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Abstract

This project was devised to explore and better understand the relationship between practitioners’ own understandings of their professionalism and their capacity to engage in ‘research’ in the further education (FE) sector. It originally aimed at identifying ways of better using research for the advancement of professional practice within FE. The study determined to explore research engagement where it could be located in five general FE colleges in the north and north east of England, in an attempt to understand how research and understandings of practitioner professionalism might be connected and how research engagement might facilitate a rejuvenated practitioner professionalism.

The project’s relevance to the conference theme, professional lifelong learning: beyond reflective practice, lies in its critical focus in challenging certain orthodoxies prevalent in the FE sector’s rhetoric with respect to developing its workforce. In common with other educators, FE practitioners have for some time been ‘encouraged’ to develop student centred practices, prioritising reflective and increasingly flexible approaches. However, these developmental priorities are underpinned by economic and accountability driven imperatives to continuously raise standards and accommodate larger and more diverse learner cohorts. Within this context the paper asks what kinds of professionalism are available to FE practitioners. In the conference’s terms, opportunities for engaging even with the ‘dogma’ of reflective practice may increasingly be restricted as broadly applicable ‘answers’ are available with respect to how to teach in FE.

Introduction

Background

It is helpful here to briefly outline the wider context within which FE practice is located. Previous work exploring the conditions of FE practitioner professionalism has noted features of change and continuity (Gleeson et al 2005, Goodrham and Hodkinson 2004) with respect to the major upheaval of Incorporation upon practice. Conditions of service for FE practitioners have been subject to extensive change since 1993 but the primary focus of practice for most, i.e. teaching students, has remained constant. While it is certainly true that learner cohorts may differ significantly to those of ten, fifteen, twenty years ago, change in the sector should be understood in relation to much broader
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1 The Incorporation of colleges refers to the FE-HE Act 1992, which released FE institutions from the control of their local authorities and gave colleges responsibilities of self-regulation and independence. This process is identified in much of the existing research literature about FE as instrumental in the transformation of conditions of labour for professional practice in FE.
shifts. Recent developments in FE professionalism have mirrored corresponding
transformations in policy development across public services (Exworthy and Halford
1999). Similarly, New Right assumptions prioritising consumerism, market hegemony
and managerialism in public services and education generally, have underpinned the
policy context of FE practice (Avis 1997, 2003). Dimensions of inclusion and
community may have been tagged on in FE, since the arrival of New Labour to
government (Hyland 2002, Hyland and Merrill 2003) but ‘a particular understanding of
global economic relations’ (Avis 1997: 243) continues to give precedence to the
market. This is true even with respect to aspects of FE provision apparently grounded in
social justice (Avis 1997).

Some commentators have rightly noted that against this background of widening
participation, audit and accountability and managerialism, with learner groups in FE
who were not previously included in the FE remit (e.g. quite recently for most colleges,
14-16 year old cohorts), colleges have become ‘livelier places’ and lecturers’ activities
increasingly focused ‘on ensuring that students remain on courses and pass
qualifications’ (Hyland and Merrill 2003: 86). That these factors would have important
implications for FE practitioners’ own learning and development is probably too
obvious to need to state and yet several of the ‘classic’ academic texts focusing on FE
do not deal with how practitioner learning and development might be problematised
and reconstructed for the twenty first century (Ainley and Bailey 1997, Hyland and
Merrill 2003). They also do not explore the kinds of professionalities available within
current conditions of service beyond stating that largely FE professionals are unhappy
with post incorporation conditions of service (Ainley and Bailey 1997, Hyland and
Merrill 2003).

This paper will consider, in relation to the conference theme, my own study’s
exploration of the kinds of professionalities that were available to the research sample
and development of a theoretical framework of ‘restricted’ and ‘extended’ (Hoyle 1974,
Hoyle and John 1995) FE professionalities ‘in flux’ (Stronach et al 2002), through
which to consider FE practitioners’ opportunities to engage in their own professional
learning through research activity. The literature review section will explore the
theoretical framework underpinning the study and propose that an extended
professionality for FE professionals that includes research activity offers a model of
professional learning that would go beyond ‘reflective practice’. The paper will then
briefly outline the methodological design of the study before discussing some of the
findings in relation to case studies that demonstrate the barriers to FE practitioners
being able to participate in an extended professionality that includes professional
learning through research activity. Finally, I offer some conclusions and two quite
different models of extended professionality for the FE sector and their implications for
the professional learning and development of professionals in the sector and possibly
beyond.

