Academic work, learning and identity

Janice Malcolm

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of PhD by publication

September 2011

University of Brighton

Academic work, learning and identity

This thesis comprises a set of linked texts, published over a 10-year period, principally as book chapters and journal articles. The texts offer a series of analyses of the literature of higher education teaching and learning; the nature of academic work and the ways in which it is constructed for different purposes; the ways in which teaching, research and discipline can be understood as elements of academic practice; discipline as the academic workplace and the nature of 'workplace learning' in this context; and the contribution of selected theoretical perspectives on learning and work to new understandings of academic practice. Taken together , these texts have made a significant contribution to the development of academic practice as a focus of educational research. They draw upon

- An initial review of the literature of learning and teaching in higher education;
- An empirical study of the construction of pedagogic and academic identity, involving extended interviews with 20 academics;
- The development of successive conceptualisations of pedagogic and academic practice and identity;
- The incorporation of new theoretical perspectives into the study of academic work and the cross-fertilisation of the field from different disciplinary perspectives.

The published texts are arranged thematically and located both within the research field and within the development of the author's academic career. The publications are critically appraised in terms of their contribution to the development of academic practice as a focus of research into higher education, and to the emergent disciplinary field of 'work and learning'.

Table of contents

Section	Page no.

NB *Since the published papers on which this thesis is based are covered by third-party copyright agreements, they are not included in the physical or e-copy deposited with the University of Brighton.*

Paper 1: Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2000) 'Becoming an educator: communities of practice in higher education' in McNay, I. (ed.) *Higher Education and its Communities*, Buckingham, SRHE/ Open University

Paper 2: Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2001) 'Bridging pedagogic gaps: conceptual discontinuities in higher education' *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6, 1, 33-42

Paper 3: Zukas, M. and Malcolm, J. (2002) 'Pedagogies for lifelong learning: building bridges or building walls?' in Harrison, R., Reeve, F., Hanson, A. Clarke, J. (eds.) *Supporting Lifelong Learning: Volume 1 - Perspectives on Learning*, London, Routledge Falmer/Open University

Paper 4: Zukas, M. and Malcolm, J. (2008) 'Pedagogic identities and lifelong learning' in Herzberg, H. (Ed.) *Lebenslanges Lernen. Theoretische Perspektiven und empirische Befunde im Kontext der Erwachsenenbildung* (Lifelong learning: theoretical perspectives and empirical findings in the context of adult education), Frankfurt am Main/ Berlin/ Bern/ Bruxelles/ New York/Oxford/Wien, Peter Lang

Paper 5: Malcolm, J., Hodkinson, P., Colley, H. (2003) 'The interrelationships between informal and formal learning', *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 15, 7/8, 313-318

Paper 6: Colley, H., Hodkinson, P. and Malcolm, J. (2003) *Formality and Informality in Learning: A Report for the Learning and Skills Research Centre*, London, LSRC

Paper 7: Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2006) 'Pedagogic learning in the pedagogic workplace' in Edwards, R., Gallacher, J. and Whitaker, S. (eds) *Learning outside the Academy* London, Routledge

Paper 8: Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2007)' Poor relations: exploring discipline, research and pedagogy in academic identity' in Osborne, M, Houston, M and Toman, N (eds) *The Pedagogy of Lifelong Learning: understanding effective teaching and learning in diverse contexts* London, Routledge

Paper 9: Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2007) 'Beyond the fringe: adult educators, work and discipline' , paper presented at the 5th International Researching Work and Learning Conference, Cape Town, 2-5 December

Paper 10: Zukas, M. and Malcolm, J. (2007) 'Teaching, discipline, net-work' in Skelton, A. (ed) *International Perspectives on Teaching Excellence in Higher Education* London, Routledge

Paper 11: Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2009) 'Making a mess of academic work: experience, purpose, identity', *Teaching in Higher Education* 14, 5, 495-506

Declaration

I declare that the research contained in this thesis, unless otherwise formally indicated within the text, is the original work of the author. The thesis has not been previously submitted to this or any other university for a degree, and does not incorporate any material already submitted for a degree.

Signed

Dated

Section 1: Introduction

1.1   Academic career context

My first University appointment was as a Lecturer in Continuing Education at the University of Leeds in 1990. For eight years before that I had been working as an adult education lecturer in further education colleges in Bradford, and had also undertaken a Masters in Adult and Continuing Education at Leeds. My dissertation (Malcolm, 1988) was a small-scale study of race, gender and disability policies in Bradford's 3 college adult education departments, written from a critical perspective rooted in feminist and Marxist radical adult education.

Once in a university post, my early research focused on women's education and on the particular policy contexts of adult education in the late 1980's and early 1990s (Malcolm, 1992; 1993; Malcolm and Jones, 1995), in part funded by a successful bid to the then Universities Funding Council for a 2-year research project. During this period I was also exploring my own political stance on education, writing with Rebecca O'Rourke on the legacy of social purpose in adult education (Malcolm and O'Rourke, 2001), and contributing a chapter on my own experiences as student and academic to a book edited by the radical feminist adult educator Jane Thompson (Malcolm, 2000). This chapter was, in effect, a manifesto of my position in relation to higher education, both as an adult educator and as a woman academic from a poor working-class background. My early experiences of grappling with critical questions of class and gender in educational contexts – both in autobiographical and in theoretical terms – have strongly influenced my later research preoccupations and the conceptual frameworks within which I have found myself most at home.

I experienced a privileged, if rather disorganised, academic apprenticeship as I made the transition from being an adult education practitioner to being an academic. I received no formal mentoring on the development of my research career, but relied heavily on extensive reading, informal contacts with colleagues, and gatherings such as the Standing Conference on University Teaching and Research on the Education of Adults (SCUTREA) for my socialisation as a researcher. However my location within a very schoolteaching-centred School of Education meant that I and my 'post-compulsory' colleagues were also exposed to ideas, theoretical frameworks and practices which were common currency among school-education academics. This in itself was a valuable experience. The traditional foundations of history, philosophy, psychology and sociology of education were being undermined by moves towards school-based training, and the academic study of education was moving into policy, management, curriculum and pedagogy. Yet the strong disciplinary orientation of teacher

education was maintained (in that students trained as teachers of history, maths, etc., rather than as subject specialists with an additional generic training in teaching). The conflicts and debates which these changes stimulated among our colleagues provided a very useful focus of comparison for those of us specialising in adult, further and higher education.

Through teaching across the Masters programme, supervising dissertations and co-supervising PhD students I was inducted into research practices as a working academic, in a way which would now be very unusual – through experiential learning. However I undertook on my own initiative a year-long course in Advanced Social Research Methods in the Leeds Sociology Department (there was of course no formal PhD research training at the time), excellently taught by Ray Pawson, a scholar of social research methodology. The breadth of my exposure to research through all of these activities had both a positive and a negative impact; in effect I did not really find my own research direction until I had been an academic for about six years, and after I had begun and then withdrawn from formal PhD study – which I had to do during a family crisis. But this long apprenticeship also meant that the direction of my research emerged from experience and familiarity with the field, and that I was able to distinguish a true intellectual focus from ephemeral passing interest. This is a rare privilege and has meant that I have never lost interest in my own research.

The final period in my research 'apprenticeship' took place when I moved into the Leeds School of Continuing Education, and involved a number of short-term commissioned research projects. One was a 3-month solo project for the local region of the Workers Educational Association (WEA) (Malcolm, 1998); another was a contribution to an ongoing project for the National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ) being undertaken by Leeds colleagues (University of Leeds, 1997). Both of these projects required me to hone my methodological skills, and required a high degree of self-discipline and methodological rigour, enabling me to exploit and refine much of what I had learnt about research methods through my own study, through teaching and supervision, and through my earlier experiments in research practice.

Despite my use here of the term 'apprenticeship', there is for me no clear dividing line between the apprenticeship phase and the beginning of self-driven and focused research practice, which was closely linked with my teaching concerns. I was involved throughout this time in new teacher education programmes (PGCE Post-compulsory), and Masters programmes in Adult or Post-compulsory Education, teaching modules on the sociology of education, policy and gender. My students increasingly comprised higher education lecturers, nurse educators, FE lecturers and other professional educators, rather than the more

Section 1 Introduction

'traditional' adult educator. In 1994-5 I became actively involved in the policy debates about compulsory teaching qualifications for FE lecturers and participated in events and discussions surrounding the 'occupational mapping' of the sector (Malcolm, 1995). My concern at this point was with the apparent seizure by the NCVQ competence culture of the field of 'educating the adult educator' – which I saw as a principal focus of my teaching.

With the benefit of historical hindsight it is easy to see that fundamental and irreversible shifts were already in process in the identity and practice of 'post-compulsory' educators and the institutions in which they worked. Adult education had been profoundly undermined by the Conservative governments following 1979 (see, for example, McIlroy and Spencer, 1988). The competence-based education movement in UK policy was dominating educational discourse (see e.g. Edwards and Usher, 1994, Hyland, 1993); and the various forms of 'gentlemen's agreement' which had enabled the professions to retain autonomy and trust in the postwar period were under popular and political attack (see e.g. Bottery, 1996). My critique of the application of competence-based approaches to teacher education was, essentially, that '*by excluding the critical consideration of educational purposes it effectively reduces the educator's role to that of technician, impoverishing both lecturer and student. Its focus on organisational commitment promotes compliance and excludes any understanding of the forces which shape lecturers' own work and that for which they prepare their students.*' (Malcolm 1995, 69); a stance which has continued to inform both my research and my teaching since that point. Although the institutional focus of my research and the forms of analysis have changed, my commitment to the broader emancipatory social purposes of education has remained fundamental.

ESRC Project R000222794 – Models of the educator in higher education: a bibliographic and conceptual map

In 1998 I designed and succeeded in obtaining funding for a small, one-year project funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). This grew out of discussions with my Leeds colleague Miriam Zukas (henceforth referred to as MZ), about two things. The first was the emergence of the embryonic Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (ILT), following the recommendations on the 'professionalisation' of university teaching made in the Dearing Report (NCIHE, 1997). Although higher education had always lagged some way behind other educational sectors in relation to centralisation, standardisation and regulation, there was a perceptible movement to promote development of a new specialist area of study and practice – 'teaching and learning in higher education' (TLHE), and this clearly struck a chord with the regulatory direction of education policy in the late 1990s. The second, linked

Section 1 Introduction

issue was the oddity and impoverishment of some of the literature emerging at the time from this movement.

As an emerging field of practice TLHE was, and to some extent remains, in a precarious position within the academy. I would argue that this was precisely because of some of the problems identified in **Papers 1 and 2** – the training orientation of many of its practitioners, the lack of academic experience of many of those claiming to train others to teach, and the theoretical and conceptual inadequacy of the literature. There were other factors too, although they were beyond the scope of the original research project. One of these was the fact that those driving the TLHE movement were generally located in post-1992 universities, most of which at that point had not developed the academic self-confidence of the older, autonomous universities. With fewer resources at their disposal they had borne the brunt of expansion and had had perforce to find ways of teaching more students without a proportionate increase in funding; indeed the early work of some TLHE luminaries was specifically geared to teaching larger classes (e.g. Gibbs and Jenkins, 1992). The history of these institutions which, in the absence of degree-awarding powers, had been obliged until 1992 to subject all of their programmes to the scrutiny of the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA), may well have contributed to an apparent willingness to accept, or even to seek, external regulation and validation. The early activities of the ILT are testament to an approach which was largely at odds with the (albeit often romanticised) traditions of academic freedom and autonomy in the 'old' universities. It was an attempt to found a professional body for academics, but without the engagement, interest or even awareness of the vast majority of academics themselves. Its focus was very much on teaching, and it initially proposed a complex set of competence-based teaching standards which academics would have to meet in order to be admitted to membership (Booth, 1998). Although the ILT failed to engage the academic community, its successor the Higher Education Academy (HEA) is still in existence and in many ways continues to be dogged by its legacy to this day. There have been successive reformulations and revisions of its accreditation procedures for individuals, programmes and continuing professional development frameworks, driven largely by the desire of some universities to be accredited by an outside body, rather than by any clear need for this kind of regulation; and predicated almost entirely on the separation of teaching from other aspects of academic work.

