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Abstract

This thesis stems from an interest in educational development and centres specifically on the values and philosophy guiding the work performed under its banner. The thesis extends and challenges dominant conceptions of educational development practitioner agency informed by a structural humanist standpoint. The study is a deconstructive autoethnographic (Denzin, 2014; Gannon, 2006; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008) examination of the ways in which various discourses of agency shape the pedagogy of educational developers supporting the use of e-learning in Technical and Further Education (TAFE) institutions in the Australian state of Victoria. This research emanated from a neophyte educational developer’s inability to enact a pedagogy immune from political considerations and consequences. In drawing upon a bricolage of Foucauldian thought encompassing notions of knowledge, power and self (Foucault, 1984a), the thesis charts how educational development pedagogy is governed by a developer’s situated and momentary conceptions of agency.

The thesis presents a re-conceptualisation of educational development pedagogy as a continually re-negotiated relationship with an assemblage of subjectivities, constituted via an educational developer’s navigation of various problems of pedagogical agency. Five broad pedagogical problems of agency served as individual vantage points to think with knowledge-power-self (Foucault, 1984a) and chart how an educational developer’s pedagogy is a series of local and momentary tactics and strategies. This pedagogy of multiplicity is presented via five agentic problems of contestation, marginalisation, e-learning as a product, compliance and pedagogy as generic.

The deconstructive autoethnographic methodology (Denzin, 2014; Gannon, 2006; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008) utilised in this research models a poststructural conception of agency reliant upon the subject locating their multiple discursively constituted selves (Davies, 1991, 2000). There is potential for this reflexive methodology to be broadly re-applied by educational development practitioners
within higher education environments, to examine how their pedagogical acts are governed by conceptions of agency in response to strategic and/or legislative agendas such as curriculum renewal and the quality assurance of learning and teaching. Continued exploration of the ways in which conceptions of agency are intertwined in the pedagogy of educational development, will provide those persons working under this banner with greater capacity to negotiate working relationships with the teaching and management stakeholders, who play a major role in governing the day to day provision of educational development expertise in vocational and higher education.
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Chapter 1 – An Introduction

An ‘educational developer’ is a position title often used to refer to an assortment of tertiary institution employees or roles primarily concerned with fostering the improvement of educational methods and processes (Baume & Popovic, 2016). This thesis is an autoethnographic examination of the ways in which educational development pedagogy is governed by an educational developer’s conceptions of agency. It is the product emergent from a research question which asks:

*How can discourses of agency shape the pedagogy of educational development subjects in TAFE e-learning relationships?*

The study is focused on the interplay of educational development agency and pedagogy in e-learning relationships at a Technical and Further Education (TAFE) institute embedded within a dual-sector¹ university in Victoria, Australia. E-learning relationships are conceptualised as a discursive terrain of conflict, where educational developers invariably navigate a multitude of agency related tensions, as they attempt to support the use of educational technology.

The main argument of this thesis is that educational development pedagogy is a localised assemblage of tactics and strategies enacted as a means of navigating situated and momentary conceptions of personal agency. The research undertaken is primarily based on a reflective journal that the researcher as research subject authored in 2009 whilst working as a neophyte or novice educational developer. Through adopting a deconstructive auto-ethnographic (Denzin, 2014; Gannon, 2006; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008) research design, the thesis outlines how educational development pedagogy is more than a set of observable actions. This thesis contends that educational development pedagogy is one of ‘multiplicity’ emergent from an educational developer’s navigation of a multitude of agency related considerations. Pedagogy is posited as the interaction between the educational developer’s tactical rationalisations

---

¹ A dual-sector university is a tertiary institution which offers a significant combination of vocational and higher education classified qualifications.
and strategic acts conceived and performed in a multitude of localised contexts. In the remainder of this chapter I will use an idealised narrative to introduce and contextualise the research problem as one of pedagogical agency for educational developers in TAFE e-learning relationships. I will then conclude the chapter by providing a brief precis for each of the key terms in the research question accompanied by a general overview of the thesis.

**Grappling with a problem of agency**

This thesis has emanated from a practice-oriented problem of ideating pedagogic tactics that are conducive with seemingly irreconcilable demands or directions. An overarching tension of pedagogic agency has been constant throughout my 11-year career working as an educational developer, always feeling like I answer to competing persons, interests and agendas. For a moment, the plan may appear fixed, only to realise that a plan is not a legally binding contract. Most educational development tasks are dependent on interactions with teachers who do not necessarily understand and/or agree with the mandate and direction conceived by others (e.g. federal/state government, institutional management). As a neophyte educational developer, I speculated that educational development pedagogy was about continually navigating these tensions in ways where I could influence and support outcomes where all ‘masters’ are satisfied. This tension has been particularly visible in those relationships I have engaged in related to supporting teachers’ use of e-learning and online teaching. It has remained in play throughout my career working in a variety of educational development roles in vocation and higher education settings. To further contextualise the research problem, it is re-presented below as an idealised narrative in italics.

*It was a morning much like many others before and after. I had two meetings scheduled. The first was with a group of teachers from the one department, who were all present in response to a directive of attendance delivered from their head of department. On arrival, the executive officer...*
informed us that the head of department had other commitments and could not attend. This somewhat frustrated me, as I had requested for this person to be in attendance they initially approached me to facilitate a workshop with their staff. At that time, s/he had reluctantly agreed to attend while I facilitate a discussion, instead of running a workshop.

Initiating these discussions (workshops) with a group of teachers can resemble a western cowboy movie where the viewer is waiting to see who will draw their gun first. They can also resemble the tense silence prior to a difficult conversation where both parties are plotting a way to initiate, without getting straight to the apparent point of conflict. In this instance, I was the cowboy on the receiving end of a barrage of bullets visible in the form of comments (from the teachers) such as:

- Our students want to study face to face as they come here to learn practical skills that you can’t teach online
- The learning management system\(^2\) is really clunky and students find it difficult to use
- We are overworked and don’t have time to be producing online learning resources
- Has the TAFE employed you to create online resources for us?

The remaining time in this ‘discussion’ became an opportunity for me to try and provide responses to the array of concerns and perceptions that had been raised. I had been initially told to provide an opportunity for the teachers to learn a series of procedural skills using a learning management system. However, no one in this group was able to confidently state what outcome they thought they would be achieving through an increased use of the learning management system, beyond generalisations such as:

\(^2\) Learning Management System (LMS) is a generic descriptor to describe software-based applications commonly used by educational institutions for the provision and administration of online courses.
• The management want to save money
• We have been told that we should attract more students
• It enables less teachers to do more

The conversation, I earlier had with the head of department, was eerily similar. I was asked to work with a department to achieve an outcome that no one can explain beyond a generalisation. It was a solution no one seems to want, for a problem, no one could identify.

The second meeting was with a manager from the central learning and teaching unit, who was eager to know how the ‘workshop’ had transpired. As I attempted to recall the earlier events, s/he regularly interjected to continually remind me that online delivery is a major strategic priority for the TAFE. It was the reason why my employment could be justified. I was promptly informed that it was my job ‘to teach the teachers how to use e-learning technologies’ and that ‘once they (teachers) are comfortable using the technology they will start to deliver their units (of study) online’. The meeting finished as it started. I came away feeling like the meat in the sandwich between buns that on the surface look like buns, but don’t taste like buns.

This short narrative above provides an idealised conception of a problem of pedagogic agency that has been consistently at play throughout the previous decade of working in various educational development roles. It is a contextual introduction to a grand problem of pedagogic agency which has served as the foci for ideating the research question explored in this thesis. I am using the term ‘grand’ to place emphasis on the ineluctability of an educational developer navigating political and personal tensions, as a condition for educating teachers to use e-learning in TAFE institutions. Prior to engaging in the production of this thesis I speculated that this grand problem of pedagogic agency is manifestly imbued in an educational developer’s pedagogic rationalisations and acts. It is this interrelationship between agency and pedagogy for educational developers
engaged in e-learning relationships, that I have sought to examine in this thesis.

Defining key terms within the research question

The previous section has contextualised how a practice-oriented challenge of educational development pedagogy being directed by a multitude of agency related tensions is a significant problem worth investigation. It is now timely to return to the research question and define each of the key terms contained within.

*How can discourses of agency shape the pedagogy of educational development subjects in TAFE e-learning relationships?*

The research question encompasses various theoretical concepts such as discourse and agency which solicit nuanced understandings when considered within the conceptual framework guiding the thesis. The conceptual framework is an assemblage of poststructuralist thought\(^3\) drawing heavily upon the work of Michel Foucault. While the conceptual framework is explained in detail in the next chapter, this short precis of key terms has been compiled as a means of articulating a refined conception of the research question.

**Subjectivity**

A Foucauldian notion of the subject problematises the individual, by positing the subject as multiple historically contingent conceptions of self (Foucault, 1997a). This conception of the subject as multiple can be viewed as a reaction against Kant’s sovereign subject who is governed by internal reason (Schirato, Danaher, & Webb, 2012). Subjectivity is used in this thesis to refer to the various ways in which multiple conceptions of one’s ‘self’ are historised constructions. These are emergent from an individual’s relation to an ethical problem, choice or question;

---

3 Poststructuralism is commonly used to describe an associable set of epistemological claims present in the post 1967 work of French intellectuals including (but not restricted to) Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault.
at or in various moments and contexts; the navigation or response to the issue through applying available knowledge in relations with others; and a re-examination of what constitutes an idealised self (Foucault, 1997a). Subjectivity is used in this thesis as a means of problematising the individual and replacing it with multiple conceptions of self, emergent from navigating a multitude of different relationships where the dynamics of each relationship are momentarily stable. From this point in the thesis I will be referring to the ‘educational development subject’ as the historicised form (or effect) emergent from the educational developer’s ongoing re-constitution of self.

Discourse

Discourse is both a central and nuanced concept within a poststructural conceptual framework, where knowledge is socially situated, historically-fluid and non-objective (Luke, 1997). Foucault (1972, 1978, 1979) conceptualised discourse as a localised socially constructed means of representing a specific reality which in turn serves as a set of rules regulating what can be understood within the given reality. Discourses are not simply knowledge statements, but function as fields or spaces for constituting knowledge, subjectivity and power relations (Weedon, 1987). Discourses enable an historicized construction of meaning in respect to what is written and said, what physically exists and those actions which are performed (Hall, 1997). For example, the words and actions of an educational developer are only understood in relation to the discourses which enable the subject and their actions to be understood. This concept of discourse engenders research which acknowledges a multiplicity of the subject, where humans are positioned as different subjects within a multitude of discourse (Davies, 2000).

Agency

Within the social sciences, agency is commonly regarded as an individual’s
capacity to make free choices and independently enact such choice. This conception of agency is informed by a humanist discourse where a person is considered an autonomous, rational, individual who has access to a free will. Within this discourse, an individual’s agency is shaped by their position within society (Davies, 1991), where structural influences such as gender, religion and social class can serve to constrain the capacity of the individual to act freely. Structural-humanist conceptions of agency are more commonly utilised within the literature related to educational development, often working within a conceptual framework shaped by modernist critical theory (i.e. Frankfurt School). In contrast, a discourse of poststructural thought posits a view of the individual as multiple discursively constructed subjectivities (Davies & Gannon, 2005). This poststructural reconceptualization of the subject solicits a post-humanist view of agency as it seemingly precludes capacity for a humanist form of agency where the rational individual acts freely (Caldwell, 2007). Davies (2000, p. 55) has presented a poststructural reconceptualization of agency as being a “capacity to recognise that constitution and resist, subvert and change the discourses themselves through which one is being constituted”. The sentiment of this reconceptualization of agency can be read within Foucault’s (1984b, p. 46) description of ‘criticism’ being a “historical investigation into the events that have led us to constitute ourselves and to recognize ourselves as subjects of what we are doing, thinking, saying”. This correlation between a poststructural agency and Foucauldian criticism, posits agency as an ongoing process of ‘becoming’, as opposed to ‘being’ (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012); through examining subjectivity as an ongoing relationship to self, governed by interactions with knowledge, others and self.

**Educational development**

The term ‘educational development’ is commonly used to classify endeavours focused on the improvement of educational methods and processes, often encompassing activities specifically intended to develop the capabilities of teaching staff (Baume & Popovic, 2016). While these activities may be
performed by a combination of teachers/academics and researchers, it has become commonplace for educational development activities to be performed by a single role typically referred to as an ‘educational developer’ (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Bath & Smith, 2004). It is a multidisciplinary field (Rowland, 2002) where the varying blend of activities performed is but one factor in speculating why these persons are referred to within the vocational education and training (VET) sector using a wide range of terms including Learning Designer (Jobslift Australia, 2011), Educational Development Advisor (Gordon Institute of TAFE, 2009) and Educational Advisor (Victoria University, 2012). However, the literature referenced in this thesis is dominated by two titles ‘Academic Developer’ and ‘Educational Developer’. Within the Australian tertiary education landscape, this term is often used interchangeably with ‘academic development’ (Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009). I have elected to use ‘educational development’ throughout this thesis on the basis that it is the only operable term to classify such work in a TAFE / VET setting, as ‘academic’ is typically only used in higher education.

**E-Learning**

E-learning is an umbrella term to describe “learning which is facilitated by electronic technologies” (Misko, Choi, Hong, & Sook Lee, 2004, p. ix). While the term has long been synonymous with online education (Anohina, 2005), its application of reference extends to encompass any educational programs where instruction, assessment and or feedback is reliant on the use of an interactive technology. There is an endless list of definitions which attempt to articulate the tools, processes and mindsets that characterise e-learning, however these are contextual, contestable and contingent on the rationale informing the use of technology. For example, The Australian Flexible Learning Advisory Group (I & J Management Services, 2011, p. 10) proposed that the use of “electronic media

---

4 VET – Vocational Education and Training is provided in Australia by Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) which are typically either publicly owned TAFEs or privately-owned RTOs.

5 The Australian tertiary sector is comprised of Vocational Education and Training (VET) and Higher Education (HE) institutions and awards.
to deliver flexible vocational learning and training” is the distinguishing characteristic for determining whether a unit or course is utilising e-learning. The Flexible Learning Advisory Group (FLAG), which had oversight of the National VET E-learning Strategy from 2012 – 2015, captured the breadth of definition in their e-learning quality model. Through their criteria for the model, they categorised e-learning as being the use of technology to assist delivery, assessment, training and assessor competence, and client service (Flexible Learning Advisory Group, 2013). Within higher education literature, the term ‘technology enhanced learning’ (TEL) (Keppell, Suddaby, & Hard, 2011; Laurillard, Oliver, Wasson, & Hoppe, 2009) occupies a similar place to that of e-learning in TAFE. It is used almost exclusively in preference to the context neutral ‘e-learning’. The use of the term ‘enhanced’ arguably implies that technology will be used to improve or value-add the learning, playing a similar role to the ‘e’ in e-learning. For the purposes of this thesis, I will be treating these terms interchangeably within a discourse of e-learning.

**Pedagogy**

Pedagogy is commonly described as the practice, art, method and/or science of teaching. It is a description which infers that pedagogy can encapsulate aspects such as techniques, understandings, processes, products, values and positions related to teaching. Van Manen (1991, p. 16) emphasised the act and its impact, through describing pedagogy as “special interactions, situations and relations between educators and students”. A conceptualisation of pedagogy utilising the aforementioned reference, is often brought to life through the intersection of contextual elements such as the practitioner group, situation, setting, tradition or philosophical position(s). In recognition of the poststructural conceptual framework articulated in chapter two, I am going to explore pedagogy expressed as a ‘moment’ (Britzman, 1991; Lusted, 1986) and as a ‘space’ (Ellsworth, 2005). Britzman’s (1991) description of pedagogy as a moment highlights the problematic nature of separating the act of teaching with that of learning. When constituted as a moment, pedagogy infers an exchange that is not simply
transmissive between teacher and student. Instead it is a productive exchange, pointing to the “agency that joins teaching and learning” (Britzman, 1991, p. 38). This emphasis on bilateral exchange is particularly poignant, as educational development is occupied by a multidisciplinary knowledge base where individual developers are unable to work behind a unified visible canon of content (Peseta, 2011). Pedagogy expressed as a ‘moment’, reinforces the notion that pedagogy is a discursive construct, which is consequently fragmentary, situated, and momentary. Pedagogy is not conceptualised as a series of replicable ‘techniques’ and ‘processes’, but that these replicable techniques and processes are the actions governed by the pedagogy.

Pedagogy expressed as a ‘space’ (Ellsworth, 2005) suggests that learning is an emergent process and that it cannot be isolated from a learner’s environment. Thus, learning occurs in this difficult to articulate space where the individual intersects with society. Ellsworth (2005, p. 123) contends that new understandings can only be formed “through movement into and within the messy intervals of space and time between the ‘things’ we already know and between the ‘begins’ we have already made of ourselves and others”. This vision of pedagogy is one driven by possibility imagined through relations with the subjectivities emergent from discourse. For educational development subjects working in e-learning relationships, spaces are those discursive fields which enable meaning to be made of the ways in which physical and virtual spaces are used. Within this thesis, the term pedagogy will be used to articulate the interconnected nature of the philosophical justification and tactical actions, utilised by an educational development subject in response to their positioning within multiple discourses of learning.

Revisiting the research question

The precis of key terms was presented as an enabler for the reader to position the research question, in relation to the conceptual framework for this thesis
outlined in chapter two. It is now timely to clarify the intention and scope of the research question cognisant of the way in which each key term has been defined.

**How can discourses of agency shape the pedagogy of educational development subjects in TAFE e-learning relationships?**

First, the ‘discourses of agency’ component of the research question refers to socially constructed conceptions of agency, encompassing both humanist or post-structural discourse. While the research question is encompassing multiple paradigmatic conceptions of agency as ‘discourses of agency’, I will be solely utilising a poststructural conception of agency to perform the sense making (analysis) components of this thesis. A poststructural re-conceptualisation of agency emphasises a subject’s capacity to locate the multiple means of their discursive constitution (Davies, 2000). Second, ‘pedagogy’ refers to the interconnected nature of the philosophical justification and tactical actions, utilised by an educational development subject in response to their positioning within multiple discourses of learning. Third, an ‘educational development subject’ is a discursively constituted conception of ‘self’ which posits the self as performing educational development activities directed toward the improvement of educational methods and processes. Finally, this thesis is an exploration of education development pedagogy within relationships of e-learning at TAFE institutions. I have elected to use the term ‘relationships’ to refer to socio-historical moments where interpersonal and/or introspective interactions are emergent from an objective or directive associated with e-learning. E-learning encompasses reference to any educational endeavours related to the provision of education that includes the use of an interactive and/or online technology.