Literature review

Reflective practice and FE professionals

…on the rare occasions when debates about professionalism and professional
practice have occurred in FE, the concept of the ‘reflective practitioner’ has often
been invoked as a way of defining what is distinctive about professional activity.
This we suggest has resulted in a rather partial view of the process of teaching and teachers’ perceptions of the wider professional dimensions of their role, and has not led to any significant analysis or engagement with the new contexts and roles in which FE teachers are expected to operate. (Guile and Lucas 1999: 204)

Guile and Lucas (1999: 204) propose that a ‘new concept of the FE teacher’ as ‘learning professional’ is required to accommodate a professionalism that combines the pedagogical and managerial priorities of post incorporation practice. In other words like my own study they are interested in what a professionalism that takes into account the hybrid teacher/manager roles of post incorporation FE practice might look like and the implications of that for teacher training in the sector. They suggest that in general those with an interest in FE education have in the past relied on the notion of the ‘reflective practitioner’ (Schon 1978) to conceptualise and locate practitioners’ experience within a frame of reference that incorporates their experience and understanding of working practices in FE. A major weakness of reflective practice as a ‘model of professionalism’ (Guile and Lucas 1999: 215), they argue, is its tendency to sideline ‘research based-knowledge’ and the connecting of practice to theoretical ideas that might help professionals better understand their work in deeper ways.

‘Connective’ models of FE professionalism (Guile and Lucas 1999: 216) and an extended concept of professionalism’ (Guile and Lucas 1999: 204) have strong resonance with aspects of the model of ‘extended professionality’ (Hoyle 1974, Hoyle and John 1995) underpinning my research study. However, while Guile and Young (1999) focus on the possibility of a future FE ‘learning professional’ who understands and connects the various and newly defined aspects of the FE role, my own work has conceptualised extended professionality in relation to the contradiction and tension inherent in professional practice and in particular the reality of balancing of internally and externally determined factors which are always unstable, always in flux. It is within this context that research activity as professional learning must compete and be understood as one of many internal ‘ecologies of practice’ or, depending on the context, external ‘economies of performance’ (Stronach 2002). Within the theoretical framework that is proposed below, dispositional and contextual factors determine the likelihood of individual practitioner engagement with research activity as professional learning and this differs somewhat from Guile and Young’s (1999) rather general and perhaps symbolic ‘learning professional’ for whom research engagement is necessarily envisaged as a good thing. In FE that may depend rather on whose definition of research is being incorporated into practice and what that means in practice.

Extended and restricted professionalities in flux

Hoyle and John (1995) distinguish between the highly ‘contested’ notion of a profession and the attributes of teacher ‘professionality’. Here ‘professionality’ refers specifically to practices associated with professional performance rather than the extensive controversy surrounding the professions and professionalism. Also helpful is their distinction between ‘restricted’ and ‘extended’ professionalities (Hoyle 1974, Hoyle and John 1995:123). In summary, the notion of a ‘restricted’ professionality refers to a technical, classroom aptitude that might be envisaged in relation to more technicist views of teaching and learning (Hodkinson 1997), although it should be
noted that Hoyle and John (1995) do not suggest that ‘restricted’ performance denotes anything less than a ‘high level of skill’ (Hoyle and John 1995:123). ‘Extended’ professionality nevertheless represents a broader professionality, incorporating collaboration and participation in multiple professional development activities, including ‘small scale research projects’ (Hoyle and John 1995:123). Hoyle and John (1995) were certain that for schoolteachers an extended professionality was increasingly the norm and that teacher dispositions were critical in determining preferences for restricted or extended professionalities. For FE practitioners in my framework the opportunity to pursue aspects of extended or restricted professionality depended as much on location within a particular institution and within particular parts of the FE sector as on individual disposition. Conditions of labour are not envisaged here as ever either simply restricted or extended for individuals but always shifting. Put another way, FE practitioners in the study were not expected to display fixed professionalities.

For Stronach et al (2002) the individual’s managing of inherent tensions between internalised ‘ecologies of practice’ and external ‘economies of performance’ lies at the heart of a concept of professionalism that is always ‘in flux’ (Stronach et al 2002:109). They warn that an excessive imbalance of tension between individuals’ ecologies and organisational economies may prove too much for some practitioners to sustain. The notion of ‘professionality’ helps define ‘ecologies of practice’ with respect to those aspects of practice that reflect individuals’ dispositional commitment to their jobs. It is possible, therefore, to focus specifically upon aspects of teacher professionality and acknowledge that while in this research study, participants did not see FE practice and perhaps teaching in general as a ‘true’ profession, they did identify important and highly personalised aspects of their roles as inherently ‘professional’.

