I understand myself and the other less well. It sets the ordinary and the educator at a distance from each other. Aversion to hope weighs words down with prescribed definition and explanation, exposing the speaker, the audience or both as incapable of The Ordinary. These expressions are less dynamic, less capable of holding the educational space open in response to complexity.

In my analysis of the work of Cavell, as well as Biesta and Noddings, the ordinary has emerged as a helpful framework for understanding the world of the student teacher. The ordinary, in its Cavellian sense, reminds us that no human project is ever entirely finalised. Human contexts are messy, open, and oftentimes difficult. Thus, an awareness of complexity and the importance of hope are key towards motivating the educator to try to understand educational realities from perspectives other than their own, and as instrumental in nurturing the capability of The Ordinary.

Resisting the Ordinary

In his 2016 Keynote Address to the European Conference on Educational Research, Paul Standish told the story of an undergraduate student preparing to undertake a research project (Standish, 2016). Gary, the student in question, has chosen to address a research question pertaining to moral education. As part of his preparation, he looks for information on moral education, morality and ethics and turns to a handbook wherein Moral Education is divided into four categories (one of which, incidentally, was imagined to be Nel Noddings' Care Ethics). Gary goes further, looking into concepts of moral philosophy and ethics via an introductory handbook on the philosophy of morality which tells him there are two delineated branches of moral philosophy, deontology, and utilitarianism, to choose between. Standish describes this approach of counting concepts as "woefully inadequate", and a reductive way to understand theories. Such compartmentalisation, Standish suggests, makes it seem that there are clear distinctions when there are not, encourages the idea that theories on morality or moral education are ready-made – to be 'applied' – and makes everything seem less messy and less challenging than it really is. Standish would like Gary to get a bit lost, a bit confused and upset, and realise that the educational is more difficult than these presentations suggest. He should struggle.

I have suggested throughout this thesis that struggle is important. A student teacher experiencing the world of the school as an educator for the first time encounters unknowns and the unpredictable at every turn. Understanding this, we can see why the language of the ordinary might be helpful in understanding this lived reality, as it encourages an honest approach and resists impulses of control. Capable of The Ordinary, the educator may "understand the open, recursive, organic, non-linear and emergent dimensions of physical and social processes as positive and necessary aspects of complex systems, rather than as deviations from the norm or as epiphenomena that need to be explained away" (Biesta, 2010a, p. 6) and become interested in them. Such dimensions are not problems to be solved, as Biesta would say, but are in fact *constitutive* of the educational realm. Here, in striving to make this realm a place of sanctuary as well as struggle, the nascent educator must call on their capability to attend, imagine, acknowledge and to be uncertain.

Complexity aids in thinking simultaneously about both the development of what we know and understand and the development of who we are in community and individually. Biesta expresses it thus:

> To the extent that education is not only about qualification (the transmission of knowledge and skills) and socialisation (the insertion of individuals into existing social, cultural and political orders), but is also characterised by a concern for the "coming into presence" of unique, individual beings (see Biesta, 2006a; 2010), complexity therefore also provides a useful vocabulary for understanding education in what might be called an educational way.
>
> (Biesta, 2010a, p. 6).

In developing this point, Biesta emphasises that the unique contribution the concept of complexity can make is in bringing into view the apparently not-complex (such ordinary concepts as Voice, Risk and Care, for example), and coming into relation with impulses to simplify, to engage in complexity reduction, to smooth the rough ground. This is his first of five theses on complexity reduction and its politics in education (Biesta, 2010a). In the second thesis, Biesta asserts that while complexity reduction is inherently neither good nor bad, it can both help and hinder ordinary educational life and experience (Ibid.). For example, timetabling is an example of complexity reduction which facilitates clear and efficient running of a school and is overwhelmingly beneficial. Other initiatives such as compulsory subjects or school uniforms are simplified rather than simple. In other words, reducing complexity is ordinarily complex.

Currently in Ireland a student teacher must successfully complete the in-school components of their initial teacher education programme in order to graduate (The Teaching Council, 2017b). This pivotal moment of complexity reduction places the everyday in-school experience of student teachers as "the fulcrum of teacher education" (The Teaching Council, 2020, p. 7) and raises questions of what it means to fail, of success criteria and consequences. It asks: What dimensions of the in-school experience actually count? Biesta frames learning in terms of change (Biesta, 2010a), which makes success criteria value judgements on which changes are worthwhile, desirable, incidental or unwelcome. A student teacher may desire to ordinarily address their students by name and make friends in the staffroom. If, however, it

is not expected that they know the names of their students or colleagues, if building relationships in the community are not valued in a formal sense, the student teacher may reduce the everyday complexity in their lives by doing away with efforts at relation.

Student teachers will make choices in order to thrive in the new and difficult context of the world of the school, choices favouring what they will be *judged* as having learned over those changes which are ordinarily desirable. In the 2020 policy document *Céim: Standards for Initial Teacher Education*, published by the professionally accrediting Teaching Council, the Graduate Teacher Standards "outline the skills, knowledge, understanding and professional values expected of newly qualified teachers" and are presented as learning outcomes (The Teaching Council, 2020, p. 20). It is explicitly stated that "student teachers are expected to use [the Graduate Teacher Standards] as a tool to support their ongoing development" and that they can be used by teacher educators to "support programme design" (Ibid.).

In my view, prescribed learning outcomes employed in this way are the epitome of complexity reduction, prospectively and retrospectively diminishing teacher education and the in-school experience of student teachers. They "make a value judgement about change" identifying some changes as valuable and naming them 'learning' (Biesta, 2010a, p. 11). Standards and guidelines are of course useful and important, but the issue here is how they are employed with respect to the ordinary, with what degree of openness and to what end. As expectations made explicit they can help the student teacher approach the ordinary complexity of their in-school experience towards, step by step, becoming capable of the everyday they will find there. However, standards as conditions of qualification lack this potential. By reducing the complexity of the in-school experience, the opportunity to become capable of The Ordinary is infringed upon, reducing the possibilities for the student teacher now as well as the communities they will become part of into the future.