Having worked and researched in the fields of adult education and FE teacher education, and indeed having spent considerable time interacting with school education researchers, it seemed strange to me that the new literature of TLHE apparently bore no conceptual or

Section 1 Introduction

theoretical relation to the established fields I knew well. Where, I wondered, did its ideas come from? And why did it make so little use of the rich and diverse traditions of educational thought? At the time I had recently come across a fascinating book (admittedly, probably fascinating only to those immersed in 60s and 70s popular music culture from an early age), entitled *Rock Family Trees* (Frame, 1993), in which the author used intricately-drawn genealogical diagrams to map the changing memberships of and migrations between British and American pop and rock groups. What intrigued me about this was the way in which changes in artistic production could be traced through the movements of, and interactions among, individual musicians. The notion of genealogy, both as a method and as a way of accounting for the existence and growth of powerful ideas or beliefs, was of course very familiar from the work of Foucault (e.g. Foucault, 1972; 1973), and was a compelling metaphor in social science research at the time. Initially, what I hoped for from the research project was a 'genealogical map' which would show whence the standard discourse of TLHE had emerged, and how it had become so detached from the established intellectual space of education. This was probably an unrealistic task for a one-year project, but the process of doing the project itself produced ideas which were eventually much more interesting to me than those embodied in the original intention.

This 1-year ESRC project was essentially a critical literature review of an emerging body of work, undertaken from the perspective of a researcher functioning largely outside the field under review. The final bibliography contained nearly 600 publications. However it was politically difficult to *publish* a systematic literature review. I had attended a Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA) conference during the course of the research, where I encountered what appeared to be a rather evangelical community of practice intent on taking and defending its own territory as 'learning and teaching in higher education'. It already had gurus and intellectual leaders, some of whom were the authors of the work I found so inadequate. I felt like a visitor from a distant planet, and when I tried to explain what my research was about, I was met with bemused incomprehension or rather suspicious disdain. The conference papers themselves provided several stark examples of what Rowland has called 'surface learning about teaching' (Rowland, 2001). So much of the literature I had come across seemed poor, undertheorised, decontextualised and focused on technical 'quick fixes' for university teachers; and any straightforward evaluation of it would inevitably have had the air of a hatchet job. But I had no desire to provoke hostility from people who were essentially well-intentioned, and it seemed that any comprehensive public critique of the field would be seen as an attack on their attempts to value teaching. I resolved this dilemma – or perhaps evaded it – by referring to the literature allusively as a body of work, or as strands of

Section 1 Introduction

thought (e.g. in **Paper 2 and Paper 3**), rather than in the more traditional manner of critiquing individual works.

My extended 'academic apprenticeship' had been largely completed by the time I applied for ESRC funding in 1998; I had identified a clear research focus and had mastered both the methodological understanding and the self-discipline to undertake independent research. Until 2004 I remained at the University of Leeds in the School of Continuing Education, first as a Senior Research Fellow, and then reverting to my original role as a lecturer. In 2004 two major changes occurred: first, the University of Leeds resolved to close this venerable School, despite an international campaign to keep it open, and it became clear that I and several other colleagues would be moved to the (very school-dominated) School of Education. I then had to move for family reasons to Canterbury, where I took up an academic post at the University of Kent, in an entirely unfamiliar academic development role. As the only established education researcher in a service-oriented Unit, it became more difficult to maintain a commitment to research and writing, but what I did manage to produce was now informed by a view from the 'other side' – the very field I had been critiquing. The cultural tensions I experienced as an outsider moving into this world – becoming 'different' in my daily work setting – were ultimately positive and fruitful. For the first time, I was forced to consider the business of 'being an academic' from a slightly more detached perspective, not least by being exposed to the perspectives of my mostly non-academic colleagues. This helped to move my work on in unexpected ways. Crucial among these was my growing realisation, strongly influenced by the experience of working closely with novice lecturers in different subject areas, of the power of discipline in shaping academic identity. I should stress at this point that I use 'discipline' in a very broad sense; I would include within the term both Bernstein's 'singulars', which are strongly-bounded and ' intrinsic to the production of knowledge in the intellectual field' – and his recontextualising 'regions', which are 'the interface between the production of knowledge and field of practice' (Bernstein, 2000, 9). But these classifications do not easily accommodate the flows of emergence, competition, dominance, colonisation, hybridity and dissolution which characterise the actor-networks of discipline and professional specialisation– all of which I would wish to convey in my use of 'discipline'. This is explored in more detail in some of the papers presented in this volume.

The academic development field of which I was so critical in the earlier papers presented here has been transformed in recent years; many of the criticisms I made of it in the period from 1998 to 2004 would certainly not be valid today. Although there remains a substantial strand of fairly superficial practice studies (as can be seen from, for example, the programmes of the

Section 1 Introduction

annual conference of the Higher Education Academy), the literature of academic development has become very much richer, utilising a range of theoretical perspectives and subjecting practice to critique. The literature on academic practice has developed to accommodate many more ethical, sociological and disciplinary perspectives (e.g. Macfarlane, 2004; McLean, 2006; Clegg, 2008; Kreber, 2009; Brennan et al, 2010), as well as to recognise the centrality of disciplinary research to practice (e.g. Brew, 2006; Macfarlane, 2009). *Teaching in Higher Education* and the *International Journal of Academic Development* – both very new journals when I began the research covered here – have become respected research publications and illustrate the move of higher education policy and (in particular) practice into the mainstream of educational research. I would lay claim to having played a part in this change, and this will be the focus of the remainder of this thesis.

1.2   Organisation of the commentary

It is important at this point to note that the chronology of academic publication often does not reflect the chronology of production. Frequently, work is published two or more years after it was written; and commissioned book chapters, for example, are often based on research which was completed some years earlier. It is therefore difficult to give a smooth and coherent account of textual production (as indeed it is difficult to perceive a smooth trajectory of progression whilst doing it). The commentary on the papers (**Section 2**) is organised in four parts, the first being devoted to methodology and the remaining three reflecting the three stages or strands of the research from my initial study of pedagogic identity, via the project on informality in learning, to my later work on workplace learning and academic identity. Although the production of the texts in the different strands took place in some cases simultaneously, the work on informality made a major contribution to the development of my work on academic identity and so is included as an interlude between the two main strands of the research. The production of the published texts is explained within each strand in chronological order of publication.

The pagination of the papers has been revised to reflect the flow of this thesis rather than the original pagination of the publications. The exception to this is **Paper 6**, which for technical reasons is included with its original formatting and pagination intact. Within each of the published papers, the referencing style of the original is retained, and references are listed at the end of each paper.

1.3   Original contribution to knowledge

The case being made here is that I have made an original contribution to the field of higher education research and that this contribution has had an impact on the field. Specifically, I have done this by:

a) Challenging the assumptions that were evident in some of the literature of higher education teaching and learning when I began the research described here, and proposing an original analysis of constructions of the educator within that literature;

b) Conducting an original analysis of concepts of formality and informality in learning and developing that analysis in relation to the work of academics;

c) Introducing new theoretical perspectives to the study of higher education and producing original analyses of the nature of academic work, drawing upon the literature of adult education, workplace learning and actor-network theory.

Section 2.1 Methodology

The overall 'project' described here arose initially from the 1998 ESRC award 'Models of the educator in higher education: a bibliographic and conceptual map' (**ESRC Project R000222794)**. My approach throughout has been qualitative and critically interpretive, rooted in, first, my linguistic training and interest in discourse analysis, with its focus on the *social context* of discourse; and second, my early readings of the Marxist- and feminist-influenced 'new sociology of education' with its explicit focus on the social organisation of knowledge (e.g. Young, 1971) and on power relations in education. However it is important to note that the project as a whole encompasses several methodological strands and that my approach has evolved as the research has progressed.

I had originally been strongly influenced by Dorothy E. Smith's work on institutional ethnography (Smith, 1987; 2005) and used it frequently in my teaching and supervision of student research. The way that my research emerged and proceeded paralleled in many ways Smith's account of her own collaborative sociological explorations of 'mothering for schooling', which arose out of her personal experience as a single parent (Griffith and Smith, 2004). This long-term project also emerged from a 'problematic' in my own experience as an academic and a teacher-educator – the emergence of a set of educational discourses and institutional practices which I found incongruous and inexplicable. When the project began, it was unclear to me where it might lead; the first stage was conceived very much as a ground-clearing exercise preliminary to identifying a research agenda. The methods employed have developed over the years as the project itself developed into something both more complex and much longer than originally envisaged. The introduction of actor-network theory (ANT) approaches in the later stages of what has turned out to be 'the project' has problematised the entire question of methodology and renders the production of a neatly-bounded, 'intellectually hygienic' account (Law, 2006) both unlikely and undesirable. It has also meant that the possibilities of fruitful research on academic work have proliferated as the work has progressed, and so, perhaps in common with many other long-term research 'projects' in academic careers, there is no tidy end-point to report.

Strand 1

The initial (funded) phase of the project was a literature review of 600 publications. The first stage employed general content analysis techniques to group the texts broadly according to dominant 'versions of the educator'. These versions represented particular 'ideological-discursive formations' (Fairclough, 1995) in the ways they talked about, or to, the educator. In

Section 2.1 Methodology

Fairclough's view, 'ways of talking' are inseparable from 'ways of seeing' (2005, 40), and the development of powerful discourses serves to 'naturalise' ideology. Through more detailed discourse analysis of key texts from each broad grouping I then endeavoured to uncover the ideological assumptive worlds of the writers and (by extension) their assumptions about the practices and communities they addressed. This process began to identify a proliferating set of divergent perspectives on questions such as: 'does it matter who the learner is?' ' is the teacher described as a socially-situated being?', 'how is learning understood and measured?' or 'what is the purpose of educational activity?' In order to refine, organise and clarify these perspectives, my co-researcher MZ (a psychologist by training) and I then carried out a repertory grid exercise (Fransella and Bannister, 1977), generating sets of 'constructs' to describe the pedagogic assumptions which differentiated the 'versions' from each other. Each of these constructs was conceived as occupying a position along a continuum between two extremes – for example, from learning understood as a social practice to learning conceived as an internal psychological process – which was now labelled a dimension of pedagogic identity. Assessing the key texts along each of these dimensions, and comparing one with another, helped to identify which were the most useful dimensions to think about, and to eliminate the less useful versions of the educator. This exercise produced nine dimensions along which the identities varied, and five workable 'versions of the educator'.

The final list of dimensions of pedagogic identity was as follows:

Learning in a community	<————————>	Individualised learning
Disciplinary community	<————————>	Pedagogic community
Moral/social accountability	<————————>	Organisational accountability
Educator as person in the world	<————————>	Anonymous/invisible educator
Learner as person in the world	<————————>	Anonymous/invisible learner
Learner-centred evaluation	<————————>	Objective measures of learning
Focus on process	<————————>	Focus on product
Content contested	<————————>	Content as given
Social orientation	<————————>	Psychological orientation

These produced the following 'versions of the educator', which were then used as the basis for further analysis:

- *The educator as critical practitioner*
- *The educator as psycho-diagnostician and facilitator of learning*
- *The educator as reflective practitioner*
- *The educator as situated learner within a community of practice*
- *The educator as assurer of organisational quality and efficiency; deliverer of service to agreed or imposed standards*

Section 2.1 Methodology

The use of the (to me, unfamiliar) repertory grid technique was a helpful means of eliminating redundant dimensions by clarifying duplicated characteristics; in this sense it was a useful addition to the tools of discourse analysis in dealing with a large and unwieldy body of material. However it was important, when presenting these ideas, to stress repeatedly that the 'versions of the educator' were quite broad categorisations which were neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive, and which were certainly not intended as models of practice. This is one of main pitfalls of trying to produce rationalised accounts of complex and messy reality (in this case, textual reality), and one that continues to dog educational research in particular. Two examples will suffice to illustrate this point.