I know we’re not real professionals… I know we’re not classed as if we are professional but certainly there’s a feeling about being professional within my colleagues, you know the emphasis, we do this, we put on a professional face, we do the job professionally… (Geoff – Lecturer)

In summary, the theoretical development of this research combined Hoyle (1974) and Hoyle and John’s (1995) notions of ‘restrictive’ and ‘extended’ school teacher professionality with Stronach et al’s (2002) deconstruction of public service (school teachers and nurses) professionalism ‘in flux’. Both theoretical approaches were originally developed in relation to professionals not working in FE and the fusing of the two sets of concepts represents a new conceptualising of professional practice as inherently characterised by tension whilst simultaneously constrained by both dispositional and contextual features of that practice. Although the focus of the study is FE, the theoretical ideas are regarded as potentially of interest to public sector professionals in a wider sense. Key theoretical concepts offered here are: a) that economies of performance and ecologies of practice are not simply experienced in a bad versus good opposition in practice and b) are often inseparably bound together in c) an ambiguous and constantly shifting professionality, that is far more likely to display aspects of both extended and restricted practice, depending upon specific circumstances than either one or the other.

Research method
**Data collection and sampling**

This research was undertaken within a broadly qualitative and interpretive framework, employing semi-structured interviews and observation as its primary data collection strategies. The involvement of ‘key participants’ committed to engagement in research activity in FE was of critical importance to the success of the study, in order to obtain practitioner accounts that included research engagement alongside individual understandings of professional practice and identity. With this in mind links were initially established, through the local (Yorkshire and Humberside) Learning and Skills Research Network (LSRN) and other regional/national Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA) events, with FE practitioners actually engaged in or at least declaredly committed to research activity within the sector. Research ‘enthusiasts’ were thus identified in colleges through these FE research networks and conference events and through a wider sample in each site, comprising their colleagues and managers, their participation in ‘research activity’ was located within the context of their organisation and the wider FE sector. Participation in ‘research activity’ by FE practitioners was conceptualised as indicating an engagement in professional understanding and development of their own practice and participants were encouraged to define ‘research’ in their own terms.

Observation of key participants was undertaken before any interviews were carried out and also wherever possible on all return visits to sites. Five college sites were researched during the first round of data collection. For the second round one of these sites was replaced, as the key participant had moved job and college. The participant’s new work location became the sixth site for the study, although by coincidence this new site was located in a college where a site already existed, placing two key participants within the same organisation for the second round of data collection. There were six sites in total across five participating colleges.

Between three and six colleagues of key participants were interviewed in each site during the first round of data collection (May 2003 to July 2004). The line manager for each key research participant was interviewed where possible. Key documentation was collected to clarify organisational policy and priorities in relation to research. To deepen understanding and explore change within the sites, in the second round of data collection (December 2004 to April 2005) all key participants were interviewed for a second time, as were many members of the wider sample who remained within the site and were willing to be interviewed again. New participants were incorporated into the wider sample during the second round of data collection. In total 41 interviews were carried out with 28 FE practitioners (see Appendix A) taking part in the study.

Interviews were roughly one hour in duration and were recorded and subsequently transcribed. Interviewees were encouraged to give detailed answers to open ended questions. Specific lines of enquiry were nevertheless part of the interview schedule in order that:

1. The interview enabled individuals to provide an account of their career histories in relation to their particular situation as FE practitioners - of
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2 The notion of ‘sites’ of practitioners was employed to locate key participants’ dispositions to research within the working context of their immediate colleagues and the organisational culture of their institution.
special interest were their understandings of their professional identities, especially with regard to their status as teachers and/or occupationally specific experts.

2. The interview invited participants to reveal their understanding of and dispositions to 'research activities', in relation to their professional identities, roles and status.

3. The interview also explored practitioners' dispositions to the value and role of educational research for FE practice.

Analysis

The process of data collection and data analysis was cyclical, with each stage of data analysis informing subsequent data collection. In this way the development of the study was shaped through a 'progressive focusing' (Ball 1991: 178) upon key issues and 'theoretically significant critical' cases (Ball 1991: 172). Analysis of interview data was approached with reference to Wolcott (1994) and his three-stage process of description, analysis and interpretation. Case studies of individual subjects were written up for each interviewee using a largely descriptive process, incorporating significant sections of the original interview data to present participants’ accounts in their own words. An interpretative approach was then employed to write up case studies for each site, drawing upon all the accounts of the site, my own fieldwork notes and documentation from the site where available. Interview data were revisited repeatedly in order that a process of ‘sustained immersion’ (Moustakas 1990: 14) in each site might be facilitated to strengthen and focus interpretation.