Becoming Capable of the Ordinary

To become capable of The Ordinary, student teachers need to experience the world of the school in an open, mundane, and everyday way. Capabilities are "the freedoms or opportunities created by a combination of personal abilities and the political, social and economic environment" (Nussbaum, 2011, p. 26). Coming into presence then can be thought of as becoming capable as a subject in the world. The "internal capabilities" personal to an individual may not flourish if the structures they operate within "cut off the avenues through which people have the opportunity to function in accordance with those capabilities" (Nussbaum, 2011, p. 28).

It is not possible to assure or even promote The Ordinary as a capability. However, programmes of initial teacher education have a responsibility to hold the educational space open for students so that they might develop an appreciative orientation towards both complexity and hope. In Biesta's terms, this holding open ensures that our educational structures "do not keep students away from such experiences, shield them from any potential intervention of the other, do not contribute to making our students deaf and blind for what is calling them" (Biesta, 2013, p. 23). Where the initial teacher education programme predefines the in-school experience, student teachers may become "deaf and blind" (Ibid.) to the everyday world of the school. Such promotion of qualification above all else turns the school into a functional space and forecloses genuine human encounter. Holding these educational spaces open for ethical encounter educates for subjectivity, I would insist; it allows individual persons to emerge.

Recognising The Ordinary as a capability of the educator values the transformative power of risky, open spaces where "imaginative neighbourhoods" (Hogan, 2010, p. 80), in Pádraig Hogan's beautiful words, emerge in the world of the school. Hogan suggests that these "neighbourhoods" can be created, that everyday occurrences can be actively and prescriptively transformed into meaningful encounters. I resist this strong language, holding instead that in the work of initial teacher education programmes to provide rich and interesting educational experiences for their students lies the *potential* for meaningful event and encounter, dependent upon their approach to Risk and weakness. The breadth of

experience of the educator is limited by predefinition, held at the level of competence, something that they (can) do, rather than becoming part of who they are as a capable educator.

The educator's voice, their educational self, is always at stake. This riskiness is inherent to their development towards being capable of The Ordinary in the complex, hopeful, everyday world of the school. Open encounter forms the situation and the opportunity for uniqueness-as-irreplaceability to emerge and for the student teacher to come to know their significance as an educator (Biesta, 2013). It is both where the educator can step into the world and where it matters that they do. These moments cannot be engineered or controlled. They cannot be scheduled as part of a particular educational experience or made to align with curricular agendas. There is, as Biesta asserts, very little educators can do with his ideas of uniqueness or subjectivity in terms of producing an 'outcome' (Ibid.). Rather, the event of subjectivity, the possibility of an individual coming into the world and discovering why they matter in it, "has to do with the ways in which [they] can be addressed by the other" (Biesta, 2013, p. 145).

Rooted in relation, this event relies on their commitment to listen, to seek something outside of themselves. Cavell's "ordinary commitment" of listening (Cavell, 2005b, p. 176) is the first phase of Noddings' model of care (Noddings, 2013) and, as I have suggested in Chapter 5, the primary mode of research in educational practice. The educator listens to seek something outside of themselves, as a first step in trying to better understand. In the event of subjectivity, the student teacher listens with a view to trying to understand their own significance as an educator. Brief, functional encounters limited by rubrics do not listen. At best they eavesdrop, picking up partial or shadowy impressions of the other. In listening the educator commits to the ordinary, to receive what is said, explore rationally, plan, and in doing so to support the other (Ibid.). Such thoughtful practice incorporates a fundamental respect for the other, be that a person or a world. As such, it is a helpful way for student teachers to think about their brief time in the school during initial teacher education. As discussed in the previous chapter (p. 125), thinking of the school as a resource for the student teacher does both a disservice in attempting to describe and interpret the student teacher's experience in school before they arrive.

Similarly, those interested and engaged in initial teacher education are called upon, in Cavell's compelling words, *to mean what they say*. Realising that language exists ordinarily "not only to mean and to state but to work and to act" (Cavell, 1994, p. 126) brings into focus the responsibility of the educator to both use their voice and to fully get behind their own words. Even for the educator fully committed to this responsibility, the voice "always escapes us or is stolen" (Ibid.), our words and actions coming back to us altered by the understanding of other minds. We can never be sure that other persons will understand our words as they are meant. It is tempting to restrict vocabulary and impose strong definitions, yet relation is an "ordinary commitment" (Cavell, 2005b, p. 176); such relation is undermined by attempts to limit its openness and potential for reciprocity. On this understanding, language itself is muted – it becomes less meaningful, less responsive, and less capable of supporting community – when it is removed from ordinary contexts.

Thus, openness is a key factor in becoming capable of The Ordinary. Cavell emphasises the extraordinariness of the everyday and its communality. That we can make ourselves intelligible to one another in our language and actions is generally the case, and yet far from given. There is always a shift between what the educator says and what the one addressed understands them to say; we each live and experience language differently because of the lives and the experience that have come before. Since, as Cavell puts it, "you always tell more and less than you know" (Cavell, 1988, p. 83), the educator's voice is inherently and necessarily risky, and "the desire to make education strong, secure, predictable and risk-free is in a sense an attempt to wish this reality away" (Biesta, 2013, p. 2). Similarly, complexity reduction, as it operates in the space of education, functions to wish away the "otherness" of the other; it privileges the common and the generalisable over the richness of community. Furthermore, in strengthening and fixing language, the opportunities for everyday educational research are constricted. The structures and systems required so that educational communities can live and work together are given precedence over ordinary moments of relation and, as a result, members of those communities have less opportunity to develop an interest in each other.

A fundamental concern of this thesis has been the sense that reform makes in the lives of educators. Reducing complex everyday relation to rubric comes at a price for both the reform

agenda and those interested and engaged in initial teacher education. Important ideas such as reflection are seen as, if not disposable because of their requirement towards qualification, then at least dispensable as soon as the requirement is fulfilled. The worry here lies in an implicit message: Student teachers have to reflect, but fully qualified educators do not.

As Hall has pointed out, where the supervising school-based mentor does not engage in an equal way in the reflection and inquiry process, the student teacher's own "inquiry stance" is not maximised. (Hall et al., 2018, p. 38). How the in-school mentor co-operates matters. Given that "it is assumed it is reflection and critical engagement with practice that enables the teacher deal with the unpredictable, the complex and the ever dynamic nature of the social situatedness of classroom events" removing the co-operative, co-reflective aspect of the in-school mentor's role undermines reflection as ordinary (Hall et al., 2018, p. 34). In fact, later in the report Hall et al. note that

> …another message from the evidence would appear to be that for student teachers to really value reflection and inquiry and get the maximum from it in terms of dispositional and transfer to the new settings that they encounter, they need to have reflection and inquiry modelled for them by their mentors/[co-operating teachers].
>
> (Hall et al., 2018, p. 38).