At an academic development conference in 1999, I heard a paper (Grenham et al, 1999) which utilised Vygotsky's idea of the 'zone of proximal development' (ZPD). This is a way of conceptualising and explaining the social and constructive nature of learning. Vygotsky was working to reconcile the underdeveloped field of developmental psychology with a Marxist (dialectical) ontology, and indeed some of the ideas underpinning this work can probably be traced back to Engels' (1876/1934) unfinished attempts to produce a Marxist account of human evolution. The conference paper mixed various versions of learning styles with an idea of the ZPD as, almost literally, a scaffold propping up the strictly limited potential of the hapless and formless student. It was clear that the ZPD had been lifted clean out of its theoretical context and applied as a tool to go in the teacher's toolbox for 'fixing' students.

The second example is the story of 'communities of practice'. Jean Lave's original anthropological studies of social learning contexts (Lave and Wenger, 1991) gave rise to 'communities of practice' as a label for the complex *processes* identified within occupational and interest groups to induct newer members or 'legitimate peripheral participants' into those groups. 'Communities of practice' was quickly seized upon in numerous professional and academic fields, initially as a *description or way of analysing* practice, but was then mysteriously transformed into a *prescription for practice*. Thus Wenger et al (2002) provide seven principles for developing communities of practice, and the National Health Service promotes their cultivation as a tool of knowledge management (NHS Evidence, 2005). The idea has become extremely popular in education (e.g. Kimble et al, 2008) and Etienne Wenger himself offers his services to organisational executives wishing to 'develop knowledge strategy, that is, a framework for strategic capabilities development' (Wenger, 2009).

In both of these examples, a concept which is developed to assist in the analysis and understanding of a social phenomenon within a particular theoretical framework, is

converted (sometimes as if by magic) into a recipe or toolkit for achieving particular ends, regardless of their purpose and context. This indeed was one of my major criticisms of much of the academic development literature I was reviewing. My reservations about using repertory grids sprang partly from a desire to avoid this 'toolkit' approach. However, the development of these 'dimensions of pedagogic identity' and 'versions of the educator' did provide an (apparently) more ordered field in which to begin further work on ideas and discourses of pedagogic identity. The literature review forms the main focus of **Papers 1, 2 and 3**.

Strand 2

It goes without saying that I had, inevitably, drawn upon my own and my colleagues' daily experience of academic work, and crucially that of my lecturer-students, when conducting and discussing the research up to this point. I was, perforce, in the position of a participant observer, and indeed the desire to explore and critique, for example, systems of scrutiny and regulation emerged very easily from my own experience of quality assurance processes (Malcolm and Zukas, 2002). As Smith puts it, 'our experiences became our research problematic' (2005, 45). However, it was clear that material drawing on a more diverse range of academic experiences would provide a richer ground for further exploration.

It is important to note that the interviews I then embarked upon had a twofold purpose. They were, of course, a useful testbed for the 'versions of the educator' distilled from the literature review, enabling me to explore how far these identity-constructs were congruent with the personal experience of university lecturers; but this was and remained a relatively minor purpose . They were not intended to provide a comprehensive account of what academics think, or how they experience their work; this could have been achieved much more easily by a large-scale survey or diary exercise (and indeed this approach has been used recently in various studies of academic work, not least the international 'Changing Academic Profession' study carried out over the last few years [UUK, 2010]). Much more importantly from my point of view, they were aimed at finding detailed and nuanced examples of how academics themselves experienced their own work and the relations of the workplace, in order to provide a starting point for further inquiry. Smith provides a useful explanation of the role of research respondents in this kind of research:

> '[Institutional ethnography] may start by exploring the experience of those directly involved in the institutional setting, but *they are not the objects of investigation*. It is the aspects of the institutions relevant to the people's experience, not the people themselves, that constitute the object of inquiry ... however defined, it is people's experience which sets the problematic of

> the study, the first step in an inquiry that travels sequentially deeper into the institutional
> relations in which people's everyday lives are embedded' (Smith, 2005, 38, emphasis added).

In this case, the 'institutions' were, as it turned out, exceedingly complex objects of inquiry,
encompassing universities, educational and social policy structures, and disciplines. Whilst the
interviews were pivotal in opening up these routes of future research travel, and were
particularly useful in identifying and making explicit the entanglements of the academic
'problematic', their function was intended to be principally generative of further research
questions.

The empirical strand of this project took the form of two sets of interviews with lecturers
teaching in higher education. The first set of interviewees comprised nine UK lecturers
interviewed by me, and six Australian lecturers interviewed by MZ during a short sabbatical at
the University of Technology, Sydney. Of the UK group, five worked in traditional 'civic'
universities, one in a 1960s university, one in a post-1992 university, and two taught HE
courses within FE colleges. Four of the Australian interviewees worked in 'new'
(technological) universities and two in vocational (TAFE) colleges. Although the participants
covered a range of institutions, career stages and teaching contexts, the intention was not to
seek a representative sample or to make the findings generalisable in any way, but rather to
seek a richer range of data to work on. The disciplines covered by the respondents were
education, social work, sociology, history, management, economics, computing, philosophy,
sports science, Latin-American studies, psychology, youth work, information technology and
English. In retrospect I can see that a less heterogeneous sample might have helped me to
identify certain issues (in particular the critical role of discipline) at an earlier stage. In this first
round, 15 semi-structured interviews following a broad schedule (see **Appendix 1**) were
conducted over a period of 30 months. The second set of interviews (**Appendix 2**)was carried
out in 2005, and involved five academics who had been working in a traditional UK university
adult education department for varying lengths of time, and were now being dispersed to
various other contexts following the closure of their own department (see **Paper 9**). All
interviews were recorded and transcribed, usually by the interviewer (i.e. myself and, in the
case of the Australian interviews, MZ). The transcripts were analysed and manually coded in
successive iterations, both in relation to the pedagogic identity-constructs arising from the
literature review, and in order to identify starting points or problematics for a deeper inquiry
into what Smith terms 'institutional relations' (2005). This is the first step in making the move
from 'the ordinary doings and language that are the stuff of people's lives onto the terrain of a
sociological discourse, the business of which is to examine *how that stuff is hooked into a*

larger fabric not directly observable from within the everyday' (Smith, 2005, 39, my emphasis). The material emerging from the first round of interviews appears in **Papers 4, 7 and 8,** where the focus is, first, on identifying the points of resonance and dissonance between the 'versions of the educator' from the literature, and the experiences and perspectives uncovered in the interviews; and then on analysing the forces and relations intersecting in the 'pedagogic workplace' . The material from the second round of interviews is utilised directly only in **Paper 9,** although the material from both sets of interviews informs the papers in **Section 2.4**. By the time **Papers 10 and 11** were written, the focus of the research had moved on from uncovering the academic problematic – and the privileging of the academic actor – to the institutional relations of academic work, as is explained in **Strand 3**.

At this stage in the account of methodology, it is important to note the influence on this project of my work on the 'Formality and Informality in Learning' report (**Paper 6**) for the Learning and Skills Research Council (LSRC), the methodology of which discussed separately in **Section 2.3**. This work overlapped to some extent with my work on the literature review and most of the initial round of interviews. In the LSRC work I focused on learning as participation (Sfard, 1998) and upon the ways in which formal and informal learning were inextricably intertwined in every context considered. I had been looking for some time at the ways in which regulatory frameworks attempted to 'teach' behaviours and dispositions to teachers, both in further and higher education (Malcolm, 1995, 1996; Malcolm and Zukas, 2002).   At the same time I was exploring the literature of situated learning (e.g. Seely Brown et al 1989 and, in a different context, Vygotsky 1978) and anthropological accounts of learning, starting with Lave and Wenger (1991), whose rather neat and consensual picture of learning within communities of practice was difficult to square with the experiences of resistance and conflict emerging from my interviews with university teachers. But Jean Lave's own work (e.g. Lave, 1996, 1997; Lave and McDermott, 2002), in which her own Marxist roots were more apparent, and that of her sometime collaborator and fellow-anthropologist Barbara Rogoff (1990, 1995) offered a more nuanced anthropological account of 'community' learning which helped to illuminate something of what I was trying to understand about academic work. Clearly this was not a purely individual exploration; the growth of interest in cognitive apprenticeship and situated learning was a general intellectual shift which was being felt across educational research, and also in related sociological fields such as the sociology of work. The LSRC project also brought me into close contact with the emerging 'work and learning' disciplinary community, which had begun to coalesce around the biennial Researching Work and Learning conferences (begun in Leeds in 1998), and where relevant ideas – in particular the 'pedagogy of the workplace' – were being actively explored. What this

Section 2.1 Methodology

eventually did for my own research was to turn the focus onto academic workplace learning, raising difficult questions about the nature of the academic workplace, and how teaching (which had originally been my principal focus) was enmeshed with other elements of academic work such as research, the production, maintenance and dissolution of academic disciplines, and engagement with multiple layers of policy and regulation.

Strand 3

Once I began to work on the idea of academic workplace learning, it became clear that the whole idea of the academic workplace was highly problematic. I was wrestling with the idea of discipline and the ways in which research and teaching were entwined as workplace practices, and this meant that the workplace itself became increasingly difficult to define. The second set of interviews, with adult education academics moving into different disciplinary contexts, had sought to elucidate how these particular practitioners experienced their workplaces and disciplinary identities, in order to identify areas for further exploration (see **Paper 9)**. I had utilised the work of Diana Crane (1972) on 'invisible colleges', and Becher's (1989) on 'tribes and territories', but these accounts, although illuminating, were very much focused on research as distinct from teaching, and did not explore everyday practices in detail. I was trying to find a way of analysing the practical, temporal and spatial complexities of disciplinary work, and the entwining of research and teaching, which involved a concept of the workplace extending beyond the institution, the classroom and stereotypical research spaces such as laboratories, to encompass private and social spaces and complex, overlapping institutional, disciplinary and practitioner communities, networks and practices. It was clear that the traditions of workplace and educational ethnography offered useful pointers for research practice, but that the messy, elusive nature of academic work demanded methodological approaches which could accommodate its lack of clear boundaries.

I came to something of a methodological turning-point, or perhaps more accurately a precipice, when I read Nespor's *Knowledge in Motion* (1994) on the recommendation of Richard Edwards. Nespor had explored the work of Bourdieu, Foucault and their followers, and had identified the problematic absence of agency and strategic action in their accounts of social relations (1994, 121-123). He had borrowed insights from social anthropology, geography, social studies of science, and had alighted on actor-network theory (ANT) as a useful approach to explore the 'enrolment' of undergraduate students in different disciplines into appropriate student practices and disciplinary communities. He happily admitted ' … I pick out concepts and ideas from widely separated disciplines and re-shape them to fit my purposes … place [others' ideas] in strange juxtapositions, use them to address different

20

questions than their authors imagined, and so forth' (1994, 2). The capacity of his approach to move beyond understandings of learning as an internal psychological process, or a bounded social interaction within a 'small "aura" of socialness' (Lave and Wenger, 1991, 144), meant that it was consonant with many of my concerns. This suggested a new way of accounting for the entanglements and complex interactions of teaching, research, discipline, the university and educational policy that were emerging from my data-gathering, and of moving more purposefully along a path that I had been tentatively clearing for myself. In particular it offered an analysis of academic disciplines as actor-networks which I found extremely helpful, not least as it was not dependent on a narrow understanding of what constituted a disciplinary field. Reading Nespor led me to explore other theorists such as Callon (1986), Latour (2005) and Law (2004), and to look more carefully at those such as Edwards (2003) and Clarke (2002) who had attempted ANT analyses of educational phenomena. Working with ANT is hard because it disrupts habitual patterns of thought, 'rejects the boundaries commonly drawn around institutions, communities and activities' (Nespor, 1994, 136) and thus has a tendency to pull the conceptual rug from beneath one's feet. Moreover it steadfastly refuses to provide any clear theoretical models or methodological rules to assist the researcher, and makes no claims to exclusivity in relation to other theories or methods – indeed, disciplinary and methodological heterogeneity seems to be a hallmark of the approach. In the laborious process of engaging with this approach I came reluctantly to agree with Stuart Hall's suggestion that 'the only theory worth having is that which you have to fight off, not that which you speak with profound fluency' (1992, 280, cited in Nespor, 1994, 2).