Findings and discussion

Empirically the study suggested that three broad conclusions might be drawn in relation to the research sample:

I. FE practitioners’ stories confirmed that a rising imbalance between the tensions inherent in professional practice became increasingly problematic during the course of the data collection period.

II. The conditions of labour described by most FE practitioners in the study worsened during the course of the study.

III. Linked to I and II, opportunities for practitioners to engage in research activity during the research period decreased for most FE practitioners in the study.

In this paper we are particularly interested in the third finding, as this most directly indicated that opportunities for extended professional learning (i.e. that included research) decreased for the sample, despite organisational rhetoric appearing to prioritise research informed knowledge and the sector’s own teacher training requirement that FE professionals ‘engage in continuing professional development’ including ‘research and study related to professional practice’ (FENTO 2001: 21). It is worth first briefly considering examples of how changes in conditions of labour were experienced quite differently by individuals, despite a general intensification of workloads, because they illustrate how the complex tensions between ecologies of practice and economies of performance were managed by individual practitioners.

Professionalities in flux
In Hoyle’s (1974) terms, an extended professionality rooted in collaboration and flexibility was increasingly commonplace in the sample in relation to organisational priorities of change or curriculum development or performance management or specific sector driven and funded initiatives, for example coaching outstanding teachers and mentoring poor ones. Teacher professionality was extended in the sense that flexibility with respect to increased workloads and cross college collaboration was observed but was underpinned by tension and risk rather than opportunities to become ‘learning professionals’ (Guile and Lucas 1999). Nevertheless, individual disposition and personal pragmatism were highly significant and some participants fared better than others in taking on and learning new roles. Economies of performance and ecologies of practice became aligned in some circumstances in pursuit of career progression. Diane, for example, had taught ‘A level’ modern languages, a declining provision at Dinsmore College, for many years but was content to become part of the college’s mentoring initiative.

You see I’ve taught languages for donkeys now and although I love it, there comes a time in your life when you want to do, you either keep doing the same thing till you retire or you look for a new challenge…And that for me was the real creative development, from being a language teacher to taking on a cross college role. That was the new dimension that I was interested in…I would see this as a promotion. (Diane – Learning Mentor/Lecturer)

John on the other hand, an HE lecturer in social sciences at Southern College, did not regard flexibility beyond his subject specialism as appropriate.

So it’s variable in as much as my head knows I’m a subject specialist and initially broached the subject of me taking over the humanities degree… I said no because I’m not a humanities person, you want an English person; I think no one would respect me as a head of a humanities degree. (John – Senior Lecturer)

However, John did take on course management responsibility for new degree provision but he was clear that it was on his own terms and despite a strong antipathy to all things managerial he was able to align his ecological commitment to teaching HE in an FE college with the organisation’s economical necessity that he also co-ordinate the new provision.

I said I’ll do the social science one and she said okay and she said well, the existing structures don’t appear appropriate for HE do they? And I said no. And so she just went with everything I said…so the situation I’m in is, I insisted as a condition of doing the job that that’s the way we run things, as a team of specialists… I’m not a line manager as such. I have to get people to do things because they respect what I say, I’m supposed to provide a leadership role. (John – Senior Lecturer)

**Individual professional learning and research**

With respect to professional learning through research engagement, a strong individual dispositional commitment to research was critical for practitioners to engage in research activity but the opportunity to fulfil this commitment was further
determined by the particular conditions of labour at the sector and the site level. All five of the originally identified ‘research enthusiasts’ (James, Meg, Helen, Heather and John) and several participants from the wider sample identified ‘research’ as important to sustaining their dispositional commitment to their work and a preferred extended model of professionality. Some described their personal engagement with research as a vehicle for reviving their professional interest.

And the project came along, this community project and it lifted me out of that...so I’m quite grateful for that because it gave me an opportunity to do something different. And I think it re-enthused my interest in the whole subject area but also in terms of staying in teaching... (Chris – Skills for Life Co-ordinator)

The balance between dispositional and site factors was rarely constant and while the conditions of labour for the sample were never especially conducive to practitioner research, they became significantly worse during the course of the study. All key participants’ second interviews described a reduction in research activity compared with their first. Even Meg, employed to co-ordinate research, had reduced the number of hours available to carry out what she regarded as purely research-focused activity.