They then go on to interpret this evidence as reason to include the co-operating teacher in the student's research project. In doing so they read experienced educators as not naturally reflective and locate reflection as outside the ordinary. An alternative would be to look anew at the lived reality of educators, where they research and reflect in everyday life. Emphasising these moments to the student teacher as ordinary reduces the distance between initial teacher education and the life of the educator in the world of the school. It has the potential to support student teachers in their complex encounters and create positive associations between research and reflection, and their educator selves.

In the Irish context, 'teaching practice' was renamed 'school placement' in 2011, in another effort to better reflect reality (The Teaching Council, 2011, p. 5). This is similar to the shift from co-operating teacher to guide or from HEI supervisor to tutor. I have been probing

throughout this thesis, however, precisely what reality the term 'placement' communicates. Etymologically, placement communicates the action of placing or the fact of being placed (Etymology Dictionary [online], 2021d). As such, school placement is the placing of a student teacher in a school. The intention of the shift is to locate the student teacher in the school community and bring them out of the idea that they are in school simply to practise teaching. It is a generous notion, communicating the best of what the in-school experience can be for a student teacher.

And yet, 'placement' is a cold word. It suggests a passive 'being placed' irrespective of, or even against, one's will. As student teachers embark on their in-school experience the desired feeling and frame of mind is, I would suggest, not one of 'being placed' but one of 'visiting', as framed by Hannah Arendt. Arendt observed that "to think with an enlarged mentality means that one trains one's imagination to go visiting", so that the solitary practice of thinking is opened up in the world as "through the force of imagination it makes the others present" (Arendt, 1992, p. 42). When we visit we venture out, we begin conversations and we take an interest. We draw those we are not in proximity to into view and spend time with them where they are. As Donna Haraway writes, this practice is both more complex and more committed than it first appears:

> Visiting is not an easy practice; it demands the ability to find others actively interesting, even or especially others most people already claim to know all too completely, to ask questions that one's interlocuters truly find interesting, to cultivate the wild virtue of curiosity, to retune one's ability to sense and respond… it sounds more than a little risky. Curiosity always leads its practitioners a bit too far off the path, and that way lie stories.
>
> (Haraway, 2016, p. 127).

This risky, open, curious practice of visiting invites the student teacher to look again at the everyday. It is not safe, but it is safe enough (Haraway, 2016). In the ordinary of the school the mutuality of practice, the relational roots of placement and the appreciative orientation of *visiting*, hold open the space for surprises and the unexpected, for the educational. As Haraway phrases it, "visiting might be risky, but it is definitely not boring" (Haraway, 2016, p. 128); rather, it is a moment founded in interesting questions and in listening. To see

placement as visiting creates space for student teachers in the school community, rather than setting them at a distance, and develops their capabilities of Acknowledgement, Imagination and Uncertainty in particular. The world is held open to be complex and hopeful, and for us to live complex and hopeful lives in it. Yet, visiting doesn't fit either. It is too transient and disconnected, somewhat one-sided, and presented like a gift the one-visited should be grateful for. All these ideas – practice, placement, visiting – are attempts to encompass the ordinary "layered, curious practice of becoming-with others" (Haraway, 2016, p. 168) that student teachers undertake during their time in school. What matters is that they remain committed and open in doing so. What matters, and here again we are returned to Cavell's idea of the ordinary, is that they acknowledge the importance of the particular and the provisional.

In being taught to be a teacher the student teacher should become aware that the teacher is far more than 'teacher'. In this way they are taught and untaught. This is an encounter with what Gordon Bearn terms "thinking lithe" or thinking otherwise (Bearn, 2021, p. 16). There is a certain sincerity prerequisite of thinking otherwise. Rooted in relation and the concrete, it calls for care and for openness, for the educator to be capable of Interruption, Uncertainty and The Ordinary. Bearn uses the example of Magritte's painting *The Treachery of Images* (1929) more commonly known as *This Is Not A Pipe* to illustrate this complex moment. This painting, Bearn suggests, teaches what a pipe *is* (conveying the image of such a thing) and *unteaches* what a pipe is (conveying *only* the image of such a thing).

During their in-school experience, the student teacher should learn that the word 'teacher' conveys their role and does not convey their role. Attaining the title of 'teacher' is essential but embodying this role honestly and openly is something that must be worked at. It cannot be easily achieved through the following of certain rules or the adherence to certain codes. Rather, being named 'teacher' involves the committed and complex process of returning to the ordinary – of *really meaning what we say* and communicating this meaning as best we can to other language-users in our community. Complexity is the capability called on to meet this moment. Acknowledging complexity is a first step towards resisting strong modes of control.

As Bearn outlines in the following example, there is always a deficit – a *gap* – in our attempts to link words to the world:

> I have often been disappointed in the arboretum, where the name of a tree is nailed to its flank, oblivious to the gentle richness of the singular tree. Philosophers seek necessary and sufficient conditions for being a Ginkgo, oblivious to the fact that the singularity of every Ginkgo slips through their fancy linguistic nets. In the end, even if they succeed, they will have caught a shadow.
>
> (Bearn, 2021, p. 15).

This is not to say that "Ginkgo" or even "tree" are not meaningful words which bring the visitor to the arboretum closer to the organism they stand in relation to. Rather, it is to say that neither is ever enough. There is an air of despair to Bearn's tone here which is a little unhelpful; I do not believe that it is possible to become capable of The Ordinary through feeling badly about it. I call instead for a joyful, hopeful commitment to relate. In doing so, we are orientated in appreciation towards the individual, ourselves and each other, as well as to the words which ordinarily represent us in the everyday world.

Bearn closes the paper wondering whether what he is suggesting has been hiding in the everyday (Bearn, 2021). Is teaching and unteaching simply "teaching", when "teaching" is released from the routine? In other words, the ordinary insists we recognise the complexity, beauty and potential in the everyday. It is a call to resist complication and to mean what we say.