Having struggled with the methodological implications of ANT, it was ironic to hear John Law recently refer to his contribution to the original coining of the term in the 1970s by Michel Callon, pointing out that 'actor-network' was intended as an oxymoron, and that ANT was seen at that point principally as ' a gadget that might do a job' (Law, 2011). This simple description contrasts somewhat with his earlier description of ANT as a diaspora, or a disparate set of 'tools, sensibilities and methods of analysis that treat everything in the social and natural worlds as a continuously generated effect of the webs of relations within which they are located' (Law, 2007, 595, cited in Fenwick and Edwards, 2010). What ANT does in methodological terms is to require a theoretical and empirical sensibility to *all* of the actors in any situation – actors which can be social, economic, material, human, 'natural', or technical – in a generalised symmetry. This was liberating for my research in that it enabled me to consider the multiple actors in the shifting and complex 'workplace' in which academic work was enacted, and to look at how, for example, material and textual actors were entangled in

Section 2.1 Methodology

academic practices, and how institutional and disciplinary actor-networks competed for dominance. To return to Smith's formulation, it provided a way of exploring 'how that stuff is hooked into a larger fabric' (2005, 39). Importantly, it took me beyond what critical discourse analysis could offer in relation to the work of the textual and the material *in and on* academic work. As Fenwick and Edwards put it, ANT sensibilities can enable us to 'examine how things enact conceptual categories and reconfigure relationships.' (2010, 9). This approach informed to varying degrees **Papers 8-11**; the account of these papers in **Section 2.4** explores in more detail the theoretical development that was taking place and the increasing fluency with which I was able to use this new language (or alternatively, my increasing sensibility to the socio-material).

Overall this research project can thus be seen as an exercise in both theory-building and empirical exploration. It has been conducted within a changing disciplinary, policy and social context, and has involved me as a researcher in major shifts of focus and new, difficult insights; it has been, to use an ANT term, 'messy' in its unruly refusal to remain within strict methodological (and indeed temporal) boundaries.   But this is not surprising; as Law argues 'In practice research needs to be messy and heterogeneous, because that is the way it, research, actually is. And also, and more importantly, it needs to be messy because that is the way the largest part of the world is' (2006, 2). He concludes 'We need to understand that our methods are always more or less unruly assemblages' (14). I have endeavoured here to present the assemblage of my own approaches thus far, and will further explore some of the questions raised by it in the account of the papers which follows in the remainder of **Section 2**.

Section 2.2: Papers 1-4

Paper 1 (2000) 'Becoming an educator: communities of practice in higher education' in McNay, I. (ed.) *Higher Education and its Communities,* Buckingham, SRHE/ Open University

Paper 2 (2001) 'Bridging pedagogic gaps: conceptual discontinuities in higher education' *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6, 1, 33 – 42

Paper 3 (2002) 'Pedagogies for lifelong learning: building bridges or building walls?' in Harrison, R., Reeve, F., Hanson, A. Clarke, J. (eds.) *Supporting Lifelong Learning: Volume 1 - Perspectives on Learning*, London, Routledge Falmer/Open University

Paper 4 (2008) 'Pedagogic identities and lifelong learning'. in Herzberg, H. (Ed.) *Lebenslanges Lernen. Theoretische Perspektiven und empirische Befunde im Kontext der Erwachsenenbildung* (Lifelong learning: theoretical perspectives and empirical findings in the context of adult education) Frankfurt am Main/ Berlin/ Bern/ Bruxelles/ New York/Oxford/Wien, Peter Lang

The papers included in this section represent the first stage of the work arising from the ESRC project 'Models of the educator in higher education: a bibliographic and conceptual map' (see page 8, this volume). Each was aimed at a different audience. Prior to the publication of these papers I had presented work arising from the ESRC project at the British Educational Research Association (BERA) (Zukas and Malcolm, 1999) and at the Canadian Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) (Malcolm and Zukas, 1999a), and had also written a satirical paper on the topic for the SCUTREA conference (Malcolm and Zukas, 1999b), aimed very much at the adult education community and full of SCUTREA in-jokes. The conceptual framework I was developing at that point had thus already been aired within a number of different academic communities which were largely mutually exclusive – the broad UK school-dominated academic education BERA community, the Canadian academic development community, and SCUTREA, which at that time was still largely populated by radically-oriented university adult educators based in old universities. Finally, it had been presented to a 'Global Colloquium' on Lifelong Learning organised by the Open University and the University of East London, an event which focused on aspects of adult, lifelong and post-compulsory education rather than on higher education (Open University, n.d.).

Paper 1 was published in 2000, but emerged from a conference paper presented at the Society for Research on Higher Education (SRHE) Conference in 1999 (Malcolm and Zukas, 1999c). Professor Ian McNay had proposed an edited collection based on a number of papers from the conference, and my paper was selected for development as a book chapter. The SRHE community was largely distinct from all of the groups to whom the work-in-progress had been presented, and was dominated at the time by researchers on HE policy and management, and by senior academics (although it has become much more diverse in recent years). The invitation to submit this chapter was therefore something of a breakthrough in

that it brought the work specifically to the attention of an HE research-oriented audience. Ian McNay straddled the new and old university sectors and had long experience of the broader post-compulsory sector, and no doubt this influenced his interest in the paper. It is worth noting that 'teaching and learning' as a field of practice at the time was still quite detached from the broader and better-established field of HE research. The field of staff and educational development was the focus of my critique, and at that time few members of this community were involved in, or indeed necessarily interested in, the work of SRHE and its members.

Paper 1 set the development of 'teaching and learning in higher education' (TLHE) into a historical context and began to problematise the idea that teaching could be extracted from other aspects of academic endeavour and turned into a generic practice and a focus of 'training'. In particular it challenged the idea that teaching could be taught outside disciplinary and practice specialisms, and introduced the idea of pedagogy as situated practice. It summarised some of characteristics of the 'versions of the educator' arising from the ESRC project and drew upon the idea of 'communities of practice' to make the case for pedagogy as an element of the academic apprenticeship within disciplines. Although I feel it makes a good case for an end to the hiving-off of teaching from academic practice and the 'specious specialism' of educational development, the analysis at this stage is still quite general. The book itself had a relatively limited audience, being published only in hardback, but the chapter has nevertheless clearly influenced the thinking of some researchers in the field; citations have increased in recent years both in PhD theses (e.g. Geirsdottir, 2008; Jawitz, 2007) and in contributions on the nature of academic development (e.g. Bath and Smith, 2004). The idea that teaching is inextricable from disciplinary practice has gained considerable ground since the paper was published –my own work having made a substantial contribution to the debate – and thus this chapter remains relevant to the concerns of contemporary HE researchers.

Paper 2 marked a real turning point in my scholarly career, in terms of its strong and lasting impact on the field. The paper brought together a number of the issues that had emerged from the ESRC research project, and was an opportunity to disseminate much more widely what I still saw as a 'visitor's' perspective on the literature I had been exploring. It built upon the STLHE paper mentioned earlier (Malcolm and Zukas, 1999a) and examined the dimensions of pedagogic identity and the emerging models of the educator in much more detail than **Paper 1**. Its publication in a relatively new and specialised British journal (*Teaching in Higher Education*) brought the ideas to a much wider audience, which included many working in the field of academic development, and it was explicitly intended 'to help identify

the links and divergences between these communities of practice, and to contribute to cultural exchanges between them' (page 67, this volume). It succeeded in a way which could not have been anticipated; there is no doubt that its effect was palpable and is still being felt. It is widely cited by many of the most respected writers on higher education teaching and academic work in the UK and elsewhere, though it is notable that (in contrast to, for example, **Paper 6** *Formality and Informality in Learning*) these citations are to be found almost exclusively in English-language publications.

The reason for **Paper 2**'s impact is partly that it expressed a discomfort with the literature of teaching and learning in higher education (TLHE) which was being experienced by many in the field, but which it was perhaps difficult for 'insiders' to express. It challenged a number of positions which had become almost axiomatic in the field of TLHE, including the dominance of phenomenographic methods and concepts of 'deep and surface learning'; 'psychologised' models of learning; and a decontextualised approach to teaching in which content and purpose had been all but erased. Crucially, it introduced ways of thinking about university teaching which were new to many readers; as Viskovic points out in her international survey of the literature of tertiary teaching, it was groundbreaking in that its 'discussion of those [pedagogic] identities developed a very different perspective from Kember's [1997], taking more account of the contextualised nature of teaching practice, and also making one of the first published links between tertiary teachers and the concept of situated learning in a community of practice'. (Viskovic, 2009, 8). Its publication at this point clearly gave expression to a concern that was widely felt but had not been widely articulated, and the paper's suggestions for further exploration fell on fertile ground. In the same year, Stephen Rowland published a seminal paper on the same theme (Rowland, 2001), in which he shared some of my concerns, albeit from a rather different standpoint. We had been in contact over the previous two years and had discussed the question of 'critical conversations' across specialisms at a seminar I gave at the University of Sheffield, as well as at a number of conferences and professional gatherings. This is a small example of the way in which disciplinary development occurs through incremental connections and conversations – an issue to which I shall return later in this text. The field of research in TLHE has changed considerably since **Paper 2** was published, and I would argue that some of that change – away from over-simplified 'in the head' formulations and towards more situated understandings of learning, awareness of teaching as a profoundly disciplinary practice, and a strong move towards recognition of the importance of both theory and context in thinking about academic practice – has been due in no small part to the influence of this paper. It seems still to have

resonances for many readers, who continue to cite it and refer to it almost as a standard text in the field.

Paper 3 was effectively an opportunity for me to summarise the research I had been engaged in over the previous three years, and to explicate the 'versions' or 'models' of the HE teacher which I had been developing, for a rather different audience – practitioner-students, rather than practising HE researchers. The book, an Open University reader, was aimed specifically at working educators studying for teaching qualifications or on professional development programmes such as the MEd in Lifelong Learning on which, at the time of publication, I had myself been teaching for several years. These students would be much more likely to be working in adult or further education, or in another 'lifelong learning' context, than the readers of *Teaching in Higher Education.* The tone and voice of the paper reflects this, in that it speaks clearly from an adult education perspective, and the selection of the two models for more detailed analysis is an opportunity to contrast a strong adult education conceptualisation of teaching with a much more mechanistic (and apparently ideologically neutral) strand of educational thought.

This chapter originated in a contribution to the Open University /UEL 'Global Colloquium', to which I had been invited in the summer of 1999, involving 'eminent researchers' (Open University, n.d.) such as Stephen Brookfield, Stewart Ranson, Tom Schuller, Lorna Unwin and Mary Hamilton (among others).   Given the purpose of the book as a course text, it would not be surprising if the chapter itself were rarely cited in published work; however the web version of the paper (which is still accessible on the web as reading for OU Master's module E845) has attracted international citations in education and other subject areas.

The book in which **Paper 3** appears has a clear pedagogic focus as a course reader, and indeed the editors had commissioned the paper precisely because they had found the 'models of the educator' (previously presented through conference papers) useful for working with teacher-students (Nicoll and Harrison, 2003). It also provides a reasonably clear account of the analysis of the models, explaining the use of repertory grid techniques in order to identify dimensions along which accounts varied, and which could thus be used for analytical purposes; its aim is partly to teach students about how research happens. The paper also provided a useful opportunity for stock-taking in terms of the research itself; it was becoming clear that the initial task of simply producing an annotated bibliography was becoming less interesting and important than the questions and concepts generated through the analysis. So for example, the paper flags up the absence of the 'educator as disciplinary actor' within

the identities discussed (page 84, this volume). This was an absence which I had noted in the review of the literature, but it had become a major focus of my thinking by the time the chapter was actually published, and is addressed in much more detail in **Papers 7-10**.