I have been in a temporary position as the head of the unit while we wait for the post to be filled...more responsibility for line-management and quality control and things like that...it’s a new challenge, which is nice but I miss the research, that what I really enjoy doing. (Meg - Research Co-ordinator)

Of the other four key participants, James had ceased to engage in research once his link with HE had ended on completion of a postgraduate degree. He had changed job, moved college (by coincidence from Middleton College to Newton College) and no longer identified any opportunity to participate in research.

...the idea of doing anything other than just trying to keep on top of things isn’t an option and even if I could persuade somebody to give me a day a week to do that rather than my job, it’s not going to get my job done. (James – Cross College Key Skills Co-ordinator)

John’s increased responsibility for course development had made him relinquish his research engagement to cope with curriculum planning priorities, including putting a long-term commitment to a PhD on hold. Heather had lost what she regarded as the research aspect of her job when LSDA project funding had ended, the college was unlikely to fund any continuing work and she described research as a part of her curriculum college development role as having disappeared.

If they really believe in it they’ll fund it themselves and it’ll be a permanent fixture...With regards to research, I haven’t really picked anything up, I’m doing bits of my own. (Heather – Curriculum Development Co-ordinator)

If the opportunity to engage in research had decreased for these four individuals, for the last key participant the situation was even worse. Helen’s highly individual role as college researcher at Newton College had been identified as no longer an organisational priority and she found herself in a redundancy pool with her job’s
clearly stated responsibility for research activity no longer considered viable by the organisation.

I put a lot of emphasis on the research and development part of it and although there is something in the job description about that, I’d made an effort to pursue those lines of enquiries…doing it myself, carrying out research myself or encouraging other people to do it. So it’s part of the job description but that part of the job will be going. (Helen - Further Education Learning and Teaching Development Co-ordinator)

Organisational priorities for professional learning and research

‘Research activity’ as envisaged by several of the organisations was continuing when the fieldwork was completed and in the case of Southern College, Dinsmore College and Weston College was becoming more embedded in organisational structures. The focus and outputs of these organisational developments were disputed by several participants as not research at all and personal and organisational definitions and understandings of research were in conflict in several cases. Organisational definitions of research prioritised instrumental outcomes that would directly benefit the organisation.

…it’s not research as I would recognise it… it’s performativity, something the organisation wants…they look at research as control. (John – Senior Lecturer)

…research primarily is to benefit the organisation…one that did a Masters’ on teaching and learning…was really looking at the impact of initial teacher training within the organisation. (Alan – Staff Development Manager)

At Weston College, where a significant amount of research project work was managed, it became almost impossible for teacher practitioners to engage in research activity as part of their professional development and learning.

…it’s kind of gave up on the turn people onto research thing because people are just far too pressured, it’s like yeah, very nice but actually here am I, stuck with these groups or this terrible retention problem…(Lorna – Learning Development Manager)

At Dinsmore College the original broadly developmental research agenda became increasingly subsumed into college quality mechanisms and initiatives to drive up standards.

A great air of distrust that we were up to something, that we were about performance management… because the roles cross, we also have a remit as the Quality Observation Team. That causes problems because we try to sell ourselves as supportive and supporting staff, but of course with our other hat on, we’re going in and doing quality obs and grading people. (Eve – Teaching and Learning Manager)
I think it has moved towards having more of a quality role… I think that’s probably the case. I think that’s something that’s naturally happened. (Roy – Curriculum Manager ILT)

For organisational research in the study, however, the short-term nature of funding for particular project work meant that further research or even to sustain and disseminate initiatives would depend upon a subsequent commitment of resources by the FE institutions themselves. This was widely felt to be unlikely given the increasing lack of flexibility with respect to the main organisational priority of balancing budgets against declining core funding. At Weston College, such difficult decisions had not been necessary as long as the research unit was financially self-sufficient. However, where funding for developments had ended, a ‘costed’ model of institutional investment of resources against anticipated core funding for success was under development. If college investment in a particular intervention could be shown to generate achievement funding from learner success unlikely to occur without that intervention and the funding available was in excess of the cost of the intervention, then the ‘research’ project was a viable proposition. Under these circumstances it seemed clear that organisational priorities were likely to increasingly continue to dominate the ‘research’ discourse and character of research opportunities at Weston College. As such an approach fits well within the particular conditions of current FE funding methodologies and policy making, it could represent an FE model of ‘research’ informed staff development, although many participants in this study would have been very uncomfortable with the narrow scope of its purpose and its ‘what work’s’ to improve standards priority for research, as opposed to a broader impact in extending practitioners’ professional learning and knowledge.