Those implementing initial teacher educational reform in Ireland have struggled to name the student teacher's in-school mentor for over a decade. The term, 'co-operating teacher' appeared in policy in 2011 (Department of Education and Skills, 2011) and was defined in 2013 as any teacher who "supports and guides" the student teacher, and acts as point of contact in the school (The Teaching Council, 2013, p. 5). But co-operation is more than supporting, guiding and providing logistical support. It is rich, open and various, led by the student though mutually beneficial to student and teacher, and rooted in meaningful relation. Contrastingly, the term 'Treoraí', translated from the Irish language as 'guide', was chosen to

replace ‘co-operating teacher’ in order to “more accurately [reflect] the nature of the role” (The Teaching Council, 2020, p. 6), and clarify the support needed to undertake it (The Teaching Council, 2019). Yet “expectations of ‘Treoraithe’ (plural of ‘Treoraí’) are no more and no less than those of co-operating teachers” (The Teaching Council, 2019, p. 3). Such privatisation of language attempts to counter the fear that we are simultaneously “necessarily inexpressive, unintelligible, and that we are expressive beyond our means, too intelligible for our good” (Cavell, 1994, p. 127); the fear of being open and interpretable. Simply put, complicating language in this way diminishes its meaning.

Such grounding of language “dulls the reality both of the ordinary and of disappointment with the ordinary” (Cavell, 1994, p. 126), simultaneously complicating and diminishing the in-school mentor’s role. My suggestion here is that ‘co-operation’ might still be a better term to capture the student teacher/mentor relationship. Co-operation makes sense in the everyday life of mentors and student teachers, and calls on them both to be capable of The Ordinary. Co-operation is risky, open and generous, while ‘to guide’ puts a distance between the student teacher and the experienced educator. Yet a guide has a distinct sense of responsibility. They are reasonably assumed to have a particular endpoint in mind, a summit or conclusion, as well as a plan to safely get the one-guided there. Co-operating on the other hand is led by the student, and implies some mutual benefit. It is rich and interesting, as well as demanding (Hall et al., 2018). Renaming the in-school mentor from ‘co-operating’ to ‘guide’ is not intended to change what they do or who they are; rather, it relocates the driving force and inhibits the student teacher in becoming capable of The Ordinary. Starting in co-operation, the student teacher is supported and their in-school mentor journeys with them. The student as future educator, uniquely significant and capable, is foregrounded. In the words of Maxine Greene, a guide “[sees] things or people small”, holding themselves apart and leading or directing, while a co-operative relation has the potential to “see things or people big”:

> To see things or people small, one chooses to see from a detached point of view, to watch behaviours from the perspective of a system, to be concerned with trends and tendencies rather than the intentionality and concreteness of everyday life. To see things or people big, one must resist viewing other human beings as mere objects or chess pieces and view them in

> their integrity and particularity instead. One must see from the point of view of the participant in the midst of what is happening if one is to be privy to the plans people make, the initiatives they take, the uncertainties they face.
>
> (Greene, 2000, p. 10).

Perhaps this complexity in deciding on a "point of view" for the in-school mentor is why the language of co-operation reappears in a Teaching Council pubication a year after it was seemingly done away with, wherein the in-school mentor is referred to as "Treoraí", "Co-operating Teacher" and simply, honestly one might say, "the teacher" (The Teaching Council, 2021, p. 8).

'Teacher', to my mind, is the one title which expresses who the in-school mentor is and why they matter. It expresses their educational self and (as Biesta would say) their peculiar 'subject-ness'. In redeeming everyday terms in this way – Joseph Dunne would tell us that we are bringing ITE discourse *back to the rough ground* (Dunne, 1993) – we are led back to the everyday in difficulty, complexity, and hope. We are led back to a re-consideration of ordinary words and the extraordinariness of everyday lives. Here, as Maxine Greene points out, "the challenge may be to learn how to move back and forth" (Greene, 2000, p. 11), to take in the necessary and the particular, the functional and the unique, in all their complexity and hopefulness. The challenge, as Greene describes it, is to resist the lure of neat, diminishing definition – to resist those rubrics and discourses that alienate us from our everyday selves – and instead to become capable of The Ordinary.

Reference List

Agamben, G. (2010). *Nudities* (D. Kishik & S. Pedatella, Trans.). Stanford University Press.

Andrews, M. (2014). *Narrative Imagination and Everyday Life*. Oxford University Press.

APT NOKUT. (2020). *Transforming Norwegian Teacher Education: The Final Report of the International Advisory Panel for Primary and Lower Secondary Teacher Education*. Advisory Panel for Teacher Education, Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. The University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, H. (1977). *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. Penguin Books.

Arendt, H. (1992). *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy* (R. Beiner, Ed.). University of Chicago Press.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Harvard University Press.

Bailey, R. (2010). Introduction. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *The Philosophy of Education: An Introduction* (Ebook Edition). Continuum. https://www.amazon.co.uk/Philosophy-Education-Introduction-Richard-Bailey-ebook/dp/B00O8MOM28/ref=tmm_kin_swatch_0?_encoding=UTF8&qid=&sr=

Bearn, G. (2021). *Seen and Said*. Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Annual Conference.

Biesta, G. (2006). *Beyond Learning: Democratic Education for a Human Future*. Routledge.

Biesta, G. (2009). Witnessing Deconstruction in Education: Why Quasi-Transcendentalism Matters. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *43*(3), 391–404. https://doi-org.ucd.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2009.00705.x

Biesta, G. (2010a). Five Theses on Complexity Reduction and its Politics. In G. Biesta & D. Osberg (Eds.), *Complexity Theory and the Politics of Education* (pp. 5–13). Sense Publishers.

Biesta, G. (2010b). *Good Education in an Age of Measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy*. Paradigm Publishers.

Biesta, G. (2013). *The Beautiful Risk of Education*. Paradigm Publishers.

Biesta, G. (2017). *The Rediscovery of Teaching*. Routledge.

Biesta, G. (2018). What if? Art education beyond expression and creativity. In C. Naughton, G. Biesta, & D. R. Cole (Eds.), *Art, Artists and Pedagogy: Philosophy and The Arts in Education* (pp. 11–20). Routledge.

Biesta, G. (2020a). *Educational Research: An Unorthodox Introduction*. Bloomsbury.