Paper 4 is rather a chronological anomaly, published as it was in 2008, several years after the other three papers in this section. However it is included here because it was a further revisiting of pedagogic identity for a new (European) audience, incorporating new work on the question of discipline which had been identified as an absence in **Paper 3**. It was written for a German publication at the request of the book's editor Heidrun Herzberg, a professor of adult education at Humboldt University Berlin. She had become familiar with my work on pedagogic identity through connections with the European Society for Research in the Education of Adults (ESREA) and through the growing 'work and learning' network, which had a strong European presence. The disciplinary and practice networks which my work has brought me into contact with have been largely Anglophone, although I had studied German and worked as a technical translator before moving into adult education. The field of educational research in Europe is very different from its counterpart in Britain, and I had been following with some interest the embryonic development of the German version of the TLHE specialism, for example through the online journal produced by the Hochschuldidaktisches Zentrum at the Technical University, Dortmund (*Journal Hochschuldidaktik*, 2009). It would be fair to say that the development of this particular specialism in Germany lagged 5-10 years behind that in English-speaking countries – in contrast to other aspects of HE research, such as policy and comparative studies, which were extremely well-established (see for example the work of Ulrich Teichler from 1970 onwards). Although constructed on a more scholarly and academic foundation than much of the parallel early work in the UK, German work on TLHE or *Hochschuldidaktik* still exhibits some of the tendencies to seek technical fixes which I had originally found so problematic in the early British literature. However there is a strong adult education tradition in Germany, and as in the UK, this has branched into a conceptualisation of lifelong learning and a focus on the many contexts in which it occurs, including the workplace.

Professor Herzberg, who had a particular interest in biographical research, had come across **Paper 9** in which I had presented material from the second round of interviews, with adult educators in higher education. This confluence of interests and the relative lack of interaction between the UK and the German higher education research communities meant that it was appropriate to prepare a chapter which combined some of the earliest work on pedagogic identity with some of the later and more fruitful ideas emerging from anthropological and

sociocultural work on learning which informed **Papers 7-9** in **Section 2.4**. Re-reading the paper now it has a rather didactic air; like **Paper 3**, it is designed as a contribution to a 'reader' aimed at educators undertaking programmes of professional development. Its intention is to summarise in an accessible way work which, for me, had already been largely supplanted by a new focus on actor-network theory – in effect, a catch-up for a 'foreign' community of practice. The selection of examples within the paper is geared very much towards a broad audience of lifelong learning practitioners, and I think works quite well in its attempt to 'open out the relationships between biography, institutional contexts and pedagogic and disciplinary identities' (page 104, this volume) for this audience. I have built further links with German-speaking HE researchers since becoming involved in the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers (CHER) and presenting some of my more recent work at a CHER conference (Malcolm, 2011).

Taken together, the four papers presented in this section represent a new way of thinking about teaching as situated practice, intricately connected with the contexts and communities in which it takes place and understood as an aspect of disciplinary academic practice. A further claim that can be made about this work is that it was strongly influential in promoting both the concept of *pedagogy* and a new conceptualisation of 'pedagogic identity' to encompass this more situated understanding of teaching. These terms have since become accepted ways of discussing what academics do (albeit sometimes in ways which I personally find problematic). This issue is discussed in more detail in relation to **Paper 8**, below.

Section 2.3: Development of concepts of informal learning

Paper 5 (2003) 'The interrelationships between informal and formal learning', *Journal of Workplace Learning*,15, 7/8, 313-318

 Paper 6 (2003) *Formality and Informality in Learning: A Report for the Learning and Skills Research Centre*, London, LSRC

These papers are both the products of a research project to which I contributed whilst at the University of Leeds, 'Formality and informality in learning: mapping the conceptual terrain'. This was commissioned in 2001-2 by the Learning and Skills Research Council (LSRC), at the time the research arm of the Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA; both since replaced by successive other bodies). The bid for the project was originally submitted by my Leeds colleagues Professor Phil Hodkinson and Dr. Helen Colley, both of whom were engaged principally in work which focused on 14-19 education and training (e.g. Colley, 2003; Hodkinson et al, 2007) . They had already embarked on the research when it became clear that they needed some specialist input on informal adult learning, since neither of them was particularly familiar with adult education research. I was approached and became the third researcher on the project, whilst continuing to work on my own research on teaching in higher education.

Methodology

The methodology for the project is summarised on pages 2-3 of **Paper 6**; the study comprised a wide-ranging literature review, a series of case-studies drawn from our own previous empirical research and that of others, and a historical survey of the development of ideas of informality and formality in learning in relation to educational policy and practice from the 19th century until 2001. The interim report of the project (Colley, Hodkinson and Malcolm, 2002) went through a 3-stage consultation process with different groups of 'stakeholders', including academics, educational practitioners and civil servants in policy roles, some of whose insights fed back into the structure and content of the research. The report was also reviewed and publicised through a number of less-conventional academic routes, such as the Informal Education website (Infed, 2009). My major contributions were in the historical survey, the analysis of the literature of experiential learning, and of APEL as a formalisation process, and the case studies located in broadly adult education contexts. The different disciplinary backgrounds of the three researchers strongly influenced some of the approaches utilised. In particular, both Helen Colley and I had studied linguistics and drew upon critical discourse analysis, Marxism and feminism in our reading of educational literature and policy documents. As Fairclough points out, 'educational practices themselves constitute a core domain of linguistic and discursive power and of the engineering of discursive practices' (1995,

220); the categorisation and labelling of educational practices through policy and professional discourse is a powerful tool for privileging or subordinating particular interests. Phil Hodkinson was more influenced by then-current debates on the nature of educational knowledge, and by Bourdieu's notions of social and cultural capital and their implications for learning. As we explain in **Paper 6** (pages 8-9), the final work is a complex product of theoretical interaction and 'embodied judgment-making' (Beckett and Hager, 2002) among the three authors, which could not have been produced without the interplay of our own (often competing) analyses and those of the academics, policy specialists and 'users' who contributed to the consultations. My contribution to the project is itemised in the previously-submitted letters from my co-authors (see page 43, this volume), though we all found the process of expressing contributions as percentages (both for this purpose and for the Research Assessment Exercise) a bemusing and rather artificial process, since the absence of any one author would doubtless have produced a very different piece of work.

Contribution to knowledge and impact

I include **Paper 5** as an example of the way in which research is formally taken up, nurtured, critiqued, and incorporated into disciplinary communities and discourse. It began life as a conference paper presented at the 3rd Researching Work and Learning Conference at Tampere, Finland (Malcolm et al 2003), and essentially summarises very briefly the main findings of the LSRC project. There was strong interest in the project from the international audience including those, such as Professor David Boud, who were closely involved in the organisation of the conference series, and who felt that the work was making an important contribution to understandings of informal learning in the workplace. In several cases, academic colleagues gave very useful feedback on the conceptual shape of the project and on some of the theoretical knots in which we tied ourselves as three very different researchers trying to produce a jointly-authored text. The paper was chosen by the conference committee to be developed as a journal article for a special issue of the *Journal of Workplace Learning*.

However the paper also illustrates the difficulty of disseminating research in journal-article-sized chunks. The aim of summarising the research in such a short piece was probably overambitious, given the range of the material covered and the complexity of the arguments explicated in the main report. This is a constant problem for academics under pressure to present, disseminate and publish at a constant rate; conference papers are often rather unsatisfactory simply because so much background has to be included to bring the audience 'up to speed'. However despite its ambition, the paper translated into a journal article (with

the obvious added advantage of a bibliography) serves its purpose quite well in summarising most of the key points of the report in an easily-accessible form; it also acts as a pointer to interested readers enabling them to seek out the full report, which was going to press as the article was published.

Paper 6, the full project report, has had a much greater impact in terms of the number and range of citations (over 300 in total in its interim and final forms, compared to about 65 for **Paper 5** [Google Scholar, 2011]). It has been cited in journals covering fields as diverse as education, youth work, counselling, management and organisation theory, nursing and other aspects of health care, digital technologies, meteorology, human resource development and religious studies. Citations have appeared in Anglophone journals from a range of countries, but also in publications from France, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Lithuania, Russia, Brazil, Japan and Korea, as well as on various international websites. Perhaps most significantly in view of the contemporary obsession with impact for the Research Excellence Framework, it has been used to inform policy and practice in a range of fields, contributing for example to the Council of Europe's *Portfolio for Youth Leaders and Youth Workers* (Council of Europe, 2007). In most cases the report is cited as an authoritative and useful overview of conceptualisations of formal and informal learning, although it has also attracted one or two more critical responses – most notably from Paul Hager, an Australian philosopher of education who had also written extensively on informal learning (Hager, 2006). Whilst praising the report as offering an 'impressive and concise' synthesis and evaluation of the literature (2006, 1), Hager's (unpublished) paper takes serious issue with the rejection of 'informal learning' as a meaningful category (a category which had underpinned much of his own earlier work). On re-reading this critique now (2009), I remain unconvinced by the argument. It is fairly clear that Hager's philosophical dispute with us was essentially based on competing ontologies; it is an instance where constructive argument is rendered impossible because each side relies upon fundamentally conflicting conceptualisations of *what is*. Although this is quite a common characteristic of academic debate, it is only in more recent years that I have come to understand the extent to which profound and often implicit ontological differences can render competing positions mutually incomprehensible. I owe this realisation, at least in part, to the Canadian scholar Tara Fenwick, whose work and conversation over the years have opened up an overview of the landscape of theory which would have been difficult to attain single-handedly (e.g. Fenwick, 2009).

The project which produced **Paper 5** and **Paper 6** ostensibly took me away from what was by then my principal research interest in higher education pedagogy, although of all the pieces

included in this thesis, **Paper 6** has had by far the broadest impact in terms of the number and range of citations. However, it also gave me an opportunity to think in much more detail about the informal learning which occurs in the workplace, and to explore the consequences of attempts to formalise learning (e.g. Colley, 2003). It also forced me to think through a range of workplace learning perspectives of which I had been vaguely aware but which I had not previously engaged with directly (e.g. Rogoff, 1990). The four 'aspects of formality/informality' suggested by the project – process, location/setting, purposes and content – offered me new insights into how academic workplace learning could be analysed. The project was, for me, a distinctive episode of academic learning in the workplace. It strongly influenced my ongoing research on higher education pedagogy and helped to broaden its scope to encompass disciplinary academic work more broadly conceived, a process which is traced in **Papers 7-11** in the next section.

Paper 7 (2006) 'Pedagogic learning in the pedagogic workplace' in Edwards, R., Gallacher, J. and Whitaker, S. (eds.) *Learning outside the Academy* London, Routledge

Paper 8 (2007)' Poor relations: exploring discipline, research and pedagogy in academic identity' in Osborne, M, Houston, M and Toman, N (eds.) *The Pedagogy of Lifelong Learning: understanding effective teaching and learning in diverse contexts* London, Routledge

Paper 9 (2007) 'Beyond the fringe: adult educators, work and discipline', paper presented at the 5th Researching Work and Learning Conference, Stellenbosch, South Africa, 2-5 December

Paper 10 2007) 'Teaching, discipline, net-work' in Skelton, A. (ed.) *International Perspectives on Teaching Excellence in Higher Education* London, Routledge

Paper 11 (2009) 'Making a mess of academic work: experience, purpose, identity', *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14, 5, 495 – 506

The papers in this section build on the work covered in **Section 2.2**, but illustrate several conceptual and methodological shifts which took place in my thinking over the period during which I was working on the 'Informality project' which gave rise to **Paper 6,** and carrying out the second round of interviews with adult educators (see page 18, this volume and **Paper 9**). Thus they draw upon anthropological, socio-cultural and actor-network perspectives, and the focus shifts clearly away from 'pedagogic identity' to a much broader conceptualisation of academic work and identity.