**The research setting and approach**

The research setting is a TAFE institution embedded within a dual-sector university in Victoria Australia. In 2009 I worked at this institution as an early
career educational developer primarily tasked with supporting TAFE teachers' use of e-learning. A major responsibility of this role was to facilitate a professional development program for TAFE teachers seeking to develop the skills and knowledge to independently facilitate e-learning related peer to peer learning. I have elected to grapple with the research question for this thesis through performing a deconstructive auto-ethnography (Denzin, 2014; Gannon, 2006). The term auto-ethnography is typically used to refer to a research endeavour or methodological approach reliant upon the dual role of researcher and research subject in order to develop understandings of a given culture (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011). A deconstructive auto-ethnography draws upon a poststructural conceptual framework in order to place presence and experience under erasure (Denzin, 2014; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008) and examine the discursive multiplicity of subjectivity. Gannon (2006) associates this form of auto-ethnography to Foucault’s (1997) description of the ancient Greek concept ‘care of the self’, where there is an ethical imperative for a person to understand their self(s) in relation to societal truths and norms, as a means to transform their agency. The auto-ethnographic component of this thesis is a collection of five chapters, with each using a different problem of agency as a starting point to explore how the educational development subject’s pedagogy has been governed by their agentic constitution.

The primary intention for this thesis is to serve as an original contribution to knowledge for the field of academic/educational development. This is achieved through applying an assortment of Foucauldian poststructural thought, to auto-ethnographically visualise a multitude of ways in which educational development pedagogy is an effect of the educational developer navigating various local and momentary problems of pedagogical agency. The thesis seeks to problematise the everyday pedagogy of an educational developer as a means to ultimately engender broader practitioner consideration of a pedagogical agency not reliant upon a structural-hierarchical rationality.
Chapter 1 - Introduction

An overview of the thesis

Chapter 2 – Conceptual Framework as a fractured lens
In this chapter I draw upon a metaphor of a fractured lens (D'Cruz, 2001) to situate the thesis within a post-positivist paradigm where there is no ultimate reality to be understood, all knowledge is contestable and truths are a product of discourse. I draw upon critiques of universalism, foundationalism and essentialism (Parkes, Gore, & Elsworth, 2010) broadly applied within poststructuralist thought, as a means to articulate the epistemological and ontological assumptions that have guided the research performed in this thesis. I conclude the chapter by articulating a conception of poststructuralist agency drawing predominately upon the work of Davies (2000).

Chapter 3 – Navigating the discursive terrain of TAFE
This chapter serves as a companion piece to the literature review, through providing a historical background to the contestable and historically contingent Technical and Further Education (TAFE) teaching environment. The background explores the interplay of TAFE specific discourse such as market driven reform, standardisation of curriculum and flexible learning in relation to the provision of professional development. While educational development subjects are among a broader group of individuals, units and organisations that manage and facilitate professional development in TAFE, there is no accessible body of literature which examines educational development agency and pedagogy in a TAFE and/or VET context.

Chapter 4 – Academic Development as a substitute
The literature review is a synthesis of the major theoretical and methodological points of contestation related to agency, pedagogy and e-learning within higher education oriented educational development. The review examines how pedagogic problems of agency are emergent for educational development
subjects in discourses of e-learning, contestability and fragmentation, marginalisation, competing service models, generic pedagogy and managerialism. The chapter concludes by contending that there has been no substantial research examining how educational development pedagogy is governed by an educational development subject resisting multiple discursive constitutions of self.

Chapter 5 – Methodological decisions
This chapter provides an account of the major methodological decisions made in the production of this thesis. ‘Writing as a method of enquiry’ (Richardson, 2000) is posited as a methodological ethos for the research, through contending that analysis is iterative and emergent throughout all components of the thesis. I conclude the chapter by explaining how the five auto-ethnographic chapters in the thesis are the product of a deconstructive auto-ethnography approach (Denzin, 2014; Gannon, 2006), where presence and experience are placed under erasure (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008).

Intermission – Reading the auto-ethnographic chapters
The intermission provides the reader with a brief overview of the writing structure and theoretical concepts utilised in each of the subsequent auto-ethnographic chapters.

Chapter 6 - Educational Development as contestable
As the first of five auto-ethnographic chapters, this particular chapter explores how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is emergent from navigating a problem of contestation. Contestation refers to an inability to utilise an accepted bounded definition of ‘educational developer’ as a means to solicit collaboration with teaching subjects. I initially draw heavily upon various components from Foucault’s (1972) archaeological topology to chart how educational development as a concept is contested. The latter component of the chapter utilises an assemblage of concepts associated with his knowledge/power
couplet (Foucault, 1978) to visualise how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is a means of resisting the constitutive effects of this knowledge.

Chapter 7 - Educational Development as marginal
This chapter focuses on how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is emergent from navigating an agentic problem of being excluded or outside of pedagogic decision making. I think with a Spivakian concept of marginality (Spivak, 1990) to visualise how an educational development subject can occupy multiple spaces, in-between the idealised centre and commonly espoused margins. I conclude the chapter by thinking with an assortment of concepts associated with Knowledge/Power (Foucault, 1978, 1980e) to examine how an educational development subject’s conception of marginality shapes their pedagogic rationalisations and acts.

Chapter 8 - e-learning as umbrella
This chapter explores how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is emergent from navigating a problem of determining the focus and objective of e-learning as subject matter. I commence the chapter by using selected components of Foucault’s (1972) archaeological topology to explore how e-learning as a catachresis or master word (Spivak, 1993) is an effect of it denoting a localized product based solution to a series of financial related targets or problems. In the latter section of the chapter I use Foucault’s (1982) conception of power as agonistic, to explore how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is emergent from resisting a predominately technological conception of e-learning.

Chapter 9 – Problems of compliance
This chapter explores how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is emergent from navigating problems of engendering and/or being marked by a status of compliance. I think with an assortment of Foucauldian concepts situated within each of the historical triple ontologies of knowledge-power-self
(Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1982, 1984a) to visualise various socio-historical instances where an educational development subject’s pedagogic acts are enacted as a means of resisting various subjectivities emergent from a problem of compliance.

**Chapter 10 - Pedagogy as an ethical relation with self**

The final auto-ethnographic chapter examines how an educational development subject navigates an agentic problem of pedagogy expressed as a set of generalised techniques. I use Foucault’s (1997) four elements of ethical relations to examine how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is an assemblage of strategies and tactics conceptualised, enacted and rationalised via a continually re-negotiated relationship with (or resistance to) a bricolage of subjectivities.

**Chapter 11 – A pedagogy of multiplicity**

In this final chapter, I briefly explore the conceptual and methodological contributions and limitations of the research. In acknowledgment of the poststructural conceptual framework guiding the thesis, I resist providing a set of generalizable conclusions. The thesis is positioned as a pedagogy of multiplicity encompassing a plethora of theoretical tools for educational development subjects to conceptualise how their pedagogy is emergent from their day to day navigation of multiple discourses of agency.
Chapter 2 - Conceptual framework as a fractured lens

In this chapter, I will attempt to articulate a conceptual framework that has informed the construction of this thesis. I am using the term conceptual framework tentatively as ‘framework’ can conjure images of a structural system or schematic. This is an image that I am unable to produce beyond the representation of metaphors. Consequently, I use the term conceptual framework drawing upon D’Cruz’s (2001) metaphor of a fractured lens. This metaphor is a reaction against conceptions of the research endeavor as a linear process where each component neatly informs the next, and where the methodology can be considered as a discrete entity away from the research(ed) and researcher.

Situating the thesis as postfoundational

Through the research question encompassing concepts such as agency and discourse, it may be claimed that it is not much beyond stating the obvious to label this research as qualitative. However, in terms of articulating a conceptual framework, this label is not simply problematic through being broad or obvious. Lather (1992) places emphasis on the function of qualitative as part of a binary opposition to quantitative to argue that it is a label more relevant to discussion of method as opposed to methodology. The diversity of methods labelled under this banner, strengthens the inadequacy of this label to serve as a means to position this research. Adams and Roulston (2006) acknowledge this diversity of methods labelled as qualitative, through describing qualitative enquiry as having capacity to act as both a science and an art. This thesis sits somewhere between these labels when they are read to function as a binary. Chapter 5 ‘Methodological decisions’ articulates how the research has been performed using a deconstructive autoethnographic research method (Denzin, 2014; Gannon, 2006), whereby enabling the work to be clearly identifiable as
qualitative. I have mentioned it here as this distinction is often made at the point of articulating a conceptual framework or methodology.

Whilst the research problem pre-dated the conception of a research question, the composition of the question itself broadly reflects how knowledge is being conceptualized in this thesis. It is a result of situating this work within a research paradigm (Higgs & McAllister, 2001) and this conceptual framework is an attempt at articulating this conception. It is a space to outline a series of ontological and epistemological assumptions which have informed the design of the research.

One way to situate or locate the epistemological and ontological assumptions guiding this research is to position the work within a post-positivist paradigm of ‘Deconstruct’ (Lather, 1992). Post-positivism is a broad label to signal that the research is not objective, not value-neutral and not generalizable (Rhedding-Jones, 2005). The paradigm of ‘Deconstruct’ is a banner which positions theoretical traditions or schools of thought such as Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism (Lather, 1992). Maclure (2011) refers to these theories as ‘Postfoundational’ methodologies, whereby there is a paradigmatic caution. One function of this caution is to engender fluidity as a reaction against positioning theory within static fixed boundaries or classifications. Researchers situating their work within this space contend that there is no ultimate reality to be understood, all knowledge is contestable and truths are a product of discourse (Lather, 2006). Vicars and McKenna (2013, p. 5) contend that one consequence of postfoundational methodologies is that research can no longer be assessed from an external objective reference point, whereby there is a greater value placed on ‘considering the symbolic, situated world as seen and told by participants in research projects.’

For this thesis, one epistemological consequence of working within a postfoundational space, is that I have approached this research problem (and subject question) as subject and researcher. A second consequence is that I work in acknowledgement that I am using paradigmatic labels to situate a conceptual framework; that can be used to contest the singularity of paradigms. Lather
(2006) draws upon Butler’s (1993) description of identity being shaped by repetition of discourse which varies, diverges and subverts in each cycle of repetition; to articulate the problematic nature of considering paradigms as static fixed entities. In simple terms, one person may label this a paradox, another may label it as an attempt at creating an entry point. In acknowledgment of educational development as a multidisciplinary field (Manathunga, 2006; Rowland, 2003), the research produced by its subjects is informed by theories situated in multiple paradigms (Kek & Hammer, 2015). Thus, the use of paradigmatic labels act as a necessary entry point for the reader to ascertain the epistemological assumptions which have guided the enquiry in order to consider the ontological claims made by the author. Given that the intended readership of this thesis is fellow educational development subjects, it is not a prerequisite for the reader to have previously engaged with postfoundational theories or to situate their conception of knowledge within this paradigmatic space.

**Poststructural thought – thinking beyond/against structuralism**

This conceptual framework is based upon conceptions of post-structuralism largely informed by readings of the work of Michel Foucault. Despite resisting being labelled as post-structuralist (Davies, 1997; Foucault, 1991), Foucault’s work from The Archaeology of Knowledge in 1969 through to his death in 1984 is commonly labelled as Post-Structuralist alongside the work of theorists such as Jacques Derrida and Gilles Deleuze. Poststructuralism as a term is problematic on the basis that it can be read as a unified theory. Consequently, it is more appropriate to use the description of poststructuralism provided by Parkes et al. (2010, p. 164), who suggest that it is a “continuum of critique that shares similar skepticism towards claims to truth in the human and social sciences.” Historically, post-structuralism is both an extension and rejection of central ideas that theorists labelled as ‘structuralist’ (Giddens & Turner, 1987).
Structuralism is a banner used to describe methodological approaches which enable phenomena to be classified and explained through the relationships between each of its subordinate components or units. Chaffee and Lemert (2009, p. 133) describe the structure as “a reconstruction based on archives of the events and objects in a field”. Consequently, structuralism is directed towards locating meaning via analysis of language, independent of the culture where language is applied (Giddens & Turner, 1987, p. 199). Structuralism is not interested in any alleged physiological traits of the individual as it is primarily concerned with the structures of language used to explain the individual (MacNaughton, Rolfe, & Siraj-Blatchford, 2001). Structuralist analysis relies on an assumption that textual categories are momentarily static in order for generalisations to be made based on the relationships identified between these categories (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 157).

A typical reference point for structuralist theory is the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss and his interpretation of the structural linguistics of Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. Lévi-Strauss (1963, p. 33) claimed that the four basic tenets of structural linguistics are visible in the following passage he recounted from the words of Russian linguist Nikolai Troubetzkoy:

First, structural linguistics shifts from the study of conscious linguistic phenomena to study of their unconscious infrastructure; second, it does not treat terms as independent entities, taking instead as its – basis of analysis the relations between terms; third, it introduces the concept of system – “Modern phonemics does not merely proclaim that phonemes are always part of a system; it shows concrete phonemic systems and elucidates their structure” finally, structural linguistics aims at discovering general laws, either by induction “or ... by logical deduction, which would give them an absolute character.”

Structuralist thought contends that knowledge is accessible via systems of language; whereby the emphasis is on relationships between the words, not the words in isolation. These relationships are structural, whereby a real or true meaning can be derived from under the veneer of the language system they
function within (Miller, Whalley, & Stronach, 2005). This is the ‘unconscious infrastructure’ Troubetzkoy refers to. Structuralism can be said to claim validity on similar grounds to positivism as it is concerned with discovering absolutes or rules. However, these absolutes are claimed on the basis of the function of structures and not inherent measurable qualities of an object (MacNaughton et al., 2001). These findings are presented solely on the basis of the method with no consideration of how the situated life experiences of the researcher may have shaped the outcomes, nor are the outcomes considered in respect to the multiple meanings that the reader/viewer may generate.

It is at this point that we can consider poststructuralism as both a reaction against structuralism and as a natural progression beyond structuralism. Butler (1990, p. 40) describes poststructuralism as the rejection of “the claims of totality and universality and the presumption of binary structural oppositions that implicitly operate to quell the insistent ambiguity and openness of linguistic and cultural signification.” Butler’s description of poststructuralism can be read simultaneously as a critique of structuralism. In a crude dichotomy, structuralism sought to generate authoritative generalisations based on charting structures using differences, while post-structuralism is concerned with explaining how the knowledge that constitutes subjects is constructed; and how it is historically situated and fluid (MacNaughton, 2005).

**Poststructural thought - three common orientations**

Parkes et al. (2010) outline three common orientations and/or critiques which are frequent in works labelled as Foucauldian poststructuralism:

1. Critique of Universalism – a rejection of grand narratives
2. Critique of Foundationalism – the death of the author
3. Critique of Essentialism – the fluid subject

While the three common orientations are intended to serve as an introduction to poststructural thought, they also have utility as a framing device for situating
the plethora of theoretical concepts utilised in the auto-ethnographic
component of the thesis (chapters six to ten).

One - Critique of universalism

This critique is a rejection or skepticism of discourses which are used to
singlehandedly explain phenomena (Parkes et al., 2010). These discourses are
commonly referred to as grand narratives or metanarratives (Lyotard,
Bennington, & Massumi, 1984), as they inevitably reduce or resist the capacity
for knowledge to be contested. It is the meta-narrative function (the truth claim)
of the discourse that is outright rejected, while the expressed observation of
phenomena is treated as historically situated and fluid; thus, open for
contestation. Meta-narratives operate as claims on truth and are commonly
linked to enlightenment values such as logic, rationality and reason (Rosenau,
2001). Macleure (2006, p. 225) uses the metaphor of ‘closure’ to describe the
mission of modernist thinking which (since the time of the enlightenment) has
sought to “dispel illusion and illuminate the darkplaces of ignorance with the
light of reason.” This metaphor of ‘closure’ is a pragmatic means to describe
universalism.

Rejection of closure is present in Huyusson’s (1984, p. 39) description of
poststructuralism as “a theory of modernism at the stage of its exhaustion.” It
acknowledges poststructuralism as both a critique and continuum of modernism
on the basis that it is through experiencing the limitations of explaining the
world via metanarratives, that necessitate poststructuralist rejections of grand
narratives. This critique is enacted through attempting to locate the historically
situated discourse that functions to create, maintain and strengthen grand/meta
narratives. Foucault used the term ‘Regime of Truth’ to describe such discourse.

“Each society has its regime of truth, its ‘general politics’ of truth: that is,
the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the
mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false
statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and
procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true.” (Foucault, 1991, p. 72)

A regime of truth functions as a discursive infrastructure tasked with maintaining closure. It relies upon meta narratives, which Cherryholmes (1988, p. 12) describes as “incomplete, time-bound, interest-relative, ideologically infirmed, and shaped by power.” Whilst theorists typically labelled as poststructuralist reject meta-narratives using similar descriptors to Cherryholmes, this rejection can be labelled as a self-fulfilling prophecy when it is not accompanied by an examination of how the meta-narrative functions to reduce knowledge to a binary like form; where the binary opposite cannot be readily described and/or justified using enlightenment values such as logic, rationality and reason (Davies & Gannon, 2005). Derrida (1976) refers to this use of binary oppositions to generate meaning as a form of metaphysical thinking; as with any binary, there is always an ‘other’ that is always subordinate or less in some respect (MacLure, 2003). One way of conceiving the rejection of universalism is to examine the function of discursive binary oppositions (which operate within or as a regime of truth), through placing emphasis on the ‘other’. When discourse is considered beyond words through its capacity to ‘organise’ the way we think and subsequently act (St. Pierre, 2000), this contestation of binaries is not simply a rejection of universalism as a theoretical ideal. Consequently, there is no expectation that the knowledge statements produced in this thesis can be assumed as being anything more than contestable and a function of multiple competing discourses. At most, there is capacity for the reader to tentatively utilize or apply knowledge statements made in this thesis in alternate/future contexts of educational development. Thankfully, there is no closure.

**Two - Critique of foundationalism**

Foundationalism operates on an assumption that there are some basic underlying assertions not in need of critique, which underpin an area of enquiry (Caraus & Lazea, 2015). The foundational aspect is claimed on the basis that they
are self-evident and/or beyond being authored at some historical moment in the past. In acknowledgment of the aforementioned critique of universalism, such assumptions can be read as fragments of truth which inform or serve as grand narratives.

Claims to knowledge which are posited as core universal meanings which underpin an area of study are treated as a social construction. “There is no truth or meaning that can derive from a text that does not in part derive its construction from reference to other texts and involve some interpretation (or re-authoring) by the reader” (Parkes, 2014, p. 7). This post-foundational discourse is commonly explained using the metaphor ‘the death of the author’. Barthes (1977) originally used the term to problematize the practice of using components of an author’s identity to construct meaning from the text.