Biesta, G. (2020b). Risking Ourselves in Education: Qualification, Socialization, and Subjectification Revisited. *Educational Theory*, *70*(1), 89–104. https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12411

Biesta, G., & Osberg, D. (2010). Complexity, Education and Politics from the Inside-Out and the Outside-In: An introduction. In D. Osberg & G. Biesta (Eds.), *Complexity Theory and the Politics of Education* (pp. 1–4). Sense Publishers.

Biesta, G., & Stengel, B. S. (2016). Thinking Philosophically About Teaching. In D. H. Gitomer & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Fifth, pp. 7–67). American Educational Research Association. https://doi.org/10.3102/978-0-935302-48-6_1

Brennan, A. (2019). Student Teacher Educational Research (STER): An Innovation in Irish Teacher Education. *Educational Research and Perspectives*, *46*, 44–74.

Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice Makes Practice: A critical study of learning to teach* (Revised). State University of New York Press.

Brookfield, S. (2017). *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher* (Second). Jossey-Bass.

Burn, K., & Mutton, T. (2015). A review of 'research-informed clinical practice' in Initial Teacher Education. *Oxford Review of Education*, *41*(2), 217–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2015.1020104

Cavell, S. (1979). *The Claim of Reason*. Oxford University Press.

Cavell, S. (1988). *In Quest of the Ordinary: Lines of Skepticism and Romanticism*. University of Chicago Press.

Cavell, S. (1989). *This New But Unapproachable America: Lectures after Emerson after Wittgenstein*. University of Chicago Press.

Cavell, S. (1991). *Conditions Handsome and Unhandsome: The Constitution of Emersonian Perfectionism: The Carus Lectures 1988*. University of Chicago Press.

Cavell, S. (1994). *A Pitch of Philosophy: Autobiographical Exercises*. Harvard University Press.

Cavell, S. (2002). *Must We Mean What We Say?: A Book of Essays* (Second Edition). Cambridge University Press.

Cavell, S. (2005a). *Cities of Words: Pedagogical Letters on a Register of the Moral Life*. Harvard University Press.

Cavell, S. (2005b). *Philosophy the Day after Tomorrow*. Harvard University Press.

Cavell, S. (2010). *Little Did I Know: Excerpts from Memory*. Stanford University Press.

Cavell, S. (2012). Remarks from Discussion. In N. Saito & P. Standish (Eds.), *Stanley Cavell and the Education of Grownups* (pp. 68–69). Fordham University Press.

Cavell, S., & Standish, P. (2012). Stanley Cavell in Conversation with Paul Standish. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *46*(2), 155–176. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2012.00846.x

Charteris, J., & Smardon, D. (2019). The politics of student voice: Unravelling the multiple discourses articulated in schools. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *49*(1), 93–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2018.1444144

Cilliers, P. (2010). Acknowledging Complexity. In D. Osberg & G. Biesta (Eds.), *Complexity Theory and the Politics of Education* (pp. vii–viii). Sense Publishers.

Colapietro, V. (2012). Voice and the Interrogation of Philosophy: Inheritance, Abandonment and Jazz. In N. Saito & P. Standish (Eds.), *Stanley Cavell and the Education of Grownups* (pp. 123–145). Fordham University Press.

Conway, P. F., Murphy, R., Rath, A., & Hall, K. (2009). *Learning to teach and its implications for the continuum of teacher education: A nine-country cross-national study*. The Teaching Council.

Cooper, J., Fraser, L., Hendry, K., & Tongue, S. (Eds.). (2021). *To Learn the Future: Poems for Teachers*. Scottish Poetry Library and Polygon.

Council for Creative Education Finland [Online]. (2021). https://www.ccefinland.org/finedu

Dall'Alba, G. (2009). *Learning to be Professionals*. Springer.

Darling-Hammond, L., Burns, D., Campbell, C., Goodwin, A. L., Hammerness, K., Low, E. L., McIntyre, A., Sato, M., & Zeichner, K. (2017). *Empowered Educators: How High-Performing Systems Shape Teaching Quality Around the World*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ucd/detail.action?docID=4818693

Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (2006). *Complexity and Education: Inquiries into learning, teaching, and research*. Routledge.

Department of Education. (1992). *Education for a Changing World: Green Paper on Education*. https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/a7aa10-education-for-a-changing-world-green-paper/

Department of Education. (1995). *Charting Our Education Future: White Paper on Education*. http://edepositireland.ie/handle/2262/79871

Department of Education and Skills. (2011). *National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030*. https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/072a65-national-strategy-for-higher-education-to-2030/

Department of Education and Skills. (2017). *Minister Bruton announces allocation of €2.4m funding to promote diversity in the teaching profession*. https://merrionstreet.ie/en/category-index/education/minister_bruton_announces_allocation_of_%E2%82%AC2_4m_funding_to_promote_diversity_in_the_teaching_profession.124939.shortcut.html

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. Free Press, Simon and Schuster.

Diamond, C. (1983). Having a Rough Story about What Moral Philosophy Is. *New Literary History*, *15*(1), 155–169. https://doi-org.ucd.idm.oclc.org/10.2307/468998

Diamond, C. (2008). The Difficulty of Reality and the Difficulty of Philosophy. In *Philosophy and Animal Life* (pp. 43–90). Columbia University Press.

Directorate-General for Education and Culture. (2010). *Improving Teacher Quality: The EU agenda*. European Commission. https://www.mv.helsinki.fi/home/hmniemi/EN_Improve_Teacher_Quality_eu_agenda_04_2010_EN.pdf

Dunne, J. (1993). *Back to the Rough Ground: Practical Judgement and the Lure of Technique*. University of Notre Dame Press.

English, A. (2016). Listening and the educational relationship: Philosophical research from a phenomenological perspective. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margins* (pp. 65–73). Routledge.

Etymology Dictionary [online]. (2021a). https://www.etymonline.com/word/relation

Etymology Dictionary [online]. (2021b). https://www.etymonline.com/word/research

Etymology Dictionary [online]. (2021c). https://www.etymonline.com/word/certain

Etymology Dictionary [online]. (2021d). https://www.etymonline.com/word/placement

Florio-Ruane, S. (2001). *Teacher Education and the Cultural Imagination: Autobiography, Conversation, and Narrative*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Florio-Ruane, S. (2002). More Light: An Argument for Complexity in Studies of Teaching and Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(3), 205–215. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053003003

Flutter, J. (2007). Teacher development and pupil voice. *The Curriculum Journal*, *18*(3), 343–354. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170701589983

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of Hope*. Bloomsbury.