Paper 7 was published in an edited collection which arose from the second conference of the Centre for Research in Lifelong Learning (CRLL), a joint venture between the University of Stirling and Glasgow Caledonian University. This conference represented to some extent a British arm of the emerging 'work and learning' disciplinary community, although it also had an international scope and its contributors overlapped to some extent with the explicitly international 'Researching Work and Learning' series. Its lengthy title in 2003, 'Experiential-Community-Workbased: Researching Learning outside the Academy', indicates the range of foci which it sought to encompass, and the ferment of interdisciplinarity which characterised the field at the time. The CRLL conferences brought together 'lifelong learning' researchers in a variety of contexts, including further and higher education, adult education, professional learning and workplace learning. Of the 110 papers presented in 2003, 14 were selected to be developed into chapters for a book. My chapter focused on the ways in which anthropological and sociocultural understandings of learning could illuminate the ways in which academics developed a 'pedagogic identity' through workplace learning. This was innovative work in relation to academics. In particular I was working on the question of how teachers exercised agency in relation to the pedagogy of the workplace, engaged in strategies of resistance and

negotiated conflicting imperatives. However at that stage I was still preoccupied principally with *teaching* as a separate aspect of academics' work and learning – for reasons which are explored in relation to **Paper 9**, below. By the time the book was published in 2006, three years after the conference paper was first presented, this preoccupation had been challenged by my exploration of the roles of discipline and research in the construction of academic identity.

Paper 8 is another CRLL offshoot, this time from the 2005 conference 'What a difference a pedagogy makes' (Malcolm and Zukas 2005a). It was selected as one of 15 papers from over a hundred at the conference to be published in an edited collection entitled *The Pedagogy of Lifelong Learning*. The title of the paper, and indeed of the book itself, is a reminder that *pedagogy*, and pedagogic identity, had by this stage become concepts with which the fields of both 'work and learning' and HE research were engaged – a development for which I feel I can reasonably claim some credit. I had produced a paper in 2003 (Malcolm and Zukas, 2003) exploring the use of the word in the post-compulsory educational research literature, and made a case for reclaiming it from the disrepute into which it had fallen, partly due to the efforts of Knowles (1980) to develop 'andragogy' as a separate intellectual territory for adult education. I argued that, except in the work of Freire and the literature of feminist and critical pedagogy (e.g. Freire, 1972; Gore, 1993; Lather, 1994), the common use of the word in English was in fact more akin to the European usage (for example in German) of 'didactics' – that is, the methods and techniques used in teaching – a small and specialised area of pedagogy. Instead, I argued, it should be reclaimed 'from the narrow meaning to which it has been reduced in English, as a rich and appropriately multi-layered term for educational social practice' (Malcolm and Zukas, 2003, 148) as a term which could encompass the complexities of purpose, power and socio-cultural context within which teaching and learning take place.

There is no doubt that 'pedagogy' has now been rehabilitated for scholarly use. However, there are a number of ironies associated with this 'reclaiming' of pedagogy. It has indeed become commonplace in the field of HE and other post-compulsory educational research, and in some cases it is used as a vehicle for the complex contextual understandings mentioned above (see, for example, the January 2009 issue of *Pedagogy Culture Society*). But in a depressing number of instances, it has been re-introduced to the field with exactly the connotations of which I was so critical – that is, as a substitute for 'didactics'. For example:

> 'The focus of the *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* is broad and includes all aspects of higher education pedagogy, but it focuses

> specifically on improving higher education pedagogy across all content areas,
> educational institutions, and levels of instructional expertise.' (IJTLHE, 2009)

This linguistic struggle has also been evident in discussions about 'pedagogic research' in relation to the Research Assessment Exercise, for example in the attempts made to distinguish pedagogic research clearly from 'descriptive or anecdotal accounts of teaching developments and evaluations' (RAE2008, 2006, 14). So although the term has become widespread in its use, its meaning remains contested and often impoverished.

Paper 8 is the first publication where the influence of actor-network theory is perceptible. Richard Edwards of the University of Stirling had strongly recommended that I should read Jan Nespor's *Knowledge in Motion,* after hearing me grappling in a conference presentation with the intertwined roles of discipline and pedagogy. Having looked at the contribution that anthropological perspectives could make to thinking about *pedagogic* workplace learning, I was struggling to integrate discipline and research work, as well as the workings of the university itself, into my emerging notion of 'academic identity' – a term which had already been utilised by writers such as Mary Henkel (2000; 2005) and which has since expanded considerably as a theme of scholarly exploration (e.g. Barnett and di Napoli, 2008). My own focus was on *identities* as produced and indeed performed through the complex interactions and relationships of different strands of academic work with broader social, institutional and cultural power relations, rather than as stable individual positionings. Reading Nespor was something of a revelation to me, in that he showed how some of these complexities could be accommodated and clarified by thinking of the discipline as an actor-network. There was a growth of interest at the time in what has become known as the 'research-teaching nexus', though I found some of the analyses available mechanistic and poorly argued (e.g. Hattie and Marsh, 2002; Coaldrake and Steadman, 1999). I had begun tentatively to explore the idea of discipline as an actor-network, in papers for the 2005 CRLL conference (the basis for **Paper 8**), and then for the Researching Work and Learning Conference in Sydney in the same year (Malcolm and Zukas, 2005b), in which I considered the 'imaginary workplace' in which academic work is carried out. Between them, **Papers 7 and 8** illustrate a transition from a focus on pedagogic identity to a broader conceptualisation of academic work, both *as work* and as a disciplinary activity which encompasses teaching, research, and the full range of socio-material interactions which support the discipline and the institution of the university.

Paper 9 is another conference paper from the Researching Work and Learning series, which I presented in South Africa in 2007. It has not yet been written up for publication, in part

because of work pressure, but also perhaps because its actual purpose, for me, was to work through my own changing ideas. It is included here as it represents a way-station in my thinking about academic identity, a point where I returned both to the history of adult education, and to the 'ordinary doings and language' (Smith, 2005, 39) of a particular group of HE practitioners, in order to develop my own thinking about the role of discipline in academic work. In this sense it is a paper that I wrote largely for my own benefit, although it has been taken up elsewhere in relation to the dismantling of adult education departments (Bowl, 2010).

I was conscious that the papers discussed in **Section 2.2** had focused principally on *pedagogic* identity and, although they had acknowledged the question of discipline, they had not grappled with its dominant role in the practice of academic work – something which was becoming increasingly evident in my own work with new academics. I was also uncomfortably aware that my own roots in adult education had coloured my perception and presentation of the pedagogic identities I was exploring, and had perhaps diverted me from seeking a less constrained conceptualisation of academic workplace practice; there is a strong sense, in some of the earlier papers, of the moral and intellectual superiority of adult education which I was not really able to justify. I needed to interrogate the ways in which adult education itself shaped – disciplined – both practice and my own understandings of academic work, and the historical analysis presented in this paper was a way of doing that (see in particular the discussion on pages 142-145, this volume).

It was entirely fortuitous that, just at the point when I left the University of Leeds, the decision was finally taken to close its School of Continuing Education, which had embodied for over fifty years a historical commitment to university-level education for 'non-traditional' adult learners. The ensuing dispersal of academic adult education staff into mainstream departments of various kinds raised compelling questions of identity, ownership and community which paralleled those I was exploring in my research, particularly in relation to disciplines as communities and actor-networks. The small group of colleagues who agreed to be interviewed produced a fascinating account of their own struggles with the demands and imperatives of both adult education and their 'home' disciplines, and helped me to identify much more clearly the ways in which temporal, spatial and material disciplinary and institutional practices worked together to produce the specific conjunctions and entanglements of the academic workplace.

Section 2.4 Papers 7-11

This gave me a firmer footing from which to explore in more detail the complex processes whereby these entanglements were produced or, once again, 'how that stuff is hooked into the larger fabric' (Smith, 2005, 39). In particular, it enabled me to move beyond discourse analysis to see the *material* nature of many of the 'textual objects' encountered in academic work (such as Powerpoint, student support policies, designs for teaching rooms, etc.) and thus to engage with the *work* that these objects *do* in creating and sustaining actor-networks of institutional and disciplinary practice. As Fenwick and Edwards put it:

> 'In education, textual objects proliferate in such things as curriculum documents, maps, educational journals, parent newsletters, student record systems, exams, text books, competency lists, newspaper editorials, training software and test instruments. While these are all cultural and discursive texts, they are also material. To focus only on the information and discourses they embed is to ignore the fact that activity changes if the materiality of the textual thing is paper, digital or plastic, heavy or delicate, mechanical or organic ... texts increasingly control, direct, monitor, document, make visible, shape, consolidate and inscribe what comes to be valued as knowledge. Texts, particularly technological texts, transport knowledge across distributed sites, and partially enact those sites. Indeed, the texts of new technologies are shifting and demanding new forms of engagement and exerting new forms of control.' (Fenwick and Edwards, 2010, 8)

The writing of **Paper 9** thus helped me to move to a position where I could begin to look in much more detail at the work some of these 'textual objects' did. This process informed the remaining two papers in this section, and is ongoing in my more recent work (Malcolm, 2010; 2011).

Paper 10 is a chapter commissioned by Dr. Alan Skelton of the University of Sheffield, who had already published a topical book on the discourse of teaching excellence in the UK, specifically in relation to National Teaching Fellowships (Skelton, 2005), and was now seeking to produce an edited collection covering more international perspectives on the same subject. He was familiar with the work I had been doing from its beginnings in the late 1990s; he had made it clear that he admired it and had made use of it in some of his own work. He may not have bargained for the commissioned chapter becoming an exercise in engagement with actor-network theory, but this was my major theoretical preoccupation at the time. The topic of 'teaching excellence' was also very live in my daily work, since my role at Kent required me to co-ordinate the University Teaching Prizes, determine selection criteria, select and co-write University nominations for the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS), and select and advise on applications for NTFS project funding. I found (and find) this a highly problematic role; it required me to promote a conceptualisation of 'good teaching' which I found simplistic, theoretically flawed and alienating, to colleagues who often felt much the same. However

the idea of writing about teaching excellence seemed a good opportunity to experiment with some of the ideas that I had come across in Nespor (1994), Callon (1986) and Latour (2005). In particular, Julia Clarke's ANT-driven study of the 'Skills for Life' initiative (Clarke, 2002) provided an example of how specific education policies could be analysed and explained within this framework.

Paper 10 is a rather ambitious paper in which I set out to nail down some of the rather slippery concepts I had been grappling with over the past few years. So the concepts of pedagogy and identity are discussed and explained – although I had used them repeatedly in previous work, a clear (public) exposition was overdue. I also decided to revisit the 'pedagogic identities' I had explored in my earlier work (e.g. in **Paper 3**) in order to incorporate a clear recognition of the fundamental importance of discipline. Finally, the idea of 'teaching excellence' was subjected to an analysis based on Callon's four 'moments' of translation (Callon, 1986). This culminated in the construction of a rather tortuous 'net' metaphor which is not wholly satisfactory, but which I think serves to paint a reasonably vivid picture of how I envisage the process of network building. In other work at the time I was experimenting with similar visual metaphors, including string bags and knitted and woven fabrics, probably because it was proving so difficult to explain ANT verbally to those who were unfamiliar with its sensibilities and methods of analysis. This preoccupation with the visual had been intensified by the experience of writing the 'imaginary workplace' paper (Malcolm and Zukas, 2005b) mentioned in relation to **Paper 8**. This focused on the spatial aspects of disciplinary actor networks, and the fact that as 'workplace learners', academics had a global and distributed workplace, ranging from their own beds and offices, to texts in paper and virtual formats, to universities, hotels , meeting rooms, etc., all over the world – that is, that the *discipline and its activities, rather than the university, constituted the academic workplace*. **Paper 10** is a further working out of these ideas and an attempt to revise what now seemed to be analytical lacunae in the original account offered in **Paper 3** – which had referred repeatedly to teachers' disciplinary identity, but had failed to explore this in detail.