“Once the Author is removed, the claim to decipher a text becomes quite futile. To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing” (Barthes, 1977, p. 147).

Since this moment, use of this term has expanded to reference a range of ideas which all decenter the role of the writer in the construction and authority of knowledge. For the remainder of this critique I will briefly discuss three such ideas:

1. Différance – Derrida’s (1976) contention that meaning is generated in the space between texts
2. Intertextuality – Kristeva’s (1980) notion that meaning of one text is based on the manner in which it transforms previous texts
3. The author function – Foucault’s claim that the textual authority of an author is a product of discourse

Derrida (1976) coined the term Différance to draw emphasis to the duality of ‘difference’ and ‘deferral’ that takes place between the word as written and word as read. One function of différance within a post-foundational stance, is that it alludes to the intertextual dependency necessary to construct meanings. No one text sits in a static state vacuum sealed by its author, it is dependent on
other texts. This juncture (as Derrida rejected the term concept) is closely related to Saussure’s (1959) earlier contention that the relationship between signifier and signified is not fixed. Whilst Saussure sought to demonstrate that the relationships between text can reveal true or proper meaning, différance serves to reinforce an anti-universalist stance by contending that this relationship provides a field for the creation of multiple meanings. Through a constant cycle of ‘deferring’ as a consequence of the space between texts and subsequent ‘differing’ of meaning (Baugh, 1997); it engenders an infinite cycle of interpretation, as there are no underlying foundations to eventually stumble upon and freeze meaning.

Kristeva (1986) coined the term intertextuality to contend that meaning is generated from a text in relation to its capacity to shift constitution of existing texts. Intertextuality is based on the Latin word ‘intertexto’ (Soderqvist, 2007); meaning to intermingle while weaving. The use of this term is an acknowledgement that discourse is not fixed, but fluid through the new signified shifting the old (Haberer, 2007). Intertextuality highlights the productive potential of the text (MacLure, 1994; McKenzie, Powell, & Usher, 1997) as the reader is not simply engaging in a one to one dialogue with a given text, but engendering change in the way in which existing texts are read. In one sense, the reader is acting as author through firstly referencing existing texts to create meaning of the new text and secondly, re-authoring the existing texts through their use in the creation of meaning. In an apparent attempt at introducing intertextuality, Kristeva (1980) modelled its working when she drew on the earlier work of Mikhail Bakhtin; by adding the word ‘text’ in brackets to numerous sections of a direct quote from Bakhtin:

“Each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read” (Kristeva, 1980, p. 66).

Through this seemingly innocent explanatory series of additions (Alfaro, 1996), Kristeva is working within a post-foundational discourse acknowledging that we are all constituted through discourse (text). In parallel, it can be read as a
rejection of (or play on) authority in authorship as Kristeva has seemingly reappropriated the words initially written by Bakhtin.

Foucault (1998) approached the death of the author as an opportunity to specify that the ‘author’ is a name attached to the text as a function of discourse. The name of the person who physically wrote the text is not necessarily the author, and nor is this person automatically afforded ‘author’ status. Foucault (1998, p. 210) describes this as the ‘author function’ as it is "characteristic of the mode of existence, circulation, and functioning of certain discourses within a society" Consequently, author status can act as a singular point to denote or elicit societal acceptance of a text. This singularity of the author function serves to iron out contradictions in the umbrella(ed) text which would normally inhibit its capacity to function on one side of a discursive binary. It enables discourse to strengthen.

The author function acts as a critique on foundationalism through problematising the origins of an idea through a claim that it is potentially playing a ‘founder of discursivity’ role (Foucault, 1998). This role is visible in the presentation of texts commonly referred to as seminal, whereby the author function can serve as a limiting force on the writing of subsequent texts. It has laid rules of acceptance for what can and cannot be said within a discourse. For example, this attempt at articulating a conceptual framework is a product of the author function playing a ‘founder of discursivity role’, as I have thus far referenced an array of author subjects whose ideas are being used in a manner not originally intended. In parallel, it is not an act of simply re-appropriating the ideas but presenting them in a manner which is reflective of their use in this historical moment.

**Three - Critique of essentialism**

A critique of essentialism is broadly expressed as a rejection of the notion that there is a universal human subject that can be described and categorized without regard of a historical positioning within history and society (Parkes et al.,
Drawing on Foucault’s responses to Noam Chomsky in a televised discussion/debate on human nature (Chomsky & Foucault, 1971), Wilkin (1999) outlined three overarching reasons to explain this anti-essentialist stance:

1. A rejection of reductionism and biologism – somewhat acting as an invert to the earlier rejection of universalisation (production of discursive grand narratives), there is a scepticism of research that seeks to explain the social world through a reliance on essentialist biological traits. One of the most obvious traits is gender (Williams, 1991). The rejection is an attempt at restricting capacity for generalisations to be made about human subjects, groups or institutions that don’t acknowledge specifics of history, culture and society.

2. A rejection of homogenization and determinism – this is a call to engender critique of ‘how’ we have come to utilise classification strategies and labels which play a deterministic function. It is a rejection of the modernist claim that there is an essential human nature (Fendler & Bailey, 2014); one that can be moulded and used as a means to initiate and justify regulatory devices such as best practice guidelines, codes of conduct and laws.

3. A contention that knowledge is entirely socially constructed – this contention restricts capacity for the aforementioned claims of an essential human nature to function. In parallel, it enables explanation of the human individual as a subject of discourse. Through acknowledging the non-static role of history, culture and society; it is enabling a conception of the human subject as fluid (Parkes et al., 2010). We are a discursive construct subject to the workings of the specific discourse that we are working within.

Anti-essentialism removes the capacity to apply or advocate that there are essential human characteristics that can be used to primarily define the author of this thesis as an Australian male heterosexual educational developer; and to subsequently apply these characteristics/classifiers in the pursuit of generalising and/or rejecting the narratives (written from the perspective of an educational development subject) contained in this thesis. When we utilise the aforementioned point in parallel with the contention that knowledge is entirely
socially constructed, this critique also serves as a rejection of what Davies (2010, p. 54) calls the ‘subject of will’, where the human subject is a ‘singular, self-contained human individual’ who is the product of their choices made through free will. When humans are conceived of as individuals (using the singular ‘I’), it provides an opportunity for the thoughts and actions of these subjects to be considered and explained in isolation to the society within which they were performed or transmitted. Consequently, the individual as ‘subject of will’ is replaced by a ‘subject of thought’ (Davies, 2010) where ‘being’ in the natural world is intrinsically linked to thought. Meaning is only possible through drawing upon what is already visible within discourse (Foucault, 1972), whereby human subjects operate as multiple instances through being written into multiple discourse. Thus, the self-determining individual is replaced by the fluid subject within this anti-essentialist critique.

**Human agency – but….no free will?**

Human agency is commonly expressed in binary opposition to social structure to infer that it represents individual freedom or originality (Hays, 1994). This conception of agency is reliant on a humanist understanding of the subject as an “autonomous individual capable of full consciousness” (Lather, 1991, p. 5). A poststructuralist rejection of this self-determining individual considered in parallel with a rejection of essential human nature and reason, can be initially read as a dismissal of possibility for human agency (Davies, 2000; Fendler & Bailey, 2014). Consequently, it may seem problematic that the term ‘agency’ features within the research question for a thesis that draws upon a poststructuralist conceptual framework.

The remainder of this section will explore how agency can be reconceptualised within a poststructural conceptual framework that is anti-foundational and essentialist. One way in which to reconceptualise agency within a poststructuralist conceptual framework is to embody the death of the author through shifting the emphasis of agency from an act of initiation to one of
response. Britzman (1995, p. 231) places emphasis on response through describing agency as “the constitutive effect, and not the originator, of situated practices and histories”. These practices and histories are products of discourse which in this context can be viewed as a non-static array of momentary rules for possibility. It is not the action or phrase which is of concern, but how these can be read within multiple discourse. With an emphasis on discourse which is fluid and socially constructed, agency is no longer able to be expressed as a will-infused act of resistance against (or emancipation from) social structures. It is about locating possibilities (Davies, 2004).

Drawing largely on a critique of essentialism, Davies (2000) reconceptualises agency as the capacity to resist, shift and subvert the multiple discourses which constitute a subject. This understanding of agency is not a strategy for subjects to escape constitution of self (Davies & Gannon, 2005), instead it provides capacity for change on the basis that subjects actively seek out multiple constitutions of self. This conception of agency is reliant on the subject drawing on the contention that each constitution (of their subjectivity) is historically situated and socially governed through discourse (Davies & Gannon, 2005). Through acts designed to chart the multiple means by which a subject is positioned in discourse, there is opportunity to perform a poststructural form of agency which rejects the capacity for identity to function as an ahistorical static grand narrative which in itself functions as a mechanism to normalise thought. It engenders an ongoing process of ‘becoming’, as opposed to ‘being’ (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) where the emphasis shifts to agency as a practice of listening (Davies, 2010) and reflection.

This reconceptualization of agency is about acknowledging a Foucauldian position of describing discourse as a fluid historical construct, denying any claim that discourse should function as a grand commentary or fixed canon. It is a conception of agency which rejects the modernist individual who can step outside of society through drawing on universal truths; replaced by a conception of an agent who is creative but only within the specific historical discursive spaces that constitute their agency (Bevir, 1999). More bluntly, it is a conception
of agency as a means of resistance. Working within a Foucauldian conception of power as relational, where the exercise of power is a structure or set of ‘possible’ actions in response to prior actions (Foucault, 1982); resistance can be understood as those acts which are performed in response to other acts within a discourse that enables the acts to have some form of meaning. All power relationships are reliant on struggles where there are two or more forces that momentarily provide a space for response. Without there being any resistive space, it would not be a power relationship as there is no freedom. It is a freedom Foucault (1982) describes of as an agonism, where each subject is an agent in an ongoing play of taunts. Without such freedom to respond, there would be no capacity for agency conceived as resistance.

**Power – relations replacing owners**

I have situated this conceptual framework as being largely informed by Foucauldian poststructuralist thinking on the basis that there is a strong emphasis on examining knowledge as a product of discourse, viewed as an effect of power (Foucault, 1978). Foucauldian conceptions of power are concerned with exploring how a historically situated set of discourse has enabled an action to solicit a resistive act and how these actions shape prior, present and or future acts. Foucault (1982, p. 781) proposed three common forms of struggle where subjects resist forms of:

a) ethnic, social and/or religious domination
b) exploitation that separates an individual from what they produce
c) subjectivity and submission.

This thesis is largely concerned with the third form of struggle, where the emphasis is on exploring how power and discourse constitute an educational development subject and how this subjectivity informs the pedagogy of the subject which, as acts of resistance strengthen and/or shift the discursive constitution of the subject (individual). It is concerned with critically charting
multiple discourses which shape the educational development subject’s conception of agency. It is concerned with relationships between this conception of agency and those acts of resistance as pedagogy.

Foucault (1978, 1979, 1980e) reconceptualised the term ‘power’ from one commonly used to signify a capacity, attribute or quality that is possessed (Cherryholmes, 1988; Davies & Gannon, 2005; Jackson & Mazzei, 2012), to that which is concerned with the visualization of relational affects and effects emergent from an exertion of force (Deleuze, 2006). Affect/effect is a useful metaphor for emphasising how knowledge serves as both an ingredient-for, and product-of relational power. Research informed by a Foucauldian conception of power is focused on examining how multiple relationships of force are played out in the everyday exchanges of words and actions, promulgating the repeated use of certain phrases, actions and processes that eventually become normalized strategies of life in given settings or situations. Foucault (1990, p. 92) succinctly brings these multiple strands together in the following passage, describing power as:

“the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system”

Foucault’s relational concept of power transcends binary oppositions such that power cannot be viewed as a negative or oppressive quality. Consequently, force can be described as movement or exchange that can simultaneously serve a variety of negative, positive and/or redundant functions (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). This conception of power places emphasis on the everyday actions and words of subjects (individuals) in a given historical moment (Taylor, 2014), whereby the ‘immanent sphere’ that Foucault referred to is discourse. One means of describing a Foucauldian concept of discourse is to consider it as more than simply a collection or array of words to signify objects (Foucault, 1972). Instead, these groupings of signs are considered as being irreducibly linked to
the practices and actions which simultaneously render their visibility and shape their future function. Discourse serves an authoritative function (Parkes et al., 2010), as one of its functions is to operate as a series of truth claims that shape what can be conceived within any given specific historical instance.

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

Another way of conceiving truth is that it is the normalized or accepted knowledge within a given social historical moment. This reference to the production of truth brings us back to the initial description of Foucauldian poststructuralism as being concerned with examining knowledge as a product of discourse, viewed as an effect of power (Foucault, 1980e). Whilst the word power is not enclosed in the research question for this thesis, it is a central theme as power is the productive entity that both informs and is informed by discourse. It is what makes certain behavior desirable (Davies & Gannon, 2005), which in the context of this thesis; are those words and actions (force) that can be labelled under the banner of educational developer pedagogy.
Chapter 3 – Navigating the discursive terrain of TAFE

The necessity of a historical background

In this chapter, I will provide an historical background to the contestable and historically contingent Technical and Further Education (TAFE) teaching environment. The chapter will provide an introductory exploration of how various vocational-oriented discourses such as the emergence of a market logic, competency-based curricula and flexible learning, guide the purpose and utility of TAFE based educational development subjects.6

TAFE - the publicly owned provider of vocational education

The scope of education and training offered by TAFE institutions has historically morphed, contingent on the policy imperatives of federal and state governments. Consequently, TAFE does not neatly sit on a continuum between secondary schools and universities (Karmel, 2009). Instead, Goozee (2001, p. 10) contended that "ever since its inception, TAFE has been expected to fill all the educational and training gaps" between the school system and higher education.

In an attempt to articulate the role of TAFE, Ramsey (1993) described TAFE as having a ‘three-fold role’. He outlined the three folds as; serving industry needs, supporting social justice and facilitating personal development. This view of TAFE was grounded in the Kangan Report (Kangan & Australian Committee on Technical and Further Education, 1974a) which was a two volume report outlining a vision for the establishment of technical and further education in Australia. Under a new name TAFE (Technical and Further Education) "technical education was given a status and a charter which gave it a recognised place within the education sector" (Goozee, 2001, p. 27). Many of the newly

6 Educational development subjects - this term is used throughout the thesis to refer to individuals who are identified as and/or self-identify as an educational developer.
established TAFEs were former trade colleges directed to move beyond an industry-centric focus and serve the wider educational needs of society (Goozee, 2001).

Four decades later and the majority of TAFE teachers teach within qualification/course types which are broadly classified within the wider tertiary education system under the umbrella term ‘Vocational Education and Training’ (VET) (NCVER, 2014). Most notably, approximately a third of the VET student cohort are enrolled in certificate 3 level qualifications. These trade oriented qualifications are delivered to students undertaking apprenticeships and traineeships (NCVER, 2012, p. 8) and are a proximate representation of the ‘Technical’ component in the moniker of TAFE (Technical and Further Education). The notion of VET emerged in the mid-1980s as a means of re-emphasising the importance of the provision of industry focussed training (Dumbrell, 2004). This shift was solidified in the ‘Training costs of award restructuring report’ (Deveson, 1990) where the acronym of TAFE was re-positioned from referring to a post-secondary education sector, to denoting the provision of non-university, publicly-funded post-secondary training and education. While TAFE institutions were initially the ‘near monopoly’ provider of VET (Chappell, 2003), they presently function as the publicly owned component within a larger array of registered training organisations (training.gov.au, 2017).

**Curriculum diversity in TAFE**

Qualification types typically delivered within TAFE, range from Certificate 1 through to Advanced Diploma (Karmel, 2009). The scope of curriculum provision has recently broadened, where it is now common practice for a TAFE institution to also offer senior secondary certificates (i.e. Victorian Certificate of Applied Learning) and higher education qualifications (e.g. Associate Degrees, Undergraduate Degrees) (Callan & Bowman, 2013). This broadening of the curriculum types used in TAFE can be viewed as an intensification of Goozee's
(2001) aforementioned contention that the role of TAFE has been to service the training and assessment gaps between the school system and higher education.

The majority of training from Certificate 1 through to Advance Diploma is competency based and utilises a national training package as its source of curriculum (DEEWR, 2011). A small proportion of training qualifications utilise state based curriculum which has been developed when a specific qualification does not currently exist in a training package (Department of Industry, 2014). The remainder of training offered by a TAFE will be in the form of short courses which are generally developed by the institution and offered fee for service. In addition, many Victorian TAFEs utilise senior secondary school curriculum associated with the Victorian Certificate of Applied Learning and undergraduate curriculum typically prepared and self-accredited by a university. An implication of this breadth of operable curriculum models is an imperative for educational development subjects to develop proficiency in advising teaching and management subjects on how to use each model within large scale articulation or credit transfer arrangements.

**Working with competency-based curriculum**

The vast majority of TAFE teachers presently facilitate competency-based training as part of qualifications outlined in national training packages. Competency based training was gradually introduced into Australian TAFEs in the mid-late 1980s (Smith & Keating, 2003). The key characteristics of competency-based training include:

- Utilisation of standards which are determined by (or under the auspice of) industry
- Outcomes being achieved through students demonstrating a specific set of skills and knowledge
- Assessment decisions being made in sole reference to standards with no capacity to consider the performance of other students (Smith, 2002).
A training package is defined as "a set of nationally endorsed standards and qualifications used to recognise and assess people's skills in a specific industry, industry sector or enterprise" (DEEWR, 2011; TP@Work, 2012). National training packages were first introduced in 1997 (Knight, 2012; Smith, 2002) as a means of providing a set of nationally endorsed competency standards and qualifications for assessing individuals’ capacity to perform in a particular vocation. They are indicative of a ‘new vocationalism’ philosophy, which posits educational institutions as having an obligation to serve an economic imperative of cultivating greater skills and knowledge based capacity in the workforce (Chappell, 2003). National training packages are designed under the guidance of Service Skills Organisations (formerly Industry Skills Councils) who are publicly funded organisations governed by a board comprised of industry representatives (ISC, 2012). The qualification types represented in training packages are classified broadly within the Australian Qualifications Framework from levels 1 through to 6. Undergraduate degrees through to PhD qualifications are subsequently classed from level 7 through to 10 within this overarching federal framework for senior secondary and tertiary education (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013). Within each qualification, there are defined units of competency which the learner must be able to satisfactorily demonstrate in order to be awarded the qualification.