Freire, P. (2017). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Penguin Modern Classics.

Fulford, A. (2016). Satisfaction, settlement and exposition. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margins* (pp. 43–47). Routledge.

Fulford, A., & Hodgson, N. (2016a). How to proceed? In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margin* (pp. 166–178). Routledge.

Fulford, A., & Hodgson, N. (2016b). *Philosophy and Theory in Education Research: Writing in the margin*. Routledge.

Fulford, A., & Hodgson, N. (2016c). Reading and Writing: Reading and writing for, and as, research. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margin* (pp. 141–165). Routledge.

Fulford, A., & Hodgson, N. (2016d). Research at the intersection: Background—Choosing from a menu of methods. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margin* (pp. 10–29). Routledge.

Fulford, A., & Hodgson, N. (2016e). Starting Points. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the Margin* (pp. 3–9). Routledge.

Fulford, A., & Mahon, Á. (2020). A philosophical defence of the university lecture. *Oxford Review of Education*, *46*(3), 363–374. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2019.1702013

Galea, S. (2012). Reflecting Reflective Practice. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *44*(3), 245–258. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2010.00652.x

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Harvard University Press.

Gingell, J. (2010). Chapter 12: Reading the Philosophy of Education. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *The Philosophy of Education: An Introduction* (Ebook Edition). Continuum. https://www.amazon.co.uk/Philosophy-Education-Introduction-Richard-Bailey-ebook/dp/B00O8MOM28/ref=tmm_kin_swatch_0?_encoding=UTF8&qid=&sr=

Gornick, V. G. (2001). *The Situation and the Story: The Art of Personal Narrative. New Edition for Writers, Teachers and Students*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Gould, T. (1998). *Hearing Things: Voice and Method in the Writing of Stanley Cavell*. The University of Chicago Press.

Government of Ireland. (2001). *Teaching Council Act*. Stationery Office, Dublin.

Green, L., & Gary, K. (2016). Pedagogy for a Liquid Time. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *35*(1), 47–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-015-9470-7

Greene, M. (1977). Toward Wide-Awakeness: An Argument for the Arts and Humanities in Education. *Teachers College Record*, *79*(1). https://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=1152

Greene, M. (2000). *Releasing the Imagination: Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change*. Jossey-Bass.

Greene, M. (2007). *Imagination and the Healing Arts*. https://maxinegreene.org/uploads/library/imagination_ha.pdf

Griffiths, M. (2016). On provocation, fascination and, writing in the philosophy of education. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margins* (pp. 110–119). Routledge.

Hall, K., Murphy, R., Rutherford, V., & Ní Áingléis, B. (2018). *School Placement in Initial Teacher Education*. University College Cork, Dublin City University.

Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.

Heaney, S. (2016). *Death of a Naturalist*. Faber and Faber.

Heinz, M., & Keane, E. (2018). Socio-demographic composition of primary initial teacher education entrants in Ireland. *Irish Educational Studies*, *37*(4), 523–543. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2018.1521731

Held, V. (2006). *The Ethics of Care*. Oxford University Press.

Hibernia College - Research [Online]. (2021). https://hiberniacollege.com/research/

Higher Education Authority. (2012). *Towards a Future Higher Education Landscape*. https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2017/04/Towards-a-Higher-Education-Landscape.pdf

Higher Education Authority. (2017). *Programme for Access to Higher Education*. https://hea.ie/policy/access-policy/path/

Hogan, P. (2010). *The New Significance of Learning: Imagination's Heartwork*. Routledge.

Hopkins, E. A. (2014). Supporting pre-service teachers to enhance the effectiveness of their classroom practice through engaging with the 'voice' of their pupils. *Teacher Development*, *18*(1), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2013.852131

Irigaray, L. (2008). Listening, Thinking, Teaching. In L. Irigaray & M. Green (Eds.), *Luce Irigaray: Teaching* (pp. 231–240). Bloomsbury.

Johansson, V. (2016). Difficulties of the will: Philosophy of education through children's literature. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margins* (pp. 74–83). Routledge.

Keane, E., & Heinz, M. (2015). Diversity in initial teacher education in Ireland: The socio-demographic backgrounds of postgraduate post-primary entrants in 2013 and 2014. *Irish Educational Studies*, *34*(3), 281–301. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2015.1067637

Kohlberg, L. (1971). Stages in Moral Development as a Basis for Moral Education. In C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, & E. V. Sullivan (Eds.), *Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (pp. 23–92). Toronto University Press.

Kohlberg, L., & Kramer, R. (1969). Continuities and Discontinuities in Childhood and Adult Moral Development. *Human Development*, *12*(2), 93–120. https://doi.org/10.1159/000270857

Laugier, S. (2011). Matter and Mind: Cavell's (Concept of) Importance. *MLN*, *126*(5), 994–1003. https://doi.org/10.1353/mln.2011.0086

Laugier, S. (2015a). The Ordinary, Romanticism, and Democracy. *MLN*, *130*(5), 1040–1054. https://doi.org/10.1353/mln.2015.0078

Laugier, S. (2015b). Voice as Form of Life and Life Form. *Nordic Wittgenstein Review*, 63–81. https://doi.org/10.15845/nwr.v4i0.3364

Mahon, Á. (2014). *The Ironist and the Romantic: Reading Richard Rorty and Stanley Cavell*. Bloombury Publishing.

Mahon, Á. (2016). Stanley Cavell, Shakespeare and 'The Event' of Reading. *JOMEC Journal*, *10*, 43–52. https://doi.org/10.18573/j.2016.10085

Mahon, Á., & McHugh, F. (2016). Lateness and the Inhospitable in Stanley Cavell and Don DeLillo. *Philosophy and Literature*, *40*(2), 446–464. https://doi.org/10.1353/phl.2016.0030

Mahon, Á., & O'Brien, E. (2018). Risky Subjectivities in Philip Pullman's Northern Lights. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *37*(2), 181–193. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-017-9581-4

Mason, M. (2008). What Is Complexity Theory and What Are Its Implications for Educational Change? In M. Mason (Ed.), *Complexity Theory and the Philosophy of Education* (pp. 32–45).