Paper 11 functions to some extent as a temporal (and probably temporary) 'bookend' to the ESRC project begun in 1998. It was submitted for a special edition of the by now well-established journal *Teaching in Higher Education* on 'purposes, knowledge and identities'. The call for papers acted as a spur to complete a paper that I had been wrestling with for a couple of years. I had explored in various conference papers the application to academic work of ANT as a methodology, and the idea of the discipline as a workplace, and wanted to knit this work together. The 'workload allocation form' presented a good example of the way in which

the claimed need to make academic work more 'efficient' had become an obligatory passage point for the various 'actors' of the university. An attempt to create an instrument of institutional control over academic work had actually functioned as a powerful technology to 're-make' academics and their own conceptions of their work (or 'change the academic subject', as McWilliam puts it [2004]). When presented at conferences and at invited seminars, this example and explication had evoked a strong and engaged response which suggested that it was a fruitful way of explaining the relevance of ANT to academic work (and one which I have since started to apply to other 'actors' such as module specification forms, and most recently to 'human resources' documents [Malcolm, 2011]). The 'research agenda' identified in the concluding section is essentially my own agenda, and I am currently engaged in pursuing it, in relation to both 'mindful disciplinarity', and to ANT-sensitised ethnographic study of academic work. This is why the bookend can only ever be temporary, as each successive analytical development raises endless new questions and more work to do. The work inevitably develops partly in response to the responses of others; as I write, it has only recently been published, and has prompted email responses from colleagues and some rather surprising expressions of interest from *Times Higher Education* and the Universities and Colleges Union. But as in the case of the other more recent papers covered here, the formalised responses of citation and collegial engagement and dispute have yet to emerge; as they do, they too will help to shape the ways in which these ideas are developed further.

Section 3

Coda

The papers presented here cover the period 2000-2009. They do not represent everything I have published and, with the exception of **Paper 9**, conference papers are not included, although they are often referred to. The numerous conference and seminar papers I wrote and presented over this period were in many cases first drafts of the papers which were eventually published. However it is worth pointing out the seminal influence that conference papers, and the discussions which accompany them, have on the development and dissemination of ideas, and on the establishment and maintenance of academic communities. Many of those who have gone on to cite, be influenced by or indeed build upon my work have first encountered it in the context of a conference presentation and discussion; and I in turn have further developed my ideas in response to their interventions and criticisms. Indeed, crucial intellectual contributions can be made, through conversation and critique, by those whose name never appears on a published paper; academic ownership is a problematic concept rendered yet more problematic by rationing mechanisms such as the Research Assessment Exercise. The PhD privileges the written word, for obvious historical reasons; but I would note that this is only one form of intellectual and academic communication, and represents only the most visible trace of the growth and dissemination of ideas.

Also absent from the assemblage of texts presented here are the various papers written on my own experience as a working-class girl becoming a student and then an academic (Malcolm, 2000); on gender and adult education (Malcolm, 1992); on the political and social purposes of adult education (Malcolm and O'Rourke, 2001); and on my engagements with issues of class in my own teaching (Malcolm, 2005). These more overtly politicised texts do not 'fit' neatly within the story about researching academic work and identity (they are, arguably, reconstituted – othered – as 'mess' by the requirement to tell a coherent research story), but they are indicative of the kind of soil from which my other work has grown, and are inevitably knitted into the writing of the academic self (Ruth, 2008) that is presented here. My engagement with ANT and my own contributions to the 're-territorialisation that rejects the boundaries commonly drawn around institutions, communities and activities' (Nespor, 1994, 136) have enabled me to understand my own career as an educational researcher, as a succession of enrolments and mobilisations within successive and overlapping actor-networks. My career trajectory has been shaped very much by the shifting actor-networks of education policy (grammar schools, free higher education, the slow death of adult education, audit culture), university politics (departmental re-organisations, promotions, funding

demands, the RAE) and political change (in class and gender relations, economic crises, the family). Within the discipline of education, I can see how certain actor-networks have worked over time and space to determine the constitution of the specialist field. The flow of ideas, people and technologies through the discipline has, during my own career, changed what constitutes research, and how the validity of theoretical positions is judged. The discipline has appropriated to itself new intellectual spaces, of which university teaching and learning, academic work and 'workplace learning' are examples pertinent to this account. The ongoing debate about the place and status of academic development (e.g. Rowland, 2001; Clegg, 2003, 2009; McAlpine, 2006) – arguably an attempt at a disciplinary actor-network which is still struggling to enrol sufficiently powerful interests – illustrates one of the ways in which this happens. As with other disciplines, scholarly social practices have been transformed by technologies, new forms of (spatial and intellectual) mobility, the successive refashionings of universities as purposeful manufacturers of social and economic change, and the powerful actor-network of the English language.

I am enmeshed in these actor-networks and my own work is both a site of and an actor in these changes. 'Participating [in a discipline] means becoming spatially and temporally organised in a form that moves you into the material spaces of the field, and becoming proficient at using the discipline's representational organisations of space-time' (Nespor, 1994, 132). The way in which we acknowledge, adopt or reject concepts or approaches, creates and changes the constitution of the discipline. As (more or less powerful) disciplinary actors we offer one another academic recognition through such practices as citation, seminar invitations, collaboration, commissioned publications, etc., processes which are themselves enmeshed in the technologies of travel, communication, publishing and the increasingly powerful actor-network of the university as a bounded and competitive organisation. The PhD can be seen as an 'obligatory passage point' (Callon, 1986, 205) through which my role as a disciplinary actor is both problematised and, one hopes, formally established. Through my own writing and other scholarly interactions, I have actively helped to shape an emerging network of understanding about academic work, by

  a) Challenging the assumptions that were evident in some of the literature of higher education teaching and learning when I began the research described here, and proposing an original analysis of constructions of the educator within that literature;
  b) Conducting an original analysis of concepts of formality and informality in learning and developing that analysis in relation to the work of academics;

Section 3 Coda

c) Introducing new theoretical perspectives to the study of higher education and produced original analyses of the nature of academic work, drawing upon the literature of adult education, workplace learning and actor-network theory.

Section 3 Coda

Acknowledgements

This PhD submission is a claim to recognition on the basis of my own contribution to the development of the discipline of education through my publications. Co-authors are clearly actors within the texts presented here. It is always difficult to disaggregate the specific contributions made by any individual in the process of collaboration, theory-building, writing and editing, and this is by no means a unique problem in relation to the PhD by publication (Solomon, 2000). Miriam Zukas has confirmed to the University of Brighton that that I had the principal responsibility for the initial literature review and for the conceptualisations on which the ongoing project was subsequently built, and that my contribution to the work presented here and co-authored with her is in all cases a minimum of 50%. Phil Hodkinson and Helen Colley have confirmed my contribution to **Papers 5 and 6** as follows:

Paper 5:   Principal author

Paper 6:   Section 5, pages 40-46 – principal author

Section 6 – principal author

Section 2 – 50%

Entire report – 30%

I confidently assert my own authorship and ownership of all of the work presented here, whilst acknowledging the invaluable contributions of my co-authors, all of whom I would like to thank for their intellectual stimulation and collegial support which has helped to produce this body of work.

COMMENTARY REFERENCES

COMMENTARY: REFERENCES

Barnett, R. and Di Napoli, R. (2008) *Changing identities in higher education: voicing perspectives*, Abingdon, Routledge

Bath, D. and Smith, C. (2004) Academic developers: an academic tribe claiming their territory in higher education', *International Journal of Academic Development* 9, 1, 9-27

Becher, T. (1989) *Academic Tribes and Territories* Buckingham, SRHE/Open University

Beckett, D. and Hager, P. (2002) *Life, work and learning: practice in postmodernity*, Routledge

Booth, C. (1998) *Accreditation and teaching in higher education*, London, Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the Universities of the United Kingdom

Bottery, M. (1996) 'The challenge to professionals from the new public management' *Oxford Review of Education*. 22, 2, 179-197.

Bowl, M. (2010) 'University continuing education in a neoliberal landscape: developments in England and Aotearoa New Zealand' *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 29, 6, 723-738

Brennan, J., Edmunds, R., Houston, M., Jary, D., Lebeau, Y., Osborne, M. and Richardson, J. (2010) *Improving What is Learned at University: An exploration of the social and organisational diversity of university education*, London, Routledge

Brew, A. (2006) *Research and teaching: beyond the divide*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan

Callon, M. (1986) 'Some elements of a sociology of translation: domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St. Brieuc Bay' in Law, J. (Ed.) *Power, Action, Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?* London, Routledge.

Clarke, J. (2002) 'A new kind of symmetry: actor-network theories and the new literacy studies' *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 34, 2, 107-122

Clegg, S. (2003) 'Problematising ourselves: continuing professional development in higher education', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 8, 1/2, 37-50

Clegg, S. (2008) 'Academic identities under threat?' *British Educational Research Journal*, 34,3, 329-345

Clegg, S. (2009) 'Forms of knowing and academic development practice', *Studies in Higher Education*, 34, 4, 403-416

Coaldrake, P. and Stedman, L. (1999) *Academic Work in the Twenty First Century: Changing roles and policies,* Occasional Paper, Higher Education, Canberra, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Colley, H. (2003) *Mentoring for Social Inclusion: A Critical Approach to Nurturing Mentor Relationships,* London, RoutledgeFalmer

Colley, H., Hodkinson, P. and Malcolm, J. (2002) *Non-formal learning: mapping the conceptual terrain; a consultation report* Leeds, Lifelong Learning Institute, University of Leeds

Council of Europe (2007) *European portfolio for youth leaders and youth workers*, available at http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/youth/resources/portfolio/portfolio_EN.asp

Crane, D. (1972) *Invisible Colleges: diffusion of knowledge in scientific communities* Chicago, University of Chicago Press

Edwards, R. & Usher, R. (1994) 'Disciplining the subject: the power of competence' *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 26, 1, 1-14

Edwards, R. (2003) 'Ordering subjects: actor-networks and intellectual technologies in lifelong learning', *Studies in the Education of Adults* 35, 1, 54-67

Engels, F. (1876/1934*) The part played by labour in the transition from ape to man*, Moscow, Progress Publishers

Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*, Harlow, Longman

Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of language*, Harlow, Longman

Fenwick, T. (2009) 'Re-thinking the 'thing': sociomaterial approaches to understanding and researching learning in work', paper presented at the 6th International Researching Work and Learning Conference, Roskilde University, Denmark, 28 June - 1July

Fenwick, T. and Edwards, R. (2010) *Actor-Network Theory in Education*, Abingdon, Routledge

COMMENTARY REFERENCES

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, New York, Harper and Row

Foucault, M. (1973) *The Order of Things: an archaeology of the human sciences*, New York, Vintage Books

Frame, P. (1993) *The Complete Rock Family Trees*, London, Omnibus Press

Fransella, F. and Bannister, D. (1977) *A Manual for the Repertory Grid Technique* London, Academic Press

Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Harmondsworth, Penguin

Geirsdottir, G. (2008) '"We are caught up in our own world" Conceptions of curriculum within three different disciplines at the University of Iceland' (Unpublished PhD thesis), University of Iceland

Gibbs, G. and Jenkins, A. (1992) *Teaching large classes in higher education: how to maintain quality with reduced resources,* London, Routledge

Google Scholar (2011) http://scholar.google.co.uk accessed July 2011

Gore, J.M. (1993) *The Struggle for Pedagogies*, London, Routledge

Grenham, G., Wade, P., and Kelly, D. (1999) 'Active learning at the National College of Ireland', paper presented at conference on Research and Practice in Educational Development(s): Exploring the Links, Stoke Rochford, SEDA/SRHE

Griffith, A. and Smith, D.E. (2004) *Mothering for Schooling*, New York, Routledge

Hager, P. (2006) 'A critique of the Colley, Hodkinson & Malcolm Report on Informality and Formality in Learning' paper presented at the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, University of Oxford, 31 March - 2 April, http://www.philosophy-of-education.org/pdfs/Friday/Hager.pdf, accessed 10 August 2009

Hall, S. (1992) 'Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies' in Grossberg, L., Nelson, C. and Treichler, P. (Eds.) *Cultural Studies*, New York, Routledge, 277-286

Hattie, H.W. and Marsh, J. (2002) 'The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: complementary, antagonistic or independent constructs?', *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 5, 603-641.