The uniformity of training packages does not extend beyond a definition of standards and context, whereby decisions related to the actual provision of training and assessment are left with the individual institution or teacher (Misko, 2010). Despite training packages seemingly offering a greater level of transparency, the way in which the curriculum is interpreted, delivered and assessed can vary greatly between individual teachers and institutions (Misko & Halliday-Wynes, 2013). Individual teachers are generally responsible for interpreting the training packages in order to develop learning content and to create assessment tasks. Training packages are regularly updated (Australian Skills Quality Authority, 2017) and as a consequence, learning content and assessment tasks often need to be modified, or in some cases completely re-
designed. While the rationale of ensuring curriculum is vocationally relevant is difficult to contest, this constant state of curriculum change compounds any pre-existing teacher difficulty in designing competency-based assessment tasks.

The core knowledge and skills associated with competency-based assessment are delivered and assessed in the Certificate IV in Workplace Training and Assessment. It is generally mandatory for all TAFE teachers in Victoria to complete this qualification, on the basis that a TAFE must assign a teacher with the qualification to supervise any teacher who has not yet completed the qualification (iVet, 2016). Despite most TAFE teachers having completed the Certificate IV in Workplace Training and Assessment, interpreting the competencies in National Training Packages remains a major challenge faced by TAFE teachers (Clayton, Meyers, Bateman, & Bluer, 2010). Designing training and assessment sequences in accordance with training packages is a "highly sophisticated skill" which is generally acquired after extensive practice, participation in professional development and/or participation in assessment validation (Hodge, 2014, p. 3). Educational development subjects often play a role in supporting teachers to iteratively develop proficiency in the design and implementation of assessment tools post completion of a Certificate IV in Workplace Training.

The emergence of a market logic in TAFE

Over the past decade a series of market-driven reforms have arguably cultivated a culture of ‘survival first’ where TAFE teacher pedagogy is arguably being governed by an intended outcome of maintaining economic sustainability.

"As a direct result of public policy, TAFE institutes are being forced down the path of ‘rationalisation’ by dropping activities they undertake – or used to – for the benefit of businesses, individuals and the community" (Inter Mediate, 2014).
In simple terms, a market driven approach operates on the premise that through competition, registered training organisations (including TAFEs) will be able to offer consumers (students and employers) greater choice, price competitiveness and access to quality training. Hamdhan (2013) argued that this approach emerged in part through the federal government attributing the poor economic performance of TAFEs to their inability to respond to changing labour market demands. Since the early 1990s in Australia, there have been various ‘demand driven’ themed reforms to vocational training (Karmel, National Centre for Vocational Education Research, Beddie, & Dawe, 2009). Goozee (2001) contended that these calls are visible in a range of federal policy documents such as the Deveson Report (Deveson, 1990); Today’s training, tomorrow’s skills (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Employment Education and Training, 1998) and the ‘User Choice’ component of the New Apprentice System introduced in 1998. A market driven philosophy re-positions governments (federal and state) from serving a function as the regulator of training providers toward a contemporary role of ‘market design’ (Cooney, 2008). It is as an approach where policy is designed after not only considering aspects of supply "who should deliver training and how", but also demand-side aspects such as "who should buy training, and why" (Cooney, 2008, p. 13).

**Market logic in action - the Victorian experiment**

The most dramatic and recent wave of market driven reform was first proposed in 2008 when the Victorian state government released a document entitled ‘Securing Jobs for your Future’ (vsc.vic.gov.au, 2008). This reform featured the Victorian Training Guarantee which outlined a commitment to fund an additional 172,000 training places over four years at an estimated cost of $316 million (AEU, 2012, p. 1; Williams, 2011b). The increase in funding was offset by a series of eligibility criteria which removed a definitive minimum (or cap) on how much training would be government subsidised (Williams, 2011a). In effect, there was now an apparent level playing field between all VET providers, private and
publicly owned (TAFEs). For TAFEs who had worked under a business model which previously served to maintain a diversity of TAFEs located geographically across the state, this proposal had two major challenges. Firstly, an open market would signal the removal of student quotas. Student quotas previously limited competition between TAFEs, helping encourage students to enrol in a geographically proximate TAFE. The second consequence was the removal of up-front funding, as the state government would now fund the TAFE after it had provided a documented period of training to a student.

The agenda announced in ‘Securing Jobs for your future’ was largely reflected at a federal level the following year. In 2009, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) outlined six key reform agendas for Australian training (NQC, 2009). Two of these points specifically outlined COAGs desire to introduce a national training system reflective of the demand driven components in the Victorian reforms. The outcome would be a reform of "training products, services, information systems and regulation to meet a more demand and client driven system" (NQC, 2009, p. 9). This reform was intended to drive "further competition in current training arrangements and strengthening capacity of providers and businesses to build the foundation and deeper and broader skills required by the 21st century labour market" (NQC, 2009, p. 9). With a state agenda being endorsed federally, Victorian TAFEs were now being overtly forced to re-consider their role as a public institution by using a ‘market logic’ applied by private enterprise (Forward, 2008). This in many ways ran counter to an identity based upon providing education opportunities to persons from marginal and low-socio-economic groups (Bradley, 2010), where "the attractiveness of affordable fees and concessions has always drawn those from low socio-economic backgrounds to TAFE" (McLean, 2012).

Victoria became the first Australian state to introduce these reform changes using a staged implementation. TAFEs gradually adapted to the ‘pay after training is delivered’ funding model, although the impact of direct competition with private providers was significant. In 2011 TAFEs delivered 48% of all government funded training in Victoria, down from 66 per cent in 2008.
Meanwhile, private registered training organisations had increased their share of the training from 14% in 2008 to 40% in 2012 (AEU, 2012; Wheelahan, 2012). There was a 104.5% increase in private RTOs delivering state funded training over the period 2008 – 2011 (Williams, 2011b). On the surface, this appeared that students now had a greater choice in determining where and how they engaged in training. Despite being introduced as a mechanism to "level the playing field for public and private provision" of training (King, 2012), reality ran counter to these policy expectations through a rapid growth in the delivery of training by private RTOs. The policy was partially proven to be the "lazy and shallow policy" that was predicted in 2008 where private RTOs delivered in bulk "those courses which were cheapest and easiest to deliver" (Forward, 2008). For example, enrolments in fitness related qualifications increased by as much as 4000%, while enrolments in recognised skill shortage areas increased by only 10% over this period, (Wheelahan & Sheehan, 2012).

TAFEs who had traditionally delivered a plethora of qualifications were now in a position where rationalisation of staff and programs appeared as the logical path of adapting to a market driven system. This response engendered emphasis to be placed on growing the delivery of popular qualifications and a contraction of curriculum diversity. Only two TAFE institutes recorded operating surpluses in 2011 (AEU, 2012, p. 2) directly after the introduction of a de-regulated funding model. During 2011, almost 300 ongoing TAFE jobs were lost and many contract positions due to expire in 2012 were not renewed (AEU, 2012, p. 2). The Victorian state government also had the problem of a training budget that had swelled by approximately 400 million dollars from 2008/9 to 2011/12 through the rollout of a market driven reform that did not deliver the labour related intended outcomes (Williams, 2011b). In May 2012, the Victorian state government announced that it was responding to this problem through implanting a significant cut to training in order to help control this 400 million dollar increase (McLean, 2012). This cut to funding was in addition to earlier cuts implemented in 2012, for a problem that was engendered and fuelled by a
market driven philosophy. In response to the larger second round of cuts, the executive director of the Victorian TAFE Association, David Williams stated:

What the government has done in capping this expansion is that they have cut the heart out of TAFE rather than target where the excessive growth has occurred. Yes, they will reduce the market in both sectors but TAFE has not enjoyed this exponential growth so they are destroying their own institutions, their own assets. (Maslen, 2012)

Victorian TAFEs generally reacted swiftly to the funding cuts, announcing a series of qualification/course rationalisations for 2013. For example, on the 18th May 2012 barely a fortnight after the cuts were officially announced, the regional dual-sector (Higher education and TAFE) University of Ballarat announced a course rationalisation and voluntary redundancy process (Watt, 2012). A consultation paper released to staff argued that the budget cuts placed the university in a position where its current 5 million dollar deficit would increase to nearly 20 million by the close of 2013 (Battersby, 2012, p. 1). The vast majority of other Victorian TAFEs made similar announcements detailing proposed redundancies, course rationalisation and in some cases campus shut down (Intermediate, 2012).

The job security of individual TAFE teachers is inevitably shaped by the capacity of TAFE institutions to remain financially viable in a market driven environment. David Williams, Executive Director Victorian TAFE Association contended that "TAFEs competitiveness will be determined by price, quality, convenience and the integrity of the outcome" (Williams, 2011a). With the exception of price, success in each of the other three factors will be shaped by teaching practices. The employment of educational development subjects can be justified as an enabler for institutions attempting to respond to these challenges. There had already been noticeable change to teaching practice with an increase in workplace delivery and re-evaluation of established delivery models (i.e. utilising e-learning) (Williams, 2011a). For educational development subjects, the task of facilitating such change is compounded by significant shifts in the TAFE teacher workforce. After a large number of experienced teachers leave the TAFE sector
there is likely to be a collective decrease in teacher capacity to develop learning resources and training methods (Norrie, 2012). This rationalisation of teaching staff and curriculum as-effect of applying a market logic, arguably serves as a set of conditions that justify the employment of educational development subjects. Management subjects imbued with responsibility for implementing human and curriculum related rationalisation, are able to position educational development subjects as a seemingly efficient means of replenishing teacher capacity by mentoring, coaching and facilitating structured professional development events.

Navigating a client focused culture

The gradual intensification of new vocationalism (Chappell, 2003) and a market logic (Forward, 2008) are indicative of the conditions which have engendered greater consideration of the required knowledge and skills for effective TAFE teaching. In recognition of the aforementioned change pressures, 'The new VET practitioner' (Mitchell, 2009; Mitchell, Chappell, Bateman, & Roy, 2005) was conceptualised as an assemblage of education and business related competencies to service the training needs of students and employers. This practitioner model was subsequently updated after Mitchell & Ward (2010) conducted a survey of VET teachers seeking to understand their perception of VET professional practice. They defined three categories of VET practitioners as the 'foundation', 'specialist' and 'advanced' VET practitioner. Reflecting upon the aforementioned requirement of developing client focused capacities, the 'specialist VET practitioner' was defined as either possessing expertise in commercial activity or learning & assessment. An 'advanced practitioner' was positioned as possessing both areas of expertise. E-learning was subsequently categorised as a skill set most likely to be utilised by a specialist VET practitioner to design and deliver assessment which goes beyond the "context of the classroom or the workplace" (Mitchell & Ward, 2010, p. 29). This client-focused positioning of e-learning suggests that TAFE teachers are no longer bound by
traditional performance related conceptions of their work grounded in classroom-based practice.

The customisation of training package curricula is a critical skill underpinning the commercial development component of the specialist VET practitioner. A common example of curriculum customisation is the development and/or provision of skill sets. The first of two types of skill sets, are a pre-defined sub-set of an award qualification (e.g. diploma) defined in a national training package, often used to serve a licencing or compliance requirement (Construction & Property Services Industry Skills Council, 2015). The second type of skill set is an assemblage of units that the specialist vet practitioner packages for the purpose of offering customised training to a group of employees from a particular company or speciality area (Mills, Crean, Ranshaw, & Bowman, 2012). Customised skill sets are a means of providing an ‘alternative method’ of training in areas which don’t as yet have qualifications, or are perceived to not warrant the development of a standardised qualification (Misko, 2010). Mills et al. (2012) found in a case study conducted with New South Wales agri-foods sector students, that the cohort was able to devise 292 different skill sets to meet their perceived training needs (which spanned 27 different job functions).

Consequently, there are tacit boundaries, which the specialist VET practitioner must navigate, as a means of reconciling an inevitable tension between being client focussed and being able to devise creative applications of training packages that deliver cost effectiveness. As specialist VET practitioners, educational development subjects are often expected to assist TAFE teaching subjects to consider these tensions through customising curriculum and critically examining the efficacy of dominant pedagogical approaches.

**E-learning and the notion of flexibility in TAFE**

Use of e-learning has been a purported enabler for TAFE institutes to survive and ultimately prosper in a demand driven VET environment. This was made clear in the cabinet-in-confidence document ‘TAFE Transition Plans – Key points’ which
summarised the transition plans submitted by each Victorian TAFE (Victorian State Government, 2012). Seven of the eighteen Victorian TAFEs directly referred to the use of online teaching as a key strategy in their strategic plans. Four further TAFEs outlined plans to substantially increase their rate of offshore teaching, with indirect reference to online teaching. Swinburne University’s opening statement summarising their strategy, was particularly blunt:

(Our) overall strategy is to establish Swinburne as Australia’s leading university in science, technology and innovation through: refocusing the TAFE program portfolio and maximising efficiency through teaching benchmarks, increasing the level of online and workplace delivery, consolidation of courses to a single campus (e.g. trades at Croydon) and reducing corporate costs. (Victorian State Government, 2012, p. 2)

The use of e-learning to provide online education being manifestly interwoven with discourses of new vocationalism and market logic productivity is not new. For example, it is reflected in Brennan’s (2003) outline of seven key factors driving online pedagogical change in VET. The factors included cost-effectiveness, teacher/trainer confidence, student reactions, collaboration, policy initiatives, commerce and education. This earlier articulation of pedagogical change is significant, as it does encompass some consideration of teaching subjects’ beyond those commonly associable with a market logic and new vocationalism.

Throughout the four decade plus history of TAFE, the use of educational technology has been associated with flexibility and efficiency related aspirations and targets. These associations can be traced all the way back to the establishment of TAFE in 1974.

The committee recalls the accelerating social effects of new techniques of communication, including computers and colour television, and increasing sophistication in their production and use. These techniques and production methods could well be the basis of new strategies for self-paced learning in TAFE. It is of the view that technology must be
developed for or adapted to TAFE in such a way as to redistribute and make better use of its teachers. (Kangan & Australian Committee on Technical and Further Education, 1974a, p. 102)

While this reference clearly associates the use of educational technologies with an intended outcome of teacher flexibility and efficiency, it appears to be centred on enabling teaching subjects to have greater capacity to provide formative feedback and pastoral support⁷. Fast forward three decades and the intended affordances of flexibility and efficiency are rationalised using a foregrounding of the student as a client. In 2002 the Victorian state government released a statement entitled ‘Knowledge and Skills for the Innovation Economy’ outlining future directions of the VET sector (Aumann, 2003). Flexible learning was identified as one area in which there must be growth in order to "increase the capability to respond to diverse client needs", before noting that there had already been progress made at this time "through the increased use of technology" (Kosky, 2002, p. 3). This increase in use of e-learning can be partially attributed to the establishment of institutional performance targets. The Office of Employment, Training and Tertiary Education ETTE released the Performance Addendum SS8: Government Services On-line (Bissland & Cashion, 2000). The performance addendum sought to ensure that Information Communication Technology (ICT) was used to support the delivery of at least 15% of the training delivered by each TAFE institution. The list of acceptable uses of ICT featured both broader general processes such as email and those now commonly associated with a learning management system (e.g. submission of student work, provision of learning materials and access to discussion boards). It also specified that a minimum of 20% of teachers and relevant support staff will have access to professional development during their normal working hours (Bissland & Cashion, 2000, p. 4).

Nearly a decade later in 2010, an e-learning benchmarking survey claimed that 69% of TAFE teachers surveyed had delivered a unit which used e-learning (AFLF, 2010).

---

⁷ Pastoral is used here to refer to the emotional or personal problem-solving support a teacher may provide to a student in response to study related challenges or issues.
Whilst this illustrated that use of e-learning processes as outlined in the addendum had been widely applied, the rationale for e-learning had also significantly shifted. Most notably, the presence of a market logic had further intensified in governmental descriptions associating flexibility and e-learning. The Victorian Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) website stated that "eLearning is important in increasing VET participation as it provides the flexibility of choice over time and location of training" (DEECD, 2012). An affordance or rationale of flexibility was now solely referring to the attraction and retention of students through accessibility and scalability. There was little remnant of an initial rationale for flexible learning which encompassed reference to improving the capacity of teaching subjects as a means of improving the student learning experience. E-learning had now firmly evolved from being a teaching enhancement or capacity, to that of a product where impact is measured by the number of students classified as customers and clients.

**In closing**

This chapter has provided a brief historical background on how the intensification of a ‘new-vocationalist’ philosophy (Chappell, 2003) and market logic (Forward, 2008) have served to position e-learning as a product. This shift is indicative of the broader social mission of TAFE contracting from an initial 'three fold role' (Ramsey, 1993) of serving industry, social justice and personal development agendas, to a current status of being a sub-group of publicly owned institutions within the broader sector of registered training organisations (RTOs). The deregulation of training in Victoria (vsc.vic.gov.au, 2008) reinforces the long-standing association between the use of educational technologies with notions of teaching efficiency and student access. This state of play solicits consideration of an educational development subject’s employment as a cost-effective instrument to facilitate the implementation of e-learning products. By effect of such discursive positionings, TAFE based educational development
subjects are invariably active within discourses of new vocationalism and market-logic. Throughout the latter auto-ethnographic component of this thesis (chapters eight to ten), I explore how an educational development subject's pedagogy is a means of resisting subjectivities emergent from discourses which posit e-learning as a product.
Chapter 4 - Academic Development as a substitute

This literature review locates the major theoretical and methodological points of contention and contestation related to a problem of pedagogical agency in educational development. This problem of pedagogical agency is encapsulated in the research question guiding this thesis:

How can discourses of agency shape the pedagogy of Educational Development subjects in TAFE e-learning relationships?

The literature review is structured using an array of commonly espoused problems of pedagogical agency presently operable in educational development literature. These are:

- Being governed by a history of educational development
- Defining the purpose and role of e-learning
- Educational development as fragmented
- Being marginalised along ‘Fault lines’
- Working in centralised educational development units
- Pedagogy as a generic set of techniques
- Managerialism and compliance.

The chapter concludes by outlining the contextual, theoretical and methodological gaps in the literature related to the examination of pedagogical agency for educational development subjects in TAFE based e-learning relationships. In summary, there is no accessible research in an Australian TAFE or vocational educational context which examines pedagogical agency for educational development subjects. In terms of the broader body of research encompassing studies of higher education, there are few examples of research which examine the interaction between educational development pedagogy and
agency using an anti-essentialist stance. From a methodological perspective, there are a small number of auto-ethnographic studies which analyse educational development pedagogy, however none of these studies work from a deconstructive standpoint.