McGarr, O., & McCormack, O. (2014). Reflecting to Conform? Exploring Irish Student Teachers' Discourses in Reflective Practice. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *107*(4), 267–280. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2013.807489

McIntyre, D., Pedder *, D., & Rudduck, J. (2005). Pupil voice: Comfortable and uncomfortable learnings for teachers. *Research Papers in Education*, *20*(2), 149–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520500077970

Merriam-Webster [Online]. (2021). https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/research

Midgley, M. (2019). *What is Philosophy For?* Bloomsbury.

Miles, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Simone Weil: An Anthology*. Penguin Modern Classics.

Munday, I. (2016). Language, teaching and failure. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margins* (pp. 100–109). Routledge.

Murdoch, I. (1999). *Existentialists And Mystics: Writings on Philosophy and Literature*. Penguin Books.

Murdoch, I. (2001). *The Sovereignty of Good*. Routledge.

Murray, C., Heinz, M., Munday, I., Keane, E., Flynn, N., Connolly, C., Hall, T., & MacRuairc, G. (2020). Reconceptualising relatedness in education in 'Distanced' Times. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(4), 488–502. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1806820

Naughton, C., & Cole, D. R. (2018). Philosophy and Pedagogy in Arts Education. In C. Naughton, G. Biesta, & D. R. Cole (Eds.), *Art, Artists and Pedagogy: Philosophy and the Arts in Education* (Ebook Edition, pp. 1–10). Routledge. https://www.amazon.co.uk/Art-Artists-Pedagogy-Philosophy-Education-ebook/dp/B076HB67B2/ref=sr_1_1?keywords=art%2C+artists+and+pedagogy&qid=1637706337&qsid=257-2902908-0506069&s=digital-text&sr=1-1&sres=B076HB67B2%2CB083X758NX%2CB07NS35S76%2CB07GBKRTBL%2CB00GU2RGGI%2CB00SHCSU64%2CB088KRWLKZ%2CB01MPZ8KKF%2CB0042JSQLU%2CB017

SAEYNI%2CB0719M1FX1%2CB00DTUKK4O%2CB07GNWXTKV%2CB00CVS453C%2CB01MTK0IAH%2CB06XCZHG9H&srpt=ABIS_BOOK

Noddings, N. (2003). *Happiness and Education*. Cambridge University Press.

Noddings, N. (2005). *The Challenge to Care in Schools* (Second Edition). Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2007). *Philosophy of Education* (Second Edition). Westview Press.

Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education* (Second Edition, Updated). University of California Press.

Noddings, N., & Sloate, M. (2003). Changing Notions of the Moral and Moral Education. In N. Blake, P. Smeyers, R. Smith, & P. Standish (Eds.), *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education* (pp. 341–355). Blackwell Publishing.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

O'Doherty, T., & Harford, J. (2017). Initial Teacher Education in Ireland—A Case Study. In M. A. Peters, B. Cowie, & I. Menter (Eds.), *A Companion to Research in Teacher Education* (pp. 167–178). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4075-7_11

O'Donoghue, T., Harford, J., & O'Doherty, T. (2017). *Teacher Preparation in Ireland: History, Policy and Future Directions*. Emerald Publishing.

OECD. (1991). *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Ireland*.

OECD. (2000). *Measuring Student Knowledge and Skills: The PISA 2000 Assessment of Reaching, Mathematical and Scientific Literacy*. OECD Publications Service.

O'Reilly, N. (2019). Tell me the story: Marginalisation, transformation, and school-based restorative practice. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *94*, 158–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.01.002

Osberg, D., & Biesta, G. (2021). Beyond curriculum: Groundwork for a non-instrumental theory of education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *53*(1), 57–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1750362.

Palmer, P. (2007). *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life* (Second Edition). Wiley.

Pirrie, A. (2015). Icarus Falling: Re-Imagining Educational Theory: Icarus Falling: Re-Imagining Educational Theory. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *49*(4), 525–538. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12124

Pirrie, A. (2016). Re-imagining educational theory. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margins* (pp. 84–91). Routledge.

Pirrie, A. (2019). *Virtue and the Quiet Art of Scholarship*. Routledge.

Pring, R. (2000). The 'False Dualism' of Educational Research. *Journal of the Philosophy of Education*, *34*(2), 247–260. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.00171

Puig de la Bellacasa, M. (2017). *Matters of Care: Speculative Ethics in More than Human Worlds*. University of Minneapolis Press.

Punch, K., & Oancea, A. (2014). *Introduction to Research Methods in Education*. SAGE.

Rilke, R. M. (2014). *Letters to a Young Poet* (R. Snell, Trans.). Sublime Books.

Rorty, R. (1999). *Philosophy and Social Hope*. Penguin Books.

Rudduck, J., & Fielding, M. (2006). Student voice and the perils of popularity. *Educational Review*, *58*(2), 219–231. https://doi.org/00131910600584207

Ruitenberg, C. (2009a). Distance and Defamiliarisation: Translation as Philosophical Method. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *43*(3), 421–435. https://doi-org.ucd.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2009.00697.x

Ruitenberg, C. (2009b). Introduction: The Question of Method in Philosophy of Education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *43*(3), 315–323. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2009.00712.x

Rutten, L. (2021). Toward a theory of action for practitioner inquiry as professional development in preservice teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *97*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103194

Sahlberg, P. (2010). *The Secret to Finland's Success: Educating Teachers*. Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/secret-finland%E2%80%99s-success-educating-teachers.pdf

Sahlberg, P. (2012). *Report of the International Review Panel on the Structure of Initial Teacher Education Provision in Ireland*. Department of Education and Skills. https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/0ef415-report-of-the-international-review-panel-on-the-structure-of-initial/

Sahlberg, P. (2018). *The Structure of Teacher Education in Ireland: Review of Progress in Implementing Reform*. Higher Education Authority of Ireland. https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2019/05/HEA-Structure-of-Teacher-Education.pdf

Saito, N. (2004). Awakening My Voice: Learning from Cavell's perfectionist education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *36*(1), 79–89. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2004.00050.x

Saito, N. (2009). Ourselves in Translation: Stanley Cavell and Philosophy as Autobiography. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *43*(2), 253–267. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2009.00691.x

Saito, N. (2013). Exceeding Thought: Standing on Tiptoe Between the Private and the Public. In *Educational Theory Yearbook* (pp. 108–116). Philosophy of Education Society.