Henkel, M. (2000) *Academic identities and policy change in higher education*, London, Jessica Kingsley

Henkel, M. (2005) 'Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment', *Higher Education*, 49, 155-176

Hodkinson, P., Anderson, G., Colley, H., Davies, J., Diment, K., Scaife, T., Tedder, M., Wahlberg;, M., Wheeler, E. (2007) 'Learning Cultures in Further Education' *Educational Review*, 59, 4, 399-413

Hyland, T. (1993) 'Competence, knowledge and education' *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 27, 1, 57-68

IJTLHE (2009) ' *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* Call for papers' : http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/cfp.cfm, accessed 10 August 2009

Infed (2009) Informal Education website: http://www.infed.org/features/informal_learning.htm, updated June 2009, accessed 10 August 2009

Jawitz, J.P. (2007) 'Becoming an academic: a study of learning to judge student performance in three disciplines at a South African university', (Unpublished PhD thesis), University of Cape Town

Journal Hochschuldidaktik (2009), online journal produced by Technische Universität Dortmund, http://www.hdz.uni-dortmund.de/index.php?id=120, accessed 10 August 2009

Kember, D. (1997) 'A reconceptualisation of the research into university academics' conceptions of teaching' *Learning and Instruction,* 7, 3, 255-275

Kimble, C., Hildreth, P., Bourdon, I. (eds.) (2008) *Communities of Practice: Creating Learning Environments for Educators, Volume 1&2,* Charlotte, NC, Information Age Publishing

Knowles, M. (1980) *The modern practice of adult education: from pedagogy to andragogy*, New York, Cambridge Books

Kreber, C. (ed) (2009) *The University and its Disciplines: teaching and learning within and beyond disciplinary boundaries*, London, Routledge

Lather, P. (1994) *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy within/in the Postmodern*, London, Routledge

Latour, B. (2005) *Reassembling the social: an introduction to actor-network-theory* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

COMMENTARY REFERENCES

Lave, J. (1996) 'Teaching, as learning, in practice' *Mind, Culture & Activity*, 3, 3, 149-164

Lave, J. (1997) 'The culture of acquisition and the practice of understanding' in Kirshner, D. and Whitson, J.A. (eds.) (1997) *Situated cognition: social, semiotic, and psychological perspectives* London, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J. and McDermott, R. (2002) 'Estranged ~~labor~~ learning' *Outlines*, 2002, 1, 19-48

Law, J. (2004) *After method: mess in social science research*, Routledge, London

Law, J. (2006) 'Making a Mess with Method', version of 19 January 2006, available at http://www. heterogeneities.net/publications/Law2006Makinga MesswithMethod.pdf,

Law, J. (2007) 'Making a mess with method' in W. Outhwaite and S.P.Turner (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Social Science Methodology*, London, Sage

Law, J. (2011) contribution to 'Living with mess: in, out of and indifferent to actor-network theory' School of Law seminar, Birkbeck , University of London, 17 June

Macfarlane, B. (2004) *Teaching with integrity: the ethics of higher education practice*, Abingdon, Routledge Falmer

Macfarlane, B. (2009) *Researching with integrity: the ethics of academic enquiry*, Abingdon, Routledge

Malcolm, J. (1988) 'A study in adult education policy with particular reference to Bradford local education authority' Unpublished MEd dissertation, University of Leeds

Malcolm, J. (1992) 'The culture of difference: women's education re-examined' in Miller, N. and West, L. (eds.) *Changing Culture and Adult Learning*, Canterbury, SCUTREA, 52-55

Malcolm, J. (1993) 'Negotiating the minefield: practical and political issues in policy research' in Miller, N. and Jones, D.J. (eds.) *Research: Reflecting Practice*, SCUTREA, 142-144

Malcolm, J. (1995) 'The competence of worker bees: the implications of competence-based education for educators of adults' in Collins, M. (ed.) *Educating the Adult Educator: Role of the University* , Saskatoon, University of Saskatchewan, 61-74

Malcolm, J. (1996) 'Futures in the education of educators' in Zukas, M. (ed.) *Diversity and Development: Futures in the Education of Adults* , Leeds, SCUTREA 125-128

Malcolm, J. (1998) *Learning Outcomes in Yorkshire North* Leeds, Workers' Educational Association

Malcolm, J. (2000) 'Joining, invading, reconstructing: participation for a change?' in Thompson, J. (ed.) *Stretching the Academy; The Politics and Practice of Widening Participation in Higher Education*, Leicester, NIACE

Malcolm, J. (2005) 'Class in the classroom' in T. Nesbit (ed.), *Class Concerns: Adult Education & Social Class.* New Directions in Adult and Continuing Education, no. 106. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass

Malcolm, J. (2010) 'Academic workplace(s) and the shaping of academic work', paper for symposium *Shaping future academic identities: elusive workplaces and emerging careers*, presented at SRHE Annual Conference, Newport, 14-16 December

Malcolm, J. (2011) 'Management and the shaping of academic work', paper presented at 24th Annual CHER Conference What are the prospects for higher education in the 21st century? Ideas, research and policy, University of Iceland, Reykjavik, 23-25 June

Malcolm, J., Hodkinson, P., Colley, H. (2003) 'The interrelationships between informal and formal learning', paper presented at 3rd International Researching Work and Learning Conference, University of Tampere, Finland, 25-27 July

Malcolm, J. and Jones, H.M.F. (eds.) (1995) *Training from Europe: Policy and Practice*, Leeds, University of Leeds

Malcolm, J. and O'Rourke, R.K. (2001) 'Lifelong learning and the legacy of social purpose', paper presented at British Educational Research Association Conference, University of Leeds, 13-15 September

Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (1999a) 'Models of the educator in higher education: problems and perspectives', paper presented to the 19th Annual Conference of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, Creating Collaborative Learning for the 21st Century, University of Calgary

COMMENTARY REFERENCES

Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (1999b) 'Thinking there is new land', in Merrill, B. (ed.) *The Final Frontier: Exploring Spaces in the Education of Adults*, Warwick, SCUTREA, 194-198

Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (1999c) 'Becoming an educator: communities of practice in higher education' paper presented to Annual Conference of Society for Research into Higher Education, HE and its Communities, Manchester, UMIST

Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2002) 'Altered states of teacher identity: the impact of scrutiny and regulation on pedagogic thinking and practice' in Edwards, R., Gray, P., Morgan-Klein, B., Murphy, M., Tett, L. (eds.) *Cultures, communities and citizens: the altered states of adult education?*, University of Stirling/SCUTREA, 192-197

Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2003) 'Dirty language: reclaiming pedagogy' in Davidson, I., Murphy, D. and Piette, B. (eds.) Speaking in tongues: languages of lifelong learning, University of Wales, Bangor/SCUTREA, 145-149

Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2005a) 'Poor relations: exploring discipline, research and pedagogy in academic identity', paper presented at CRLL Conference, What a Difference a Pedagogy Makes – Researching Lifelong Learning and Teaching, University of Stirling, 23-26 June

Malcolm, J. and Zukas, M. (2005b) 'The imaginary workplace: academics as workplace learners', paper presented at 4th International Conference on Researching Work and Learning, University of Technology Sydney, 11-14 December

McAlpine, L. (2006) 'Coming of age in a time of super-complexity (with apologies to both Mead and Barnett)', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 11, 2,123-127

McIlroy, J. and Spencer, B. (1988) *University Adult Education in Crisis*, Leeds Studies in Adult and Continuing Education, University of Leeds

McLean, M. (2006) *Pedagogy and the University: critical theory and practice*, London, Continuum

McWilliam, E. (2004) 'Changing the academic subject', *Studies in Higher Education*, 29, 2, 151-163

Nespor, J. (1994) *Knowledge in motion: space, time and curriculum in undergraduate physics and management* London, Falmer Press

Nicoll, K. and Harrison, R. (2003) ' Constructing the good teacher in higher education: the discursive work of standards', *Studies in Continuing Education*, 25,1, 23-35

NHS Evidence (2005), http://www.library.nhs.uk/KnowledgeManagement/ViewResource.aspx?resID=88442 – accessed 10 August 2009

Open University (n.d.) Masters Module E845 'Supporting Lifelong Learning': http://www.open.ac.uk/lifelong-learning/index.html , accessed 6 August 2009

RAE2008 (2006) *Panel K Criteria and Working Methods*, (Ref RAE 01/2006 [K])Research Assessment Exercise, Bristol

Rogoff, B. (1990) *Apprenticeship in thinking: cognitive development in social context*, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Rogoff, B. (1995) 'Observing sociocultural activity in three planes: participatory appropriation, guided participation and apprenticeship' In J. V. Wertsch & P. Del Rio & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of the mind*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 139-164

Rowland, S. (2001) 'Surface learning about teaching in higher education: The need for more critical conversations' *International Journal for Academic Development,* 6,2, 162–167

Ruth, D. (2008) 'Being an academic: authorship, authenticity and authority' *London Review of Education*, 6, 2, 99-109

Seely Brown, J., Collins, A., Duguid, P. (1989) 'Situated cognition and the culture of learning', *Educational Researcher*, 18, 1, 32-42

Sfard, A. (1998) 'On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one', *Educational Researcher*, 27, 2, 4-13

Skelton, A. (2005) *Understanding Teaching Excellence in Higher Education: towards a critical approach,* London, Routledge

COMMENTARY REFERENCES

Smith, D.E. (1987) *The Everyday World as Problematic: a feminist sociology* Boston, Northeastern University Press

Smith, D.E. (2005) *Institutional Ethnography: a sociology for people* Lanham, AltaMira Press

Solomon, N. (2000) 'Re/constructing the subject: tactical textual uptakes' (Unpublished PhD thesis), University of Technology Sydney

Thompson, J. L. (ed.) (1980) *Adult Education for a Change*, London, Hutchinson

University of Leeds (1997) *Report to NCVQ: advising NCVQ on the DfEE project 'Inter-Consortium Credit Agreement'* Project no. NVQ/COR/X-6101, School of Continuing Education (unpublished report) – contributing author Janice Malcolm

UUK (2010) *The Changing Academic Profession in the UK and Beyond*, Research Report, London, Universities UK

Viskovic, A. R. (2009) *Survey of Literature Relating to Tertiary Teacher Development and Qualifications*, Wellington, Ako Aotearoa National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) *Mind in Society: the development of higher psychological processes* London, Harvard University Press

Wenger, E. (2009) 'Services' web page http://www.ewenger.com/services/index.htm , accessed 10 August 2009

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. and Snyder, W.M. (2002) *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide to Managing Knowledge*, Harvard Business School Press

Young. M.F.D. (1971) *Knowledge and Control: new directions for the sociology of education*, London, Collier Macmillan

Zukas, M. and Malcolm, J. (1999) 'Models of the educator in higher education' paper presented at British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Sussex, Brighton, 2-4 September

APPENDIX 1

First interview schedule: exploring pedagogic identity

1. Tell me about your teaching career to date. (including qualifications etc)

2. Would you say that you think of yourself *primarily* as a teacher?

3. What do you think about the content of what you teach? (Is it externally set, etc?)

4. Let's talk about your students. What impact do they have on your teaching?

5. Does it matter if you teach different groups? What things make a difference?

6. Are there things about you and your life that impact on your teaching?

7. How do you think your students would describe you? How would they describe your relationship with them?

8. I want to unpack some of the things about how you see yourself as a teacher.

   a) What's influenced you?

   b) What do you see as your strengths and weaknesses?

   c) Are there any points for development?

   d) What are your goals – where do you see yourself going from here?

9. We're trying to find out if teachers think of themselves primarily as individuals, or as part of a work team, or as part of something else. How do you see yourself?

10. How do you see the relationship between teaching and research?

Appendix 2

Second interview schedule: transitions from AE into disciplinary departments/ academic identity

1. Tell me about your career to date (qualifications, subject, students, settings, years teaching)? How did you come to be doing this?

2. How do you describe yourself now? (Job title; discipline; strengths and weaknesses)

3. How did you describe yourself at other career stages?

4. How would your students and colleagues describe you?

5. What's changed in your work life?

    a) What differences do you notice in the organisation of work?

    b) In the organisation and practice of research?

    c) In the organisation and practice of teaching?

    d) Culturally – internally and externally?

6. Where do you locate yourself in relation to the discipline and disciplinary community?

7. What's got better? And worse?

8. What strikes you about the departmental culture?

9. Are your students different and if so, how? How does that impact upon you?

10. On reflection, what was it that was distinctive about working in an adult education department?

11. How do you feel about your academic work and yourself as an academic now?