The scope of the literature review

This literature review has been written in parallel to the historical background chapter, as a pragmatic response to there not being a field of research documenting the work of educational developers in Australian vocational educational environments. In order to write a literature review that actually explores the agency and pedagogy of educational developers, I drew on the field of academic development in higher education. This decision was made on the basis that the classifiers educational development and academic development are often considered interchangeably (CADAD, 2014), complemented by my experience engaged in similar roles working as an educational developer/academic developer in a variety of higher education and vocational education settings. In addition to a small selection of books, the International Journal for Academic Development (IJAD) has been the major source of scholarly research in this field. The research from this journal is almost always written by persons working in educational development related roles about the work performed under this banner. Authors who have written multiple articles which relate to an exploration of agency for educational developers include:

- Webb (1992, 1996a, 1996b);
- Manathunga (2007, 2011);
- Land (2001, 2003, 2004);
- Gosling (2001, 2003),

8 A critique of essentialism is a rejection of a universal human subject described and categorized without consideration of a historical positioning within history and society. See chapter 2 – Conceptual framework as a fractured lens for a detailed outline of this critique.

9 A deconstructive auto-ethnography is an attempt at placing presence and experience under erasure and examining the discursive multiplicity of subjectivity. See: chapter 5 – Methodological decisions for an extended outline of this approach.
Catherine Manathunga and Tai Peseta are the only two authors from this list who were based in Australia at the time of writing. The remaining authors have written about their experiences working within educational development at universities in the United Kingdom.

**Significant studies**

In this section I will provide a brief overview of three studies which are significant conceptually, structurally and/or methodologically. These are examined individually prior to the body of the literature review in order to illustrate the most accessible sources of conceptual, structural and methodological thought, proximate to a grand problem of pedagogical agency. The first example (Land, 2001, 2003, 2004) is conceptually significant through outlining a common set of pedagogical tactics in educational development. The second study (Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009) is structurally significant as it is a synthesis of perspectives from individuals working in institutional educational development leadership roles. The third study (Peseta, 2005) is theoretically and methodologically significant, serving as the most proximate example of scholarship to the enquiry undertaken in this thesis.


Land conducted an ethnographic study based on a series of 33 semi-structured interviews with individuals working in educational development related roles in the United Kingdom. Emergent from this work was a schema of twelve pedagogical tactics which Land referred to as orientations to academic development. This accessible set of commonly espoused pedagogic tactics is conceptually significant, as the work was performed in acknowledgment of a
problem of pedagogical agency that guides this thesis. Land (2003, p. 35) described the orientations as a classification of the varying ways in which educational developers "perceive priorities and make strategic choices within the cultural and political constraints of their local organizational environment". The twelve orientations from Land (2003, pp. 35-45) are:

1. Managerial - Focuses on achievement of institutional objectives
2. Political Strategist – Collegiate with persons where an association is most likely to produce results
3. Entrepreneurial – Initiates ‘new’ activities which will often involve external partnerships
4. Romantic – Focuses on assisting the ‘well-being’ of individual teachers
5. Vigilant Opportunist – Leverages ‘topics of the moment’ in the institution
6. Researcher – Uses research as a means to influence if not legitimise development approaches
7. Professional Competence – Driven by a rationale to improve the student experience via work which helps all teachers to reach a standard level of performance
8. Reflective practitioner – Seeks to cultivate an environment of self and peer reflection amongst teachers
9. Internal Consultant – Works as an observer who may advise and evaluate
10. Modeller-Broker – Models practice for teachers to follow and/or adapt
11. Interpretive-Hermeneutic – Facilitates critical discussions through weaving wider perspectives into the contextual dialogue
12. Discipline Specific – Works with teachers on the basis of having a common/shared subject discipline understanding.

The orientations presented as a schema of common pedagogical tactics have been subsequently used to create a range of binary-like expressions guided by a structural-hierarchical conception of power. Most notably, Neame (2013) adapted the orientations to create a binary of interventionist vs democratic as a means for educational development subjects to reflect upon the nature of their pedagogical interactions with a ‘client’ community in specific institutional
contexts. Similarly, Leibowitz et al. (2011) used the orientations to create a binary of ‘Managerialist’ and ‘Collegial’, as a means to analyse pedagogy in relation to the structural-hierarchical tension of institutional plans vs individual teacher interest. These dichotomies are products indicative of the potential for ‘self-fashioning’ of educational development subjects, that Lee and McWilliam (2008, p. 74) had earlier forecasted as a risk associated with the orientations. They made this contention through drawing upon Foucault’s (1988b) ‘technologies of the self’, which is a concern with the ways in which individuals draw upon knowledge and norms to govern or constrain their capacity for action. While the aforementioned re-applications of the orientations certainly suggest that they have potential to inadvertently constrain the pedagogical agency of other educational development subjects, the orientations could alternatively be viewed as a smorgasbord of available ‘positions’ (Davies, 1991) or theoretical starting points for educational development subjects to examine how their pedagogy is discursively constituted.

Peter Ling and the Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development (2009)

Development of Academics and Higher Education Futures

This publication is considered significant on the basis that it is presents a view of Educational Development endorsed by the Council of Australasian Directors of Academic Development (CADAD). The council is exclusively comprised of individuals who lead institutional academic/educational development units, and the group defines its purpose as seeking to ‘enhance its members capacity to be key strategic advisers in academic development’ (CADAD, 2014). When we consider the work of educational development to be largely directed by institutional concerns (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Baume & Popovic, 2016; Peseta, 2005), it is these individuals whom arguably have greatest capacity structurally to shape the agency of individual academic development subjects.
As part of the literature review, Ling and Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development (2009, p. 22) categorise four general ‘approaches’ to educational development as:

1. Teacher focused - concerned with supporting teachers with the practical acts of teaching in a range of contexts.
2. Learner focused - concerned with using how a student learns as a reference point for educational development activities.
3. Organisation focused - educational development activities driven by institutional plans and agendas.
4. Sector wide focused - educational development activities which are actively devised in response to broad policy agendas.

This succinct dissection of the outcomes associated educational development provide a structural rationale for descriptions of the field (Green & Little, 2013; Manathunga, 2007) which posit educational development subjects’ as working across multiple irreconcilable discourses. Despite this reference to educational development activities needing to serve multiple stakeholder roles, the report contains no subsequent acknowledgment of the problem of pedagogic agency as articulated in the introduction to this thesis.

E-learning was identified as being a major conceptual imperative driving educational development work. Ling and Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development (2009, p. 42) constructed a table comparing the survey responses from directors of educational development centres with those of individual educational development subjects, in relation to the factors they perceived as having the greatest impact on their work. ‘Flexible learning/teaching with technologies’ was listed as being a strong influence for both groups, ranked as the first for developers and fourth for directors. In contrast, ‘curriculum design’ was ranked much lower in both groups, at nine for developers and fifteenth for directors. The apparent discrepancy between the impact of ‘flexible learning/teaching with technologies’ to that of ‘curriculum design’ is significant, as the provision of online learning is typically reliant upon a
unit of study undergoing a combination of pedagogical and curriculum re-design.

Tai Peseta (2005)

Learning and Becoming in Academic Development: An autoethnographic enquiry

Peseta’s work was a PhD examining a neophyte academic development subject’s journey of learning and becoming an academic developer. It is conceptually significant, as it positions academic development as a 'hybrid encounter' where subjects are solicited to critically examine how particular ideas and concepts have become dominant (Peseta, 2005). The work has methodological significance as the only accessible example of a PhD thesis in the field of educational/academic development produced using an auto-ethnographic approach. However, for the remainder of this section I will focus solely on the conceptual significance of Peseta’s work, as there are considerable differences in the autoethnographic approach employed in this work, in relation to the deconstructive approach (Denzin, 2014; Gannon, 2006) used in the current thesis.

Peseta initially posited a problem of pedagogical agency as a binary opposition of enacting a professional identity articulated in the field of academic development research and responding to competing institutional measures of performativity. This tension was typified in a view that the primary mission of academic development is to support academics to improve their teaching, where the actions performed in response to this mission are institutionally measured via their visible effects on the academic/teacher (Peseta, 2005, p. 44).

Contestation of academic development as a coherent identity served as an enabler for Peseta to re-conceptualise the problem of agency as one of opportunity. One way in which this singularity of identity was contested, was through an examination of dominant discourses within the field of academic

10 A deconstructive auto-ethnography is defined in chapter 5 'Methodological decisions'.
11 Ball (2003) defines performativity as a set of actions which function as accepted measures of productivity, output or quality in a given environment.
development and their effects on the practices of an academic development subject in an institutional context. Peseta utilised a dominant discourse of student learning in parallel with an articulation of a performative outcomes focused institutional context, to claim that this discourse engendered a pedagogy of replication. Peseta describes this pedagogy of replication as a state of play where "the models, theories and taxonomies of learning used by developers in their work with others becomes unproblematically reproduced in different disciplinary contexts that continue a homogenous reproduction of the student learning experience itself" (Peseta, 2005, p. 202). Through performing a deconstructive autoethnography (Denzin, 2014; Gannon, 2006) this thesis is an attempt at contributing to Peseta's positioning of academic development as a hybrid encounter, where academic/educational development subjects are solicited to "do the work of how we think it into being" (Peseta, 2005, p. 219).

Emergent problems of pedagogical agency

The body of this literature review is structured using seven problems of pedagogical agency for educational development subjects. The majority of the literature for this review is situated in the field of Academic Development, due to there being no visible body of literature detailing the pedagogy or identity of educational developers in TAFE. My starting point was the ‘International Journal for Academic Development’ and I read through the contents (and in some cases the abstracts for individual papers) for previous issues over the past fifteen years in order to locate seminal works or suitable starting points. These starting points were Land (2001), Manathunga (2007), Peseta (2014) and Webb (1992). Each of these papers explore agency for educational development subjects or the field of educational development. From these four articles, I was able to locate subsequent works via in-text referencing, which grappled with concepts related to a poststructural conceptualisation of agency such as subjectivity, contestability and performativity. This cycle of snowballing continued until I was
able to construct an annotated bibliography comprised of approximately fifty journal articles, reports, book chapters and texts.

The emergent problems of agency which emerged were:

- Being governed by a history of educational development
- Defining the purpose and role of e-learning
- Educational development as fragmented
- Being marginalised along ‘Fault lines’
- Working in centralised educational development units
- Pedagogy as a generic set of techniques
- Managerialism and compliance

The remainder of this chapter will examine how each of these pedagogical problems of agency are rationalised conceptually, theoretically and methodologically in the academic development literature.

**Being governed by a history of educational development**

This component of the literature review provides a brief synthesis of the available histories of educational development, as the field is a product of its past, and its subjects are viewed through lenses informed by perceptions of what they have done, have been asked to do and so on. Webb (1992, p. 351) drew a link between history, discourse and agency stating that "in Foucauldian terms we are part of an anonymous discourse which pre-dates our own arrival on the scene, and which moulds and constrains our agency as individuals". Locating the various historical discourses which serve to constitute the individual as a subject of educational development is one means of enacting a poststructural conception of agency (Davies, 2000). This tactic of resistance is about seeking to understand how the educational development subject may be positioned by discourse, through locating dominant sources of history and exploring how these historical accounts serve and sustain the discourse which foster a given positioning.
The evolution of educational development over the past 50 years in Australasia, Europe, and North America can be broadly understood through a movement of practice which initially focused on the individual teacher (academic), progressing to the institution, and most recently sectoral drivers (Fraser, Gosling, & Sorcinelli, 2010). For educational development subjects in Australia seeking to locate an accessible historical account of the banner they work under, Lee et al (2008) produced an oral history of educational development in the Australian higher education context. It is based on interviews with prominent educational development subjects, representing a continuum of developers who have worked in the field since its formative years in the 1950s. Some of these individually presented oral histories reflect the aforementioned conception of practice (Fraser et al., 2010) through describing early academic development activity as being informal, performed by a collection of individual academics seeking to develop and extend their understanding of undergraduate teaching. In parallel, there was also an acknowledgement of a post second world war discourse of student wastage (Lee et al., 2008) cultivating the perceived need for educational development. A discourse of 'student wastage' was initially conceived as one of the ‘deviant student’ to be later replaced by those of ‘university responsibility’ and ‘teacher deviance’ (Manathunga, 2014, p. 77). This progression echoes the broad shift in educational development practice from being an activity largely supporting individuals to that which is driven by institutional and sectoral agendas (Fraser et al., 2010). The emergence of an institutional perspective into educational development is visible in a perspective offered over two decades earlier by Moses (1985) who stated:

In many cases, it was the concern about teaching standards and failure rates or drop-out rates which prompted the establishment of (academic development) units and ensured their continuing support. (Moses, 1985; p.76)

In the Australian Higher Education environment, academic development became a 'distinctive’ profession in the late 1960s (Manathunga, 2011) and by the 1980s its main purpose was to "improve the quality of teaching and learning in a
particular institution through advice, information, courses on teaching methods, evaluation, sometimes audio-visual services, and often research" (Moses, 1985, p. 76). This short phrase linking teaching quality and teaching methods suggests that there was already a broad assortment of accepted pedagogical strategies or modes which educational development subjects were nominally expected to use. In addition, the reference to "sometimes audio-visual services" solicits future analysis of whether the function of educational development in the 1980s had already extended beyond the realm of professional development, to the development of educational products such as re-usable learning objects.

In reference to a North American higher education context, Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach (2006) articulated a five tiered evolution of educational development. Four past stages include:

- **Scholar** – the provision of services to support academics/teachers scholarly/research competence.
- **Teacher** - early programs designed to foster teaching as a scholarly endeavour.
- **Developer** – emergence of centralised academic development units and acknowledgement of the academic/educational developer role.
- **Learner** – a broader view of teaching enables a shift from a singular focus on the development of the pedagogical/delivery expertise to incorporate understandings of how to support student learning (Ouellett, 2010).

Despite educational development in North America enjoying a ‘different historical trajectory’ to that in Australia (Manathunga, 2011, p. 348) the five tiered evolution of educational development as expressed by Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach (2006) shows some parallel to the evolution of the educational development field as expressed through the aforementioned histories (Lee et al., 2008; Manathunga, 2011; Moses, 1985). It is problematic to interpret these stages in a linear manner in respect to an Australian context, as all of these stages represent different components of roles likely to be occupied by present academic developers.
To complete their five tiered evolution of educational development, Sorcinelli et al. (2006) declared that educational development is currently in the age of the ‘networker’. It is where an educational developer has the task to "preserve, clarify, and enhance the purposes of faculty development (educational development), and to network with faculty and institutional leaders to respond to institutional problems and propose constructive solutions as we meet the challenges of the new century" (Sorcinelli et al., 2006, p. 28). In terms of a problem of pedagogical agency, the first component of this statement can be re-read as an effect or product emergent from the pedagogies used to facilitate the ideation and implementation of solutions to complex problems. While broad articulations of educational development pedagogy are accessible in the aforementioned Australian accounts of educational development (Lee et al., 2008; Moses, 1985), the history of educational development is arguably dominated by conceptions of identity and subjectification based on a primary role of supporting teachers via the provision of professional development (Golding, 2014). The age of the networker (Sorcinelli et al., 2006) formalises a gradual diversification of educational development away from this idealised centre of supporting teachers, to a space comprising an assemblage of learning, teaching, management and regulatory stakeholders.

**Defining the purpose and role of e-learning**

This section will explore how the multiplicity of rationales for e-learning serve as a pedagogical problem of agency for educational development subjects. From a technological perspective, e-learning discourse is dominated by utterances featuring learning management systems. Learning management system (LMS) is a term used to refer to applications/systems specifically designed to enable the ‘development, delivery, assessment and administration’ of online courses (Wright, Lopes, Montgomerie, Reju, & Schmoller, 2014). Popular LMSs in Australian institutions include Moodle, Blackboard and Desire2Learn. They are commonly referred to by alternate terms such as Course Management Systems.
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(CMS) and Virtual Learning Environments (VLE) (Watson & Watson, 2007), and for the purpose of this discussion I will be treating them as interchangeable terms.

These systems became popular in tertiary institutions in the late 1990s (Siemens & Tittenberger, 2009) and have become the ‘first choice’ learning technology across the sector (Downes, 2005; Mott, 2010; Siemens, 2010; Weaver, Spratt, & Nair, 2008). Major criticisms propelled at Learning Management Systems often relate to their standardised nature (Conole, Sharp, & Beharrell, 2002) where the affordances of the system arguably engender normative pedagogy. Other criticisms include their potential for managerial surveillance of teaching (Adams, 2010; Land & Bayne, 2001), their potential to constrain pedagogic creativity (Kuriloff, 2001) and the overemphasis on administrative functions compared to teaching capacity (Mott, 2010; Siemens, 2004b). The sentiment of these criticisms is suitably expressed by Gibbs & Gosper (2006) who described the LMS as teaching with a ‘strait jacket’. The aforementioned critiques are centred on acts of teaching under the umbrella of e-learning using a learning management system. Given the dominant status of the institutionally mandated learning management system in tertiary institutions, these critiques are part of a discourse of e-learning which is likely to shape teacher’s interactions with the educational development subjects whom are tasked with supporting teachers with e-learning.

Teacher ‘perceptions of usefulness’ is regularly listed in higher education literature as one of the main factors affecting teacher adoption of e-learning, although there is a relatively small body of research directly exploring the factors which influence teachers e-learning practice in tertiary education (Torrisi-Steele & Drew, 2013). This tension is reflected in Sorcinelli et al.’s (2006) declaration of the four major tasks educational developers undertake when working with teachers in relation to e-learning:

- Understanding academics attitudes to technology
- Choosing appropriate technology
• Using knowledge of clients and objectives to help academics integrate technology
• Implementing appropriate technology for the various programs and goals of faculty centres. (Sorcinelli et al., 2006, p. 189)

These four tasks are differentiated using role-oriented references, arguably serving to introduce or represent a problem of structural agency where educational development subjects in e-learning relationships are responsible for serving the opposing interests of teacher and institution. Rationales for the use of e-learning are commonly expressed within discourses of institutional growth and/or individual teacher opportunity. Since the late 1990s e-learning has been viewed as an enabler for institutional agendas related to the growth and/or maintenance of student numbers (Green et al., 2013; Torrisi-Steele & Drew, 2013). Thompson and Holt (1996) described this movement as the ‘technological imperative’, where the premise was that "large scale use of new technologies will establish and maintain competitive advantages for institutions" (Torrisi & Davis, 2000, p. 167). This imperative was echoed by Hicks, Reid, and George (2001, p. 143) who acknowledged that ‘online delivery’ was considered to be an enabler for "the university sector to provide for a larger and more diverse cross-section of the population". Many of the aforementioned papers that had cited the institutionally driven technological imperative (Thompson & Holt, 1996), also made references to the opportunities for individuals using and/or consuming e-learning. For example, Hicks et al. (2001, p. 143) boldly proclaimed that e-learning "provides new and possibly better opportunities than face-to-face teaching", while Torrisi and Davis (2000, p. 166) stated that "the development of online learning materials is an endeavour aimed at improving the quality of the learning environment".

These seemingly contradictory statements were made at a time when e-learning and online learning were in their infancy. Educational development subjects were acknowledging the institutional drivers for e-learning use, whilst also harbouring an individual belief that e-learning could serve as an enabler for pedagogical evolution. Torrisi and Davis (2000) conducted a small study of
academic views on e-learning which encapsulate the pedagogical and subjectivity consequences of this paradoxical position for educational development subjects in these early years. They found that teachers (academics) initially conceived the role of educational developers as being primarily focused on assisting teachers to adapt learning materials for transmission to students via an online learning environment. This initial positioning placed emphasis on educational development subject’s technical proficiency at adapting/creating interactive learning materials and placing them in an online learning presence in a learning management system. The dominant tasks that were requested of educational development subjects were to provide teachers with information on the affordances of technology, provide procedural skills based instruction and to locate and disseminate e-learning implementation case studies (Torrisi & Davis, 2000). This emphasis on technical proficiency was echoed eight years later by Kanuka, Heller, and Jugdev (2008) who created four constructs of technical, social, pedagogical and managerial in a study attempting to identify professional development needs and direction for teachers utilising e-learning. Meanwhile, Hardy (2010) worked with a group of teachers/academics at an Australian university for a six month period where they worked collaboratively toward an overall objective of developing flexible learning approaches. Critiquing ICT applications was one of the three main activities that this group regularly engaged in throughout this period. The other two recurrent activities were centred on teachers defining flexible learning and teachers exploring the challenges of attempting to respond to an institutional agenda (Hardy, 2010). These few references from IJAD elicit a view that educational development subjects are still trying to navigate a discursive binary of institutional vs teacher pedagogical opportunity.

Over the past 15 years, educational development subjects have regularly utilised a binary opposition of student learning vs teacher centeredness as a means of articulating a rationale for e-learning which is not directly attributable as institutional. This binary is operable in educational development literature in IJAD from Torrisi and Davis (2000), Hicks et al. (2001), Trigwell (2001), Kanuka et
al. (2008), Hardy (2010), Cochrane, Black, Lee, Narayan, and Verswijvelen (2013), Green et al. (2013) and Owens (2015). Student learning is typically referred to as a collaborative process of learning informed by socio-constructionist or social-constructivist discourse (Vygotsky, 1978). Cochrane et al. (2013, p. 279) drew on this discourse to describe the binary as one of ‘instructivist’ (teacher centred) vs ‘socio-constructivist’ (student learning) pedagogy. This concept is articulated via statements of opportunities such as online education enabling a "dynamic communal process of sense-making and knowledge creation" where teachers reconsider their "teaching strategies from a paper-based transmission mode to a socio-constructionist online presence" (Green et al., 2013, pp. 166-167).

Various survey instruments and coding devices utilise and reinforce student and teacher oriented binary oppositions. Most blatantly, Owens (2015) recently attempted to classify the teaching beliefs and practice of National Teaching Fellows in the UK as being either ‘student’ or ‘teacher’ centred. Pedagogy which was student centred was classified using descriptors such as ‘problem solving’, ‘interactive’ and ‘facilitative’. These were juxtaposed against teacher centred descriptors such as ‘imparting information’, ‘using media’, ‘training for jobs’ and ‘knowledge of the subject’ (Owens, 2015, p. 79). It is merely a contemporary example of the way in which binaries have been long used within academic development literature to classify and engender particular e-learning pedagogies. I contend that an educational development subject's use of such binaries is a pedagogical tactic enacted as a means of ideating the purpose and utility for e-learning. An educational development subject’s perceived need to ideate the purpose and utility for e-learning serves as a problem of pedagogical agency.

**Educational development as fragmented**

The following component of the literature review will examine how conceptions of educational development as fragmented may engender a problem of pedagogical agency for its subjects. Educational development described as
fragmented (Rowland, 2002; Webb, 1992) can infer that there is no definitive field of educational development and that it is simply an umbrella term to describe a ‘family of strangers’ working in a myriad of educational support roles (Harland & Staniforth, 2008). This understanding could be used to critique the research question for this thesis on the basis that the question refers to ‘educational development’; a term likely to be interpreted as denoting a field.

Educational development elicits references to fragmentation as it does not function as a stand-alone discipline with an established set of credentialing processes and standards. Whilst there are professional recognition schemes such as SEDA (Staff and Educational Development Association) fellowships in the UK, there is no dominant or singular pathway of practice into educational development and there is not an established set of entry qualifications or vocational standards (Fraser, 1999; McDonald & Stockley, 2008; Peseta, 2005). Persons working in the educational development sphere come from a range of disciplinary backgrounds (Bath & Smith, 2004; Fraser, 2001; Harland & Staniforth, 2008; Leibowitz, 2014). For example, probable disciplinary backgrounds for developers engaged in the e-learning space include primary, secondary and/or tertiary education, information communication technology and visual/interactive design. The breadth of prior skills and knowledge which is deemed credible for entry into educational development positions is indicative of a job without a dominant disciplinary base.

Educational development has been described as interdisciplinary (Manathunga, 2007; Rowland, 2003), inferring that educational development is a product of multiple disciplinary inputs and subjects. This interdisciplinary status may be explained by the diversity of tasks and the breadth of disciplinary origins that its subjects bring to the discourse of educational development. Most notably, Green and Little (2016) conducted a survey with 1000 educational developers from 38 countries and found that 58% of developers hold a doctorate or PhD, with two thirds of this group having obtained this qualification in a field other than education. This state of play arguably engenders educational development subjects to try and create/locate grand narratives which enable a singular
succinct and uniform categorisation of a profession. Lee and McWilliam (2008) observed that there is a significant body of emical\textsuperscript{12} literature where educational development subjects' attempt to promulgate the ‘disciplinarisation’ of educational development. While such conceptions of identity are variable both epistemologically and ontologically (Fraser, 1999; Harland & Staniforth, 2003; Kinash & Wood, 2013), they are arguably an attempt at trying to legitimise educational development as a field of research in higher education. It is a conceivable effect of a higher education environment where academic career progression is almost always linked to research output published within an established discipline (McGrail, Rickard, & Jones, 2006; Norton & Cakitaki, 2016). In contrast, a TAFE teacher’s performance is often measured through their industry engagement and rates of graduate employability, in parallel with their maintenance of credentials as a vocational practitioner (Centre for International Research on Education Systems, 2016). Within a TAFE institutional context, qualifications are typically situated in organisational clusters based on vocations which seemingly have a long history, are visible in the wider community through their graduates, and are taught by teachers who may have had little reason to work outside of their discipline area. Consequently, the interdisciplinary nature of educational development (Manathunga, 2007) may engender educational development subjects in TAFE instructions to self-identify using the disciplinary banner that they previously worked within as student and/or teacher, in absence of being able to clearly articulate the purpose and practice of their work via the classifier ‘educational development’.

Educational development as an activity is largely driven by local and/or institutional goals (Fraser et al., 2010; Harland & Staniforth, 2008; Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009). This sentiment of responsiveness was adequately captured by Gibbs (2013), when he was reflecting upon his four decades of educational development practice.

\textsuperscript{12} Emical is defined in the Merriam-Webster dictionary as: "of, relating to, or involving analysis of cultural phenomena from the perspective of one who participates in the culture being studied".
Over the past 40 years, I have engaged in such a wide variety of ‘change tactics’, with the broad intention of improving teaching and learning, that it is sometimes difficult to encompass them all under a banner like ‘educational development’ without feeling that the term is being stretched a little. (Gibbs, 2013, p. 4)

Gibb’s (2013) reference to change tactics refers to a pedagogy of localised response performed under the general banner of quality enhancement. This reflection posits categorisations of common educational development pedagogy as being aggregations of frequency, more so than representing a dominant identity of educational development which can be enacted and earned through performing a set of codified pedagogical actions. It also highlights the problematic nature for educational development subjects working to a mission of improving teaching and learning in a discursive landscape which is epistemologically fragmented. Viewing educational development as a distinct field where there is a coherent purpose is problematic (Webb, 1992), as it promotes dogmatic practices which inevitably act to constrain the agency of subsequent educational development subjects. Harland and Staniforth (2008) contended that there was not even a common set of values which can be attributed to educational development, except a unilateral commitment to assisting others. They drew this conclusion after asking a group of twenty developers situated across six nations to reply to a position paper they prepared, positing educational development as being fragmented structurally, operationally, ontologically and epistemologically.

While educational development expressed as a fragmented identity can be viewed as a negative within modernist discourses of cohesion and uniformity, it provides opportunities for its subjects to re-conceptualise their pedagogy through dislocating identity and practice. Without references to fragmentation and contestation in the educational development literature, it would be difficult to not conceptualise educational development pedagogy as a series of regulatory ideals. Borrowing from the work of Foucault (1979), Butler (1990, p. 335) described a ‘regulatory ideal’, as "a fiction that operates within discourses
and which, discursively and institutionally sustained, wields enormous power”. A regulatory ideal functions both as a norm and as a series of regulated practices. Educational development expressed as a regulatory ideal suggests that it is those pedagogic acts which are highly repetitious and visible, which serve as the norms that shape expectations of how educational development subjects are expected to ‘perform’. These pedagogic norms do not necessarily reflect what educational development subjects actually do. Instead, they function as a template of ‘performance’ for persons working under the banner of educational development.

Conceptualising educational development as a regulatory ideal enables it to be viewed as a performative template, more so than a representation of a codified set of practices. If academic development is to serve as a term to describe the actions or pedagogy of its subjects, it can be described as under erasure as there is not another accessible term to describe our work. Echoing the work of Grant (2007), expressing educational development as under erasure places attention on its contestability, multiplicity and capacity to misrepresent or constrain the actions of persons/subjects employed under its banner. Writing under erasure is a tactic that was adopted by Derrida (1976), where he would present a word with a line through it, in recognition of the necessity to retain its use, while in parallel attempting to discourage use of the word to narrow conceptions of the phenomena being described. Lather (2003, p. 263) succinctly described writing under erasure as "keeping something visible but crossed out, to avoid universalizing or monumentalizing it". Educational Development as under erasure posits it as an umbrella term, necessary to provide focus to a myriad of activities (conducted under the banner). It is a way of responding to Leibowitz’s (2014, p. 358) rhetorical question "is there any point in attempting to define the term at all?". Educational Development under erasure is a conception of the field as contestable and fragmented. This re-conceptualisation of the field can potentially serve as an agentic enabler for its subjects who will inevitably face criticism and direction regarding their pedagogy via utterances of uncertainty,
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multiplicity and contradiction.

**Being marginalised along ‘fault lines’**

Educational development conceived of as a fragmented enterprise (Harland & Staniforth, 2008; Land, 2004; Rowland, 2002; Webb, 1992), makes it problematic for those persons (subjects) working under this banner to believe that their actions and words are being interpreted based on an objective ‘single’ identity as an educational developer. As explored earlier in this review, persons working under this banner are constrained by a visible history of educational development (Brew, 2010), which is situated institutionally and in literature categorised under banners such as academic development, educational development and studies of higher education. Published conceptions of educational development can be selectively cited by its subjects, in an attempt to articulate a level of uniformity that contradicts its contested and fragmentary status. This is a problematic activity, as educational development is largely focussed on achieving institutional or sectoral objectives (Clegg, 2009; Fraser et al., 2010) where the educational development subject’s agency will be inevitably shaped by the multiple localised discursive conceptions of educational development. These discourses serve as a reference point to regulate and assess the work of individuals employed as educational developers.

One might say that educational developers need to walk a tightrope between acquiring or maintaining ‘clout’ and influence on the administration on the one hand, and being seen as either an advocate of staff concern, or a neutral advising body on the other hand. (Moses, 1985, p. 83)

While this three-decade old description of academic development terrain may resonate with persons employed under this banner through a ‘we’ versus ‘them’ dichotomy (van Hattum-Janssen, Morgado, & Vieira, 2011), it is also problematic. Locating the position of the tightrope is difficult when many individuals in the institution are employed in roles where they act in the interests of both sides of
this artificial divide. Little and Green (2012, p. 214) used the term ‘marginal’ to reconceptualise this tightrope as an in-between space where the educational development subject is "located between and among other units, as simultaneously inside and outside". One of the binaries which readily enable conceptions of marginality is that of intramural vs extramural (Little & Green, 2012) discipline identity, where educational development subjects are positioned epistemologically based on their educational/academic credentials. The ‘Intramural’ pole refers to educational development subjects who are discursively positioned via their credentials in areas closely related to educational development, including studies of higher education. Extramural refers to subjects who are discursively positioned based on their credentials within discipline areas that have not been historically associated with educational development.

Academic (educational) developers are very often disciplinary migrants, performing hybrid, liminal roles at the 'fault lines' between teachers and learners, between academics and managers, and between teaching and research. As a result, their identities as scholars can be described as 'unhomely'. While this in-between space is uncomfortable and ambiguous, its deconstructive power lends itself to 'thinking at or beyond the limit' of current teaching and learning discourses. (Manathunga, 2007, p. 25)

Manathunga’s (2007) post-colonial description of educational development roles as liminal problematizes the notion of an educational development subject expecting their pedagogy to be understood via a cohesive structuralised identity. Thinking about educational development as liminal solicits educational development subjects to critique their pedagogy in relation to multiple discourses. An educational development subject’s pedagogic acts will likely solicit multiple and contradictory conceptions of meaning across multiple discourse. Working with this poststructural view of subjectivity, Lee and McWilliam (2008) argued that educational development subjects need to
identify these contradictory positions with no intent to unify, reconcile or resolve such difference.

It is not necessarily scholarship of the Marxian sort that pre-empts a transformative moment for academic (educational) development. Rather, criticality needs to be directed towards mapping the field in multiple ways that allow its diversity to be deployed knowingly in the ongoing re-invention of the academy. (Lee & McWilliam, 2008, p. 75)

A decade later, and there are limited examples of research where educational development subjects have attempted to respond to this call. For example, Kensington-Miller, Renc-Roe, and Morón-García (2015, p. 288) produced a series of auto-ethnographic vignettes to articulate the contestable and fragmented nature of educational development. Despite this acknowledgement, the research was performed with an overall intention to "contribute to the on-going battle for academic (educational) development to be recognised as a discipline" (Kensington-Miller et al., 2015, p. 288). They contend that the breadth of credentials, outcomes and pedagogies of educational development subjects is not reason enough to preclude educational development from being considered a discipline. This argument requires the reader to develop a multilayered perspective of educational development that is not easily communicable to persons outside of the field. The difficulty in communicating a contestable notion of educational development arguably engenders its subjects' to report 'victory narratives' (Peseta, 2007, p. 17) that typically "defend and extend our relevance as a community, rather than making public the intense difficulty of our work".

Following from Manathunga's (2007) re-application of Rowland's (2002) metaphor ‘fault lines’ to explore educational development as a liminal identity, I will be re-using this metaphor to briefly examine educational development subjects’ conceptions of their pedagogical agency along binary oppositions. Working within a poststructural conceptual framework, these conceptions both enable/strengthen and acknowledge the discursive positioning of educational development subjects in their day-to-day practice. Davies and Harré (1990, p.
describe positioning as "the way in which the discursive practices constitute the speakers and hearers in certain ways and yet at the same time is a resource through which speakers and hearers can negotiate new positions". Positioning reflects a Foucauldian conception of subjectivity (Foucault, 1982) where individuals are subjects written or spoken into multiple discourse (Davies, 2000). In regard to agency, fault lines as binary oppositions may serve as starting points for educational developers to explore how their pedagogic acts are serving multiple functions through their positioning across multiple discourse.

Webb (1996a) originally presented the 'expert / vanguard' binary fault line within a context of discussing potential roles for educational developers in action research projects. The 'expert' position refers to situations when the educational development subject is requested to work with a teacher (or group) on the basis that they have specific knowledge or skills to offer. In contrast, the 'vanguard' position refers to situations when the educational development subject is positioned as the initiator of the engagement with the teachers. This binary solicits educational developers to move beyond questioning "who wants me here?" to ask "which discourses are in operation which may lead me to being positioned as the initiator (vanguard)?" For example, an educational development subject who has been requested to work with a group of teachers (by one teacher in this group, or by their manager) may enter the conversation dismayed to find that s/he is being positioned as the vanguard by the teachers in the group. Vanguard positioning is occurring through the educational development subject being asked (repeatedly) by the group of teachers to justify the meeting and articulate their capacity to serve a function that is considered appropriate to the teachers. This fault line is one that educational development subjects will inevitably navigate where their responses are visible through their pedagogical acts and rationalisations.

All (educational developers) recognise that a process of change must be negotiated in some fashion, entered into and supported if the developer’s role is not to be superfluous. (Land, 2001, p. 10)
Educational development is typically not concerned with maintaining the present as it is largely characterised by mandates for change. This is evident from its origin as an informal practice of supporting individual teachers to improve their practice through to present accounts which are posited within a diverse assortment of change agendas including e-learning (Fraser et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2008; Moses, 1985). This movement suggests that the role of the teacher (academic) has evolved in the context of educational development from its inceptual position as self-determinatory to a contemporary position as implementing change in response to (or direction by) institutional or sectoral concerns. Neame’s (2013) ‘democratic’ / interventionalist’ dichotomy of Land’s (2003) twelve orientations to educational development reflects this shift in the role of teachers in educational development relationships, as the two headings infer that there is an affected or other party. Whilst this binary was conceived as a pragmatic means for educational development subjects to evaluate the "essential features of different scenarios" (Neame, 2013, p. 337), it can also serve to reinforce a tension of a collaborative ideal (democratic) vs a performativite necessity (interventionist) when the educational development subject is not able to draw associations between the orientations (Land, 2003) that informed the creation of the dichotomy and their situated pedagogic acts.

The marginalisation of educational development subjects can be further explored through the fault line ‘centripetally’ or ‘centrifugally’ (Gillespie, Robertson, & Bergquist, 2010) which uses organisational location as its basis for differentiation. Centripetal activities are those which typically require teachers to come to a location, which is the domain of the educational developer (e.g. centralised training centre). In contrast, centrifugal activities are those which are facilitated in the teacher’s domain (e.g. their office, classroom etc.). This distinction has commonality with both the ‘vanguard / expert’ (Webb, 1996a) and ‘democratic’ / interventionalist’ (Neame, 2013) fault lines when the notion of space is viewed beyond the physical location to a pedagogic location. For example, a suite of standardised advertised workshops facilitated by an educational development subject at a location used by all the workshop
participants (in their own teaching activities) can be initially conceptualised as centrifugal. The clarity of this initial reading erodes when this fault line is considered in parallel with the ‘vanguard / expert’ (Webb, 1996a) and ‘democratic / interventionalist’ (Neame, 2013) fault lines. A reading of multiple fault lines will likely produce ‘interrelationalities’ (Ellsworth, 2005) where educational development subjects are forced to examine the intersection of multiple discourse in parallel. Reading the interrelationalities between fault lines inevitably undermines the binary function of each fault line and reflects a view of marginality that is liminal. For example, a fault line expressing tension between developing the ‘program’ or the ‘individual’ (Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009) may elicit a broadening of ‘location’ as discussed in the ‘centripetal/centrifugal’ binary to include a course or person as a ‘location’. For educational development subjects seemingly "watching their backs" (Bath & Smith, 2004, p. 10), the challenge is to locate fault lines and consider how they may be positioned along these binaries and then consider ‘interrelationalities’ with other fault lines.

**Working in centralised educational development units**

Educational development is most commonly located in a divisional unit of the institution which is organisationally independent of the faculties, schools and/or departments responsible for day to day teaching (Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009). This organisational separation is indicative of the ‘we’ versus ‘them’ dichotomy (van Hattum-Janssen et al., 2011) which describes tensions between the perceived needs of individual teachers and institutional agendas. This tension is encapsulated in the foundational question "to who are we loyal?" (Peseta & Manathunga, 2008) as educational development subjects seemingly represent institutional agendas through their employment in a centralised learning and teaching unit. While the dichotomy appears clear, the actual relationship between these disparate tensions is nuanced through factors such as an individual centre’s mandate and its role in
the overall provision of educational development activity at the institution (Hicks, 1999). It can also be explained via a general historical shift of focus in educational development from working with individual teachers to a focus on course teams, departments and leadership of teaching (Gibbs, 2013). This discussion will briefly explore the agency of educational development subjects along this ‘we’ versus ‘them’ dichotomy (van Hattum-Janssen et al., 2011) in relation to the emergence and centralisation of institutional learning and teaching units.

Institutional learning and teaching units (commonly labelled as Academic Development Units) emerged in Australian Higher education institutions from the 1970s through to the 1990s (Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009). Early units were generally established as centres to support individual academics to improve their teaching practice (Lee et al., 2008; Moses, 1987) and they have since evolved into centres which are now more often than not aligned with institutional management (Holt, Palmer, & Challis, 2011). This shift in organisational position is often characterised by the physical location occupied by a central unit (Lee et al., 2008). For example, a small confined portable structure removed from the thoroughfare of institutional activity paints a very different picture to that of a unit physically located in an easily accessible modernised building on the main campus of an institution. While educational development subjects working in learning and teaching units can claim that they are still working to the overall mantra of improving the quality of teaching practice (Brew & Jewell, 2012), their centralisation is most evident through their stewardship or contribution to institutional learning and teaching strategic policies (Stefani, 2011). This organisational repositioning has arguably seen academic development subjects employed in learning and teaching centres have their individual autonomy reduced, as an effect of gaining "a seat at high table" (Gibbs, 2013, p. 8).

Characteristics of centralised units which vary considerably across institutions include size, level of responsibility regarding technology, level of service and their relationship with senior management (Ling & Council of Australian
Hicks (1999, p. 47) conducted a survey with directors of learning and teaching centres representing approximately 40% of all Australian universities. From this work he classified four common models of educational development work in Australian universities:

1. Central – Development work is managed by a centralised unit
2. Dispersed – Development work is managed by individual faculty/schools
3. Mixed – Development work is undertaken by both a centralised unit and faculty/schools
4. Integrated - Development work is cooperatively shared by a centralised unit and faculty/schools.

Hicks (1999) advocated for the integrated model based upon earlier work performed in the United Kingdom (Murray & Holmes, 1997), although he conceded that the central model was most prevalent in Australia at that time. A decade later, Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development (2009) conducted a survey of educational development stakeholders and discovered that the centralised institutional learning and teaching centres still prevailed as being the dominant organisational location for educational development subjects. However, they did discover that there had been a move to more of an ‘integrated’ approach, now commonly referred to as ‘hub and spoke’ (Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009). The ‘hub’ refers to the central unit and the ‘spokes’ describe the roles undertaken in or managed by the faculties and schools. Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development (2009, p. 36) discovered that the main challenges faced in relation to the hub and spoke model include ambiguity in relation to determining responsibilities and maintaining cross faculty communication. In addition, they found that it can also be difficult for the central unit to syndicate the diverse activity of embedded developers in order to inform institutional agendas. For educational development subjects based in central units, this transition to hub and spoke models presents a landscape where they are likely to experience various problems of pedagogical agency emergent from
navigating the often contrasting needs of teaching and management subjects. It is naive to suggest that an educational development subject can expect to successfully rationalise the needs and expectations of faculty based teachers with institutional agendas using the ‘we’ versus ‘them’ dichotomy. Instead its representative of an environment where competing interests and agendas become difficult to define solely informed by alternate organisational locations. This is further exacerbated by frequent restructures of central units (Fraser & Ryan, 2012; Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009) and the ever changing assortment of activities not commonly associated with the improvement of teaching (Sorcinelli et al., 2006) which may now live within a central unit. Ironically, this state of ‘flux’ is in part an outcome from central units trying to respond to (and balance) institutional needs with those of individual faculties (Holt et al., 2011).

Fraser and Ryan (2012) explored this state of flux through interviewing 19 of 27 former directors of institutional learning and teaching centres in Australian universities between 2002 and 2007. They surprisingly found that 8 (approx 40%) of the 19 former directors had commenced working within the field of educational development as the director of an institutional learning centre. "Convincing senior managers of the legitimacy and benefits" of educational development was cited as one of the three most commonly mentioned challenges by this group of former directors (Fraser & Ryan, 2012, p. 140). Consequently, there is reason to consider how a director’s level of prior experience performing the role that they are tasked with advocating, shapes the agency of educational development subjects whom are employed in institutional learning and teaching centres. This lack of experience working at the coal face of educational development is arguably reflected in the group of directors citing successes which were more reflective of projects than cultural change (Fraser & Ryan, 2012, p. 143) and in advocating models of educational development that were completely devolved or hub and spoke where the emphasis of the learning and teaching centre is "reserved for strategy development and core professional development" (Fraser & Ryan, 2012, p. 140). For educational development
subjects working within an institutional centre where the director is focussed on achieving and reporting such outcomes, there is a tension between achieving outcomes that are easily communicatable and attempting to facilitate localised change with individual teachers where the impacts are incredibly difficult to communicate or quantify.

If our academic managers are able to seize on anecdotal evidence from individual influential people within our institutions, or focus only on data that suit their political agendas to the exclusion of other more compelling and perhaps more accurate data, what is the point of producing rational evidence of effectiveness? Do academic developers (educational development subjects) really have any control over the narrative they tell about their impact – especially when that evidence is often produced by others? (Brew & Peseta, 2008, p. 84)

While use of the poststructural conceptual framework articulated in chapter two of this thesis would engender a response of no, there is capacity for agency through educational development subjects (individuals) attempting to locate their multiple subjectivities. The ‘we’ versus ‘them’ dicotomy (van Hattum-Janssen et al., 2011) is symbolic of the tensions an educational development subject is likely to experience in relation to their relationships with central management, teachers and faculty based educational developers. Despite the symbolic resonance, it is only one of many available differentiation schemas that an educational development subject can draw upon to guide reflexive consideration of their discursive positionings. There is an imperative for educational development subjects’ to question whether symbolic but simplistic dichotomies such as ‘we’ vs ‘them’ to self-govern their pedagogical ideation and decision making.
**Pedagogy as a generic set of techniques**

This section will explore how pedagogy expressed as a generic set of techniques serves as a problem of pedagogical agency for educational development subjects. I will examine the apparent contradictions that exist between visible educational development pedagogy being and/or espousing a generic activity; and hidden pedagogies reflective of the ways in which developers often act as consultants (Rathbun & Turner, 2012) in a peer review capacity (Boud, 1999). This section will conclude by examining this tension within the context of e-learning through the predominance of pedagogical models.

Educational Development has been widely criticised for treating pedagogy as a skills oriented concept (Manathunga, 2011) where the act of teaching is reduced to a generic activity (Rowland, 2003). One rationale for this criticism is the absence of educational development related literature which explores pedagogy from a critical perspective (Lee & Green, 1997; Malcolm & Zukas, 2001; Manathunga, 2011; Usher & Edwards, 2007). This is particularly relevant to the research question considering that pedagogy in this thesis is being used to articulate philosophical positions and acts influencing the learning space\(^{13}\). While educational development is generally viewed as a practical activity (Gosling, 2003), an over emphasis on skills is visible in common professional development approaches (Webster-Wright, 2009) and in the concepts with which educational developers are often entrusted to teach (Webb, 1992). This criticism is arguably based on educational development practices which are informed by institutional objectives and are reflective of a profession which is largely positioned outside of the faculties and schools in an institution (Hicks, 1999; Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009). Despite these criticisms, the pedagogy of educational developers can be largely hidden when a developer will work with teachers on a one to one basis (Gillespie et al., 2010; Tynan &

\(^{13}\) Pedagogy is defined in the key terms section of Chapter 1 'Introduction'.
Smyth, 2007), and thus not contribute to any contestation of educational development pedagogy conceptualised as a technique.

Educational development has emerged in response to a desire to improve teaching related outcomes where early practice centred on working with individual teachers/academics (Lee et al., 2008). Since this time, educational development has been gradually centralised (Fraser et al., 2010; Hicks, 1999) where major contemporary imperatives are typically project based (Fraser & Ryan, 2012). Given this historical shift from working with individuals to facilitating change-based implementation projects, it is foreseeable that educational development subjects would be facilitating activities which are both generic and efficient. Educational development subjects may consequently experience a pedagogic tension of ideals through viewing the one to one dialogic exchange as the ideal. For example, in centrally offered workshops it can be difficult to contextualise the skills when one measure of success for the session is the generation of a capacity participant base comprised of teachers across the institution. Reflective of this context, Webster-Wright (2009, p. 703) contended that professional development activities are often "episodic updates of information delivered in a didactic manner" where little value is placed on situated learning. The most common workshops are individual entities where there is limited scope for ongoing development (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012). These events have greatest impact when they are used to disseminate institutional information (e.g. policy) or provide instruction on discrete skills (Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009). This combination of didactic teaching and offerings of professional development dominated by common concepts, illicit criticism of educational development as treating teaching as a ‘generic activity’ (Rowland, 2003). This is compounded by an environment where teachers who engage with educational developers want concrete solutions (Webb, 1992). There appears to be limited opportunity for (or at least precedent of) educational developers in visible settings such as workshops to not treat pedagogy as a largely skills-based concept dogged by generalisations and devoid of context.
Educational development work is not commonly restricted to standardised events and is often comprised of consultative activities (Rathbun & Turner, 2012) and peer review (Boud, 1999) normally undertaken in a one to one or small group setting (Debowski, 2011; Gillespie et al., 2010; Tynan & Smyth, 2007). This idealistic setting for educational development subjects (Prebble et al., 2004) may engender discussion of pedagogy which moves beyond the generalizable, however the outcomes from such work are largely non-reportable. Pedagogy is often treated as a private matter (van Hattum-Janssen et al., 2011), as it is a reflection of how a teacher views their world. There is tension for education developers between breaking confidentiality in order to report their one-to-one consultative work where pedagogy has been treated beyond the generalizable; and respecting this ‘private matter’, thus perpetuating their highly visible existence working predominately in a skills and/or process based capacity. Land (2004, p. 37) described the standardised activities as "high presence", whilst he argued that the consultative activities are "high impact". However this high impact work only becomes visible through the words and actions of the teacher who the individual developer has worked with (Debowski, 2011). This invisibility of educational developers and pedagogy needs to be acknowledged when considering the aforementioned argument that educational development works to reduce pedagogy to a skills oriented concept (Rowland, 2003). Without such an acknowledgement, it is likely that an educational development subject will experience a performative tension to focus on standardised procedural solutions, which can be easily disseminated and/or replicated.

On the one hand, academic developers (educational development subjects) play an important part in advancing learning and teaching quality; on the other, they are often expected to do so in a piecemeal and technical way that is supposed to have an almost immediate impact on specific activities, such as feedback, assessment, and so on. (Di Napoli, 2014, p. 4)

At this point it would be logical to explore the commentary and potential role of dominant conceptions of pedagogy such as constructive alignment (Biggs &
Tang, 2007), that rely upon various psychological discourse to provide taxonomies and binary like differentiations of practice such as deep and surface learning. Given that the research in this thesis is situated in a Victorian TAFE in relation to e-learning relationships, I will instead explore how pedagogy as a technique is reinforced through e-learning discourse. Rationales to teach online are often presented as or supported by a series of capabilities/opportunities referred to as ‘affordances’. The term affordance was first used by Gibson (1979) and it is used to describe the scope for action available within an environment. "The affordances of the environment are what it offers the animal, what it provides or furnishes, either for good or ill" (Gibson, 1979, p. 127). For example, an educational developer may produce resources using this concept in order to encourage teachers to use a learning management system. The resource would contain a list of affordances such as "Access and download course materials", "Submit assessment tasks for teacher review" and "Participate in asynchronous text-based discussion with both teachers and students".

These resources serve a practical purpose not-too-dissimilar to a vacuum cleaner commercial where the consumer is told what the manufacturer believes the capabilities of the object to be. However, in isolation they also serve to strengthen the argument that educational development subjects treat pedagogy as a generic concept where the online environment is strictly a piece of technology, and not an expression of the teacher’s pedagogy (or learning design). The concept of affordances was expanded by Donald Norman who highlighted the perceived affordances an object or environment offered. "The term affordance refers to the perceived and actual properties of the thing, primarily those fundamental properties that determine just how the thing could possibly be used" (Norman, 1988, p. 9). Perceived affordances are referring more to the ‘usability’ and not strictly the ‘utility’ (Bower, 2008), whereby there is an indirect acknowledgement that pedagogy is not limited to skills and processes to achieve outcomes. Consequently, case studies which feature a teacher voice articulating a link between their pedagogy and the perceived affordances would provide educational developers with an opportunity to shift
discourse related to their treatment of pedagogy as a series of generalisable techniques (Rowland, 2003).

There is inevitably a range of procedural skills a teacher must become proficient in, in order to teach online. Educational development subjects often need to work with teachers to develop these skills and it is acquisition of these skills, which are bound to be of more immediate importance than exploration of philosophical positions or theories informing pedagogy. This demand is reflected in the dominance of texts regarding online pedagogy which focus on the process of implementation (Brennan, 2003). One commonly cited example is Salmon’s (2000) five stage e-moderating model. The model is based on Salmon’s analysis of online interactions in Open University online courses over a two-year period and it aimed to describe a typical lifecycle of an online course. However, the model was used as a springboard to produce a practical guide to facilitating an online unit. The intent here is not to criticise or evaluate Salmon’s model, but to illustrate how there is an overwhelming demand from teachers for literature related to e-learning pedagogy that focuses on the practical and procedural aspects. Lisewski and Joyce (2003) argued over a decade ago that there was an over reliance on models such as Salmon’s within discourse related to e-learning. For educational development subjects there is a temptation to use online pedagogic models to construct a vision (illusion) of best practice which in parallel acts as a tactic to establish legitimacy (Webb, 1992). Kirkup (2002) applied the term ‘reification’ to describe how a model maintains its dominance through there often being little demand to develop new models and approaches. If existing models such as Salmon’s (2000) are being used to establish or maintain legitimacy, the focus shifts from educational development pedagogy being characterised by generalised techniques (Rowland, 2003) to it resembling a normalising force in a relational conception of power.

Over the past decade numerous theories related to online pedagogy have emerged, although their visibility within online pedagogy in tertiary institutions is minimal. For example, the theory of Connectivism (Downes, 2008; Siemens, 2004a) posits knowledge as a function of networks. This theory in-directly
informed the emergence of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). The term MOOC, was originally applied to describe an online course ‘Connectivism and Connective Knowledge’ facilitated by Stephen Downes and George Siemens (Cormier, 2008). This online course was Downes and Siemens attempt at creating a sequence of learning based on their shared conceptions of Connectivism. Since this time, the term MOOC has morphed from a pedagogic descriptor, to that of a brand (Wiley, 2012). It is typically used by institutions to signify that an educational offering is free, open to students globally and has a smaller duration than established award study options. Despite the recent prominence of discussion related to MOOCs and the small array of MOOC offerings at Australian Universities (MOOC List, 2014), pedagogy informed by Connectivist approaches is most likely to remain positioned on the margins for Australian educational developers. What commenced as a genuine attempt at shifting online pedagogy, has become a product-based vehicle for universities to promote themselves using taster courses labelled as MOOCs.

In conclusion, pedagogy is arguably treated as a generic activity within educational development practice (Rowland, 2003) and literature (Gosling, 2003). The same criticism can be applied to e-learning (Lisewski & Joyce, 2003) where there is a tendency to rely on models of practice and practical guides which use a language couched in affordances. Within educational development discourse there is a dichotomy of visible and invisible practice and it is those activities such as standardised institution wide workshops which are most visible. In contrast, it is the often-invisible consultative activities of an educational developer where there is scope for discussions of pedagogy which expand beyond a series of techniques and generalizable practice. The challenge for educational development subjects is to be critical of the generic visible approaches they use and/or espouse and consider how their practice is serving to solidify their position within the institution. To do so, educational development subjects need to acknowledge that teaching is a contested activity and ‘surrender’ any claims to being an authority (Manathunga, 2007). An enabler for such a surrender, may be for educational development subjects to adopt a
broader conceptualisation of pedagogy, where it is considered a means to articulate philosophical positions and acts influencing the learning space. Such a philosophical reconceptualization of pedagogy, will arguably enable educational development subjects to enact a shift in pedagogy that reflects the atheoretical to theoretical shift that Gibbs (2013) claimed had already occurred within educational development over the past decade or so.

**Managerialism and compliance**

This discussion will explore how a discourse of managerialism is represented as a problem of pedagogical agency for educational development subjects. I will explore how this problem serves as both an effect of pedagogy, and as an effect governing future pedagogical acts and rationalisations. A philosophy of managerialism is concerned with the "objective search for efficiency, effectiveness and excellence" (Deem, 2001, p. 11). It is typically enacted through the production of strategic targets and quality assurance, generally driven by the upper administrative tiers of the institution (Moses, 1995; Preston, 2001). Managerialism is commonly visible through language and procedures which serve to implement and sustain standardised practice (Kayrooz, Pearson, & Quinlan, 1997; Preston, 2001). Becher and Trowler (2001, p. 10) outline four key components of a managerialist mindset:

a) Decisions being rationalised using notions of the customer and the ‘market’

b) Positioning organisational change endeavours as the sole domain of senior management

c) Organisational change is a top-down process

d) Knowledge conceptualised as an object that can be mechanised

In the context of educational development, a common example is the drafting, championing and or use of quality assurance instruments. Quality assurance processes are designed to assess how individuals in the institution are responding to the objectives set within a culture of managerialism (Moses,
1995). Thus, quality assurance requirements and processes are often justified through an impending future that is "arguably worth achieving" (Mårtensson, Roxå, & Stensaker, 2014, p. 543), where the present is sceptically in deficit.

Anecdotally, many TAFE institutions have a separate quality assurance department organisationally detached from the institutional learning and teaching unit where educational development subjects are likely to be employed. This organisational separation can be misleading, as quality assurance influences quality enhancement and vice versa. For example, Ling and Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development (2009) reported that directors of institutional learning and teaching units nominated this inherent tension as a major concern. One way in which this convergence of quality assurance and enhancement is made visible is through educational development subjects' use of standardised resources and methods. Resources such as assessment tool templates and pre-semester teaching checklists bear little difference to common quality assurance tools (e.g. SWOT analysis) as all serve a purpose of self-management. Preston (2001) referred to the ordinary nature of these tools as a device to conceal the strength of the rationale behind the strategies that they have been initially designed to help implement. Rathbun and Turner (2012, p. 232) suggested that this ‘non-neutrality’ of a resource can be considered when its ‘specific purpose’ and ‘overarching goal’ are independently evaluated.

Despite the aforementioned pressure on educational development subjects to present ‘technical’ and ‘piecemeal’ solutions (Di Napoli, 2014), a challenge for educational development subjects is to locate the overtly non-neutral functions within the overarching goals; and in light of any discoveries, consider whether the resource still serves its intended specific purpose.

Common educational development practices such as institutionally offered workshops have potential to reinforce managerialism, as these activities can function as a set of compliance measures where the reportable outcome can be easily reduced to a binary of yes/no. It is incredibly difficult for educational development subjects to resist facilitating such events when the field of educational development has defined itself through the provision of professional
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development (Golding, 2014). This almost unavoidable role in supporting managerialism, fosters criticism from teachers that educational development subjects serve as ‘foot soldiers’ for senior management (Manathunga, 2007; Rowland, 2007). For example, Bradley (2010) conducted an ethnographic study with a small group of experienced TAFE teachers in order to learn about their experiences of professional development. She found that there was a real disconnect between what teachers and managers determined to be relevant professional development opportunities and that they were largely isolated from this decision-making process. The teachers believed that managers displayed an "apparent disregard and implied disrespect for the teacher’s professional judgement” (Bradley, 2010, p. 4). A major source of their frustration was being strongly encouraged to attend professional development events that seemed to focus on achieving departmental/institutional objectives with little opportunity for the needs of individuals.

Criticism of professional development events being primarily directed by managerial concerns, solicits educational development subjects to consider designing sessions using an enquiry based approach (Kahn & O’Rourke, 2004) where there is opportunity for teachers to develop solutions through drawing links between their experience and the institutional objectives. The parallel challenge for educational development subjects is to work through these issues with the persons in management positions (who have initially requested the professional development) prior to any facilitation. An available pedagogic tactic is to place emphasis on creating conditions which engender ‘everyday conversation’ (Haigh, 2005) between educational development and management subjects. Such actions are part of an advocacy role argued for by Rowland (2002) where educational development subjects encourage teachers in management positions to consider their educational values when making decisions.

Educational development subjects’ proximity to (and dependence on) management is representative of a terrain which does not appear conducive to a critical approach as advocated by Rowland (2003) and Gosling (2003). For
example, van Hattum-Janssen et al. (2011, p. 41) argued that instrumental approaches such as those outlined earlier are indicative of educational development subjects trying to respond to "urgent and diverse demands, reconcile conflicting values and preserve faculty autonomy". While educational development subjects seemingly occupy a difficult space between managerialism and their own personal understandings (Manathunga, 2007), pedagogies of efficiency which utilise self-regulatory standardised activities and resources can serve to reinforce this tension. The impetus need not be on rejection of such pedagogies, but on first developing the capacity to critique the assumptions which underpin the related evaluative and reporting processes (Bamber & Anderson, 2012). One such enabler for educational development subjects is the adoption of reflexive practice, where subjects examine their basis for "credibility and authority" (Kayrooz et al., 1997, p. 68). Educational development subjects may start this reflexive journey by acknowledging the fragmented nature of their work and identity (Gosling, 2003; Grant, 2007) through questioning whether their sense of credibility is seated in privilege gained through practices which support managerialism.

Opportunities for enquiry – relational power as a stepping stone

The previous discussion of managerialism explored how educational developers work within and simultaneously serve a culture of compliance. This outcome focused culture demands its inhabitants to demonstrate a level of ‘performativity’; which for educational developers rewards the repeated use of generic actions, concepts and strategies (MacKenzie, McShane, & Wilcox, 2007; Rowland, 2007). This disciplined behaviour is a mechanism of power as the acts are seemingly ‘performed’ in the knowledge that they will be visible and accepted by the persons with whom the individual developers deem to be an authority. However, these authorities are not limited to ‘managers’, but the evolving line up of people with whom an individual developer relates. The relationships are complex and thus power within these relationships cannot be
expressed as something owned or as a pyramid which reflects an organisational chart. Foucault (1982, p. 788) described power as "not simply a relationship between partners individual or collective; it is a way in which certain actions modify others".

This web of everyday retaliatory actions (not limited to physical acts) is represented and understood via language/knowledge otherwise referred to as discourse. Some discourses gain a dominant status as ‘a regime of truth’ (Foucault, 1980d) acting as a set of tacit rules, filter or benchmark for determining the legitimacy of a given act or statement. Thus it is through discourse that power is created and maintained (Gosling, 2003). "Power regulates relations not objects, precisely because if power can successfully regulate the relations, it gets the objects for free - there are no neutral or essential objects or persons that somehow exist before power relations" (Nealon, 2008, p. 38). In regards to the topic of this thesis, Foucault’s understanding of power as relational and distributed (Foucault, 1978, 1982) eliminates any possibility for this literature review to reveal a static singular view of agency for educational development subjects. Moreover, it solicits a reconsideration of the educational developer, as the subject is a product of these relationships of power (Foucault, 1978, 1982). Thus, agency is expressed as acts of resistance, resisting who we are constituted as being (positioned) within relationships of power that are operable within discourse (Davies, 1991).

This closing section of the literature review will draw upon a Foucauldian conception of power to contend that a substantial original work intentionally exploring the agency of educational developers as multiple discursively constructed subjects is necessary. The various problems of pedagogical agency that have served as the foci for this literature review are tensions emergent from educational development subjects' constitutive effects emergent from a multitude of discourse. Meanwhile, the literature review has discussed a range of pedagogical acts typically performed by educational development subjects that can serve a disciplinary function. These include:
- Enacting policy directions (e.g. e-learning) which are driven by broad governmental agendas (Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009).
- Promoting and supporting teachers use of technologies (e.g. learning management system) which foster standardised teaching (Conole et al., 2002) and enable surveillance (Land & Bayne, 2001).
- Producing learning resources (e.g. checklists and templates) which can serve a self-regulatory focus for teachers (Land, 2003; Manathunga, 2006).
- Conducting workshops on topics pre-determined by persons not participating (e.g. managers) (Bradley, 2010).

The discursive conditions engendering both educational development pedagogies and conceptions of agency are inevitably localised and momentary. For example, an educational development subject agreeing to facilitate a workshop where s/he has been told what the topic ‘will be’ could temporarily justify the action as a necessary action in order to garner access to work with the group of teachers. In parallel, this determination may have been made with a view that the teacher’s topics of interest are a reflection of the espoused values of management. "The legitimacy of professional development is increased if there is clear institutional support for it, and if high ranking staff make use of centrally organised professional development" (Moses, 1985, p. 81). In this particular example the educational development subject’s conception of agency is being governed by a seemingly rational conception that the success of a pre-structured workshop is governed by the organisational status of the attendees. This conception of agency is reliant arguably upon a juridical conception of power (Foucault, 1978, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) which posits power as an agent oriented possession or right. Juridical power is a right afforded by some form of law or code that can be used to supress or prohibit human actions. Foucault (1978, p. 136) described this form of power in its extremity as ‘the right of death’ where a monarch exercised a right to take life.
Contesting notions of a juridical power, educational development has also been described as a ‘political game’ where the various ‘layers’ present a mix of frustration and opportunity (Peseta, 2014). It is indicative of work where there are significant tensions and apparent contradictions that cannot be simply rationalised using a juridical view of power. An educational development subject may navigate this political game using structural concepts such as organisational location and status complimented by binary modes of rationalisation (e.g. expert / vanguard) already explored in this literature review. However, such conceptions of the field are only entry points for an educational development subject to commence constructing multiple, nuanced, non-static and contradictory understandings of their work which enables them to perform a poststructural form of agency.

As a step toward such a conception, Di Napoli (2014) described this process of navigation as ‘game playing’ where educational development subjects "at all times reposition themselves on the continuum between the two extremes (of compliance and resistance) as the system itself evolves" (Di Napoli, 2014, p. 7). While this continuum seemingly acknowledges the multiplicity of tensions or discourses at play, it is arguably reliant upon a juridical view of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) which posits power as an agent oriented possession. The difficulty of working with an agent-oriented conception of power are emergent in the following passage from Little and Green (2012), reflecting upon a series of semi-structured telephone interviews with 15 educational development subjects:

After soliciting concrete examples of scenarios or ‘tensions’ when developers felt caught between two or more units, we asked them to explain who ‘held the power’ in each interaction to understand better what power dynamics they discerned. Frequently, interviewees struggled with this question until we reframed power as ‘clout’. As anticipated, determining dominance was complicated: often one player might hold literal power (such as financial power or veto rights), while another held symbolic power. (Little & Green, 2012, p. 206)
The term ‘clout’ can be reconceived within a poststructural conceptual framework as a subject locating their multiple discursive positionings. This acknowledgement of dominance as ‘complicated’, is associable with a Foucauldian conception of power as relational (Foucault, 1978, 1980b, 1982). The aforementioned excerpt problematises power as an individually possessed quality, replacing it with a conception that is discursive. Power and agency are not mutually exclusive as there would not be power in a relationship if there was not some element of freedom for each participant (Foucault, 1982). For educational development subjects seeking to construct conceptions of their agency in power relationships, the search to locate dominant discourse is shaped by discourse itself. In effect, discourses limit what "is possible to think and say" (Manathunga, 2014, p. 77). Thus, Popkewitz (1999) argued that we needed to focus on "how the eye sees"; the values which shape individuals’ interpretation of their reality (Popkewitz, 1999, p. 22). Popkewitz’s (1999) call to focus on values has been echoed within the educational development research community by Rowland (2003), Gosling (2003) and Manathunga (2011).

I suggest that all of us in educational development need to become more critical, explicit and self-reflexive about the philosophical, theoretical and methodological assumptions and approaches we bring to our research. (Manathunga, 2011, p. 350)

A decade ago Lee and McWilliam (2008, p. 74) drew upon a Foucauldian conception of power to make a call for educational development subjects to create ‘ironic texts’ where the intent is to not produce grand narratives that articulate a vision of a ‘quality developer’ reliant on the use of traditional binaries and categories. They advocated that the field of educational development (academic development) is ‘ripe for re-description’ through the production of such ironic texts using ‘Self-referential knowledge’, where the emphasis is on examining the ‘taken for granted’ knowledge that subjects utilise in order to conceptualise themselves. In regards to research examining the pedagogical agency of educational development subjects, there is a small array of 'ironic texts' (Di Napoli, 2014; Roxå & Mårtensson, 2016; Saroyan, 2014) that
have been guided by epistemological stances which leverage critiques of
universalism and foundationalism. There is an opportunity to extend and
problematisse contentions made in these important works, through examining
the interplay between agency and pedagogy while working with a conception of
the educational developer as multiple discursively constituted subjects.
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Introduction

In chapter 2 – Conceptual Framework as a fractured lens I articulated a conceptual framework for this postfoundational thesis which largely draws on a Foucauldian conception of poststructural thought. The label postfoundational was used to contend that there is no ultimate reality to be understood, all knowledge is contestable and truths are a product of discourse (Lather, 2006). I initially situated the thesis as being informed by three common critiques (Parkes et al., 2010) commonly labelled as poststructuralist. These include a rejection of grand narratives (universalism), acknowledgement of the reader as an author (foundationalism), and the erasure of the individual replaced by the fluid subject (essentialism). In direct response to the research question, I drew upon the work of Foucault (Foucault, 1982, 1998) to articulate a conceptual framework where knowledge constitutes subjects as a product of discourse and as an effect of power (Foucault, 1980c).

The conceptual framework is reliant on a Foucauldian conception of power as relational, dependent on discursive space featuring two or more forces; where the exercise of power can be described as a set of ‘possible’ actions in response to prior actions (Foucault, 1982). It solicits a re-conceptualisation of agency as the capacity to resist through identifying and utilizing the multiple readings of self within a given historically situated discourse (Davies, 2010; Davies & Gannon, 2005). This thesis is primarily invested in exploring how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is emergent from a multitude of subjectivities.

This chapter will explore the methodological implications for this conceptual framework, followed by a rationale for the subsequent methodological decisions used to explore the thesis question:

How can discourses of agency shape the pedagogy of educational development subjects in TAFE e-learning relationships?
Navigating discursive terrains

“There is no such thing as ‘getting it right’, only ‘getting it’ differently contoured and nuanced.” (Richardson, 2000, p. 521)

The aforementioned conceptual framework can be read as a series of aspirational grand narratives if the reader views the methodological decisions contained in this thesis as not embodying poststructural critiques of universalism, essentialism, and foundationalism (Parkes et al., 2010), and the Foucauldian notion of power as relational (Foucault, 1982). The direct implications for this thesis are that there is no capacity to claim that the observations discovered through this research are generalizable; the role of the researcher as objective observer is reduced to a myth; and the self is understood as a series of historically situated discursive constructs (subjects).

The term ‘crisis of representation’ is commonly used within research where the conceptual framework is informed by poststructural thought, as a means to express the epistemological incapacity to directly capture individual’s lived experience (Denzin, 1994). Poststructural theories question the objectivity and individuality of what is written, given that these words come from somewhere (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) and are subsequently read/re-written within a particular historical moment, within a multitude of discourse. This crisis of representation is encapsulated in Lather’s (1992, p. 88) description of educational research informed by poststructural thought, as an endeavor "to produce an awareness of the complexity, historical contingency, and fragility of the practices we invent to discover the truth about ourselves." This invention of practices is made visible in discourse and is an effect of power (Foucault, 1980c). The crisis of representation read within the context of poststructural thought elicits a methodological approach which is not seeking to unearth a series of foundational truths (Lather, 1993), or to explain these truths using the label of individual experience, but to draw upon an anti-foundational stance as the basis
to problematize the capacity for language to serve a singular function of capturing truths.

This process of decentering language is enacted through examining the relationships between knowledge and power made visible through various discourse. In the case of this thesis, it is about locating and problematizing the conditions which incite common practices and knowledge to be dominant within educational development discourse. These conditions are visible in the discursive terrain of language and actions which serve as representations written, read and re-written during the process of doing research, typically referred to as ‘data’. Given the anti-universalist position stated in the conceptual framework, it is a pragmatic approach to study the discursive terrain, instead of focusing solely on producing or re-purposing fixed explanations. The purpose is to describe how sense is being made, as opposed to solely discovering or describing objects or actions (Davies, 2004). Examining the workings of the discursive terrain, rather than independent objects, ensures that there is no final word that can be produced which is free from the capacity for further critique in relation to readings of power and representation (Miller et al., 2005). The explanations and insights presented in this thesis can be made without an intention of carrying the naive burden of being generalizable in a gamut of contexts. Moreover, the thesis can serve a pedagogical purpose through modelling ways for educational development subjects to examine their multiple discursive positionings and examine how these positionings may govern their pedagogical rationalisations and acts.

**An uncomfortable reflexivity**

This conceptual framework elicits a reflexive research methodology, as the emphasis of the research is on examining the workings of a discursive terrain that make certain actions desirable. It is a task which cannot be performed through objective observation. Poststructural thought situates the researcher as the discursively constructed subject whose transmitted words are written into
various discourse by the reader (Davies, 2004). As the conceptual framework is focused on the examination of the interplay between discourse, knowledge and power, it is a call to look at the effects of discourse on us, and the ways in which it also operates through us (Davies, 2010). It reflects a Foucauldian concept of power that is productive (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) read in parallel with the notion of the ‘death of the author’ (Barthes, 1977) where the role of the reader is viewed as productive in the construction of knowledge. There is no capacity to objectively separate the individual from society and the researcher should not be awarded an exemption. The objective researcher guided by modernist ideals is placed under erasure (Lather, 1992) in a world where language creates (not reflects) social reality (Richardson, 2000). Without possibility for objective observation the researcher is reflexive; not through choice, but through necessity (Davies et al., 2004).

Reflexivity conceptualized within a poststructuralist conceptual framework is an acknowledgement that the researcher is writing from/within different discursive positions at different times (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005). It is a form of uncomfortable reflexivity (Pillow, 2003) where the aim is to represent the self as multiple and conduct an examination of how these multiple selves may have been discursively constructed through workings of power (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). The emphasis is on examining ‘how’ we claim to know (Visweswaran, 1994), as opposed to using the presence of voice as a means to legitimize the representation of what we know (Pillow, 2003). Examining self as multiple is a key means of making a poststructuralist conception of agency visible:

> It is in looking at what is found when one gazes at oneself as constituted subject and the means of its constitution that the details may be found that enable researchers to recognize and (at least momentarily) break out of the oppressive determinate structures and practices through which those selves are constituted and made real. (Davies et al., 2004, p. 368)

The aforementioned extract succinctly articulates the purpose of the autoethnographic chapters which constitute approximately half of the overall
thesis. The crisis of representation is enacted through a form of reflexivity where the knowing ‘I’ is placed under erasure (Denzin, 2014; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008) and replaced by a conceptualisation of the researcher as a fluid discursively constructed/positioned subject. It engenders the use of a reflexive methodological approach where the researcher openly examines how their multiple-self is playing a role in shaping the insights presented within the thesis. These insights are tenuously presented from a position that there is no end point, only pauses featuring further questions and conflicting positions.

**A theoretical and methodological bricolage**

The conceptual framework provided a reading of various theoretical perspectives placed under a banner of Foucauldian poststructuralism. The common orientations/critiques (Parkes et al., 2010) that were used to unpack this banner elicit a rethink of the traditional line between theory and method