Saito, N., & Standish, P. (2014). Cavell, Stanley. In D. C. Phillips (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy* (pp. 112–113). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and Capabilities*. Oxford University Press.

Shakespeare, W. (1986). *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. The Educational Company of Ireland.

Skea, C. (2017). Student satisfaction in higher education: Settling up and settling down. *Ethics and Education*, *12*(3), 364–377. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2017.1343560

Skerritt, C., Brown, M., & O'Hara, J. (2021). Student voice and classroom practice: How students are consulted in contexts without traditions of student voice. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2021.1979086

Smeyers, P. (2007). On the Limits of Empirical Educational Research, Beyond the Fantasy: A Rejoinder to D.C. Philips. In D. Bridges & R. Smith (Eds.), *Philosophy, Methodology and Educational Research* (pp. 333–350). Blackwell Publishing.

Smith, R. (2009). Between the Lines: Philosophy, Text and Conversation. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *43*(3), 437–449. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2009.00700.x

Smith, R. (2010). Chapter 13: Writing the Philosophy of Education. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *The Philosophy of Education: An Introduction* (Ebook Edition). Continuum.

https://www.amazon.co.uk/Philosophy-Education-Introduction-Richard-Bailey-ebook/dp/B00O8MOM28/ref=tmm_kin_swatch_0?_encoding=UTF8&qid=&sr=

Smith, R. (2016a). Reading between the lines. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margins* (pp. 129–138). Routledge.

Smith, R. (2016b). The Virtues of Unknowing. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *50*(2), 272–284. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12206

Smith, R. (2020). Writing Up and Down: The Language of Educational Research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *54*(3), 666–678. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12440

Standish, P. (2001). Data Return: The Sense of the Given in Educational Research. *Journal of the Philosophy of Education*, *35*(3), 497–518. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.00240

Standish, P. (2004). In Her Own Voice: Convention, conversion, criteria. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *36*(1), 91–106. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2004.00051.x

Standish, P. (2010). Chapter 1: What is the Philosophy of Education? In R. Bailey (Ed.), *The Philosophy of Education: An Introduction* (Ebook Edition). Continuum. https://www.amazon.co.uk/Philosophy-Education-Introduction-Richard-Bailey-ebook/dp/B00O8MOM28/ref=tmm_kin_swatch_0?_encoding=UTF8&qid=&sr=

Standish, P. (2013). Rethinking democracy and education with Stanley Cavell. *Foro de Educación*, *11*(15), 49–64. https://doi.org/10.14516/fde.2013.011.015.002

Standish, P. (2016, August 24). *Empiricism and the Avoidance of Philosophy*. European Conference on Educational Research, Dublin, Ireland. https://youtu.be/v0_pxNP5xtg

Standish, P. (2020). On Being Resolute. In H. Appelqvist (Ed.), *Wittgenstein and the Limits of Language* (pp. 133–158). Routledge.

Stenhouse, L. (1981). What Counts as Research? *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *29*(2), 103–114. https://doi-org.ucd.idm.oclc.org/10.2307/3120018

The Teaching Council. (2011). *Policy on the Continuum of Teacher Education*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/publications/teacher-education/policy-on-the-continuum-of-teacher-education.pdf

The Teaching Council. (2013). *Guidelines on School Placement (First Edition)*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/publications/ite-professional-accreditation/guidelines-on-school-placement.pdf

The Teaching Council. (2016a). *Code of Professional Conduct for Teachers, 2nd Edition*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/publications/fitness-to-teach/code-of-professional-conduct-for-teachers1.pdf

The Teaching Council. (2016b). *Cosán: Framework for Teachers' Learning*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/publications/teacher-education/cosan-framework-for-teachers-learning.pdf

The Teaching Council. (2016c). *Research Strategy*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/_fileupload/research/research-strategy-updated.pdf

The Teaching Council. (2017a). *Droichead: The Integrated Professional Induction Framework*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/_fileupload/droichead-2017/droichead-the-integrated-professional-induction-policy.pdf

The Teaching Council. (2017b). *Initial Teacher Education: Criteria and Guidelines for Programme Providers*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/publications/ite-

professional-accreditation/criteria-and-guidelines-for-programme-providers-march-2017-.pdf

The Teaching Council. (2018). *Teaching Council Strategic Plan 2018-2020*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/publications/strategic-plan/teaching-council-strategic-plan-2018-2020.pdf

The Teaching Council. (2019). *Report and Action Plan of the School Placement Working Group to the Department of Education and Skills' Teacher Supply Implementation Group*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/teacher-education/initial-teacher-education/school-placement/school-placement-working-group.pdf

The Teaching Council. (2020). *Céim: Standards for Initial Teacher Education*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/news-events/latest-news/ceim-standards-for-initial-teacher-education.pdf

The Teaching Council. (2021). *School Placement Innovation Report*. https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/publications/teacher-education/school-placement-innovation-report-2021.pdf

US-NCATE. (2010). *Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, USA. http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/blue-ribbon-panel.pdf

Vansieleghem, N. (2016). Making voices visual: Two images. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margin* (pp. 92–99). Routledge.

Vlieghe, J. (2016). The educational meaning of 'practising'. In A. Fulford & N. Hodgson (Eds.), *Philosophy and Theory in Educational Research: Writing in the margins* (pp. 57–64). Routledge.

Warner, A. R., Houston, W. R., & Cooper, J. M. (1977). Rethinking the Clinical Concept in Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *28*(1), 15–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/002248717702800104

Weil, S. (1951). *Waiting for God*. Putnum.

Weil, S. (2002). *Gravity and Grace* (Second). Routledge.

Winch, C., Oancea, A., & Orchard, J. (2015). The contribution of educational research to teachers' professional learning: Philosophical understandings. *Oxford Review of Education*, *41*(2), 202–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2015.1017406

Winter, P., & Biesta, G. (2011). Coming Into the World, Uniqueness, and the Beautiful Risk of Education: An Interview with Gert Biesta by Philip Winter. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *30*(5), 537–542. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-011-9254-7

Wittgenstein, L. (2009). *Philosophical Investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Wiley-Blackwell.