Conclusions

I have in this paper linked my own work’s development of a theory of extended and restricted professionalities in flux to the conference theme of moving professional learning beyond reflective practice. Essentially, I have argued that as other commentators have suggested, new conditions of labour for public service professionals and hybrid forms of practice/managerial responsibilities demand that new conceptualisations of professional learning and development are necessary. The conceptualisation of an extended FE professionality that includes ‘research and study’ in a broad sense might also apply to the future development of other professional groups. However, in carrying out both the theoretical development and empirical work in this study, I have suggested that contextual constraints in FE in particular present significant barriers to moving professional learning towards including research knowledge, as organisational priorities may reconfigure the meaning and purpose of research to fit their own priorities and sector necessities.

From this study an FE ‘costed’ model of organisational research might be construed that is quite different to Guile and Lucas’ (1999) research knowledge based ‘learning professional’ and the recommendations that other recent research into FE has made with respect to developing practitioner professionality across the sector. This alternative vision is presented by way of concluding this paper for delegates to further consider in relation to the wider issues of professional learning at the heart of the conference theme.
An alternative approach to developing a FE research culture more aligned to broader understandings of professionality would need to reconfigure the conditions of labour for FE practitioners, in order that extended professionalities include opportunities and access to research activity as a matter of course. Reporting the final conclusions of a major longitudinal study into FE, Hodkinson et al (2005) citing Fuller and Unwin (2003) and Hodkinson and Hodkinson (2005), identified significant limitations to FE practitioner professionalism that were rooted in contextual rather than dispositional constraints upon FE teacher professionalities. They recommended that engagement in research may have the potential to extend and expand FE professional learning and practice if included within conditions of labour that explicitly include the processes of research in workloaded responsibilities for individual as well as organisational gain.

This would entail creating more space for tutor autonomy and collaboration, encouraging, rewarding, sustaining and supporting creativity, imagination and innovation, and providing better tutor learning opportunities, including challenging expectations and assumptions…Tutors need more expansive learning environments at work, including opportunities to step outside the working context and engage with critical thinking – for example through engagement in research or other HE-linked courses and activities.

(Hodkinson et al 2005)
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Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Job Title/Description</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
<th>Time/Part Time</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James*</td>
<td>English Lecturer</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>English Lecturer (PTHP)</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Programme Manager – Humanities and Public Services</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Programme Manager – Learning Support</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James*</td>
<td>Cross College Co-ordinator – Key Skills</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Further Education Learning and Teaching Development Co-ordinator</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Principal Lecturer</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>0.5 Cross College Key Skills Co-ordinator for Communication/ 0.5 Lecturer in Key Skills</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Lecturer in Communication Key Skills</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>a) Curriculum Development Co-ordinator/ Learning Coach (first round of data collection)</td>
<td>FT (Two 0.5 posts)</td>
<td>Dinsmore College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Curriculum Development Co-ordinator (second round of data collection)</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mandy         | Director of Teaching and Learning                            | FT             | (Seconded 0.5 to local Lifelong Learning Partnership)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>a) Lecturer/Learning Mentor/Learning Coach</td>
<td>FT (Two 0.5 posts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) 0.5 Advanced Tutor/0.5 Curriculum Manager</td>
<td>FT (Two 0.5 posts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Curriculum Manager - ILT</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Curriculum Development Co-ordinator</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Manager</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Southern College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Higher Education Partnership Manager</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Learning Tutor</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Staff Development Manager</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna</td>
<td>Learning Development Manager</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Weston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg</td>
<td>Research Co-ordinator</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Research Project Monitor</td>
<td>PT (Temporary Contract)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Skills for Life Co-ordinator</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Level 1 Level 2 Project Co-ordinator/ PTHP Lecturer</td>
<td>PT (Temporary Contract)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Project Worker/PTHP Lecturer</td>
<td>PT (Temporary Contract)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Assistant Principal for Lifelong Learning and Higher Education</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Sample table (all organisational and participant names are pseudonyms)**

NB Key research enthusiast participants are in bold.
*James moved from Middleton College to Newton College in January 2004 i.e. between round 1 and round 2 of data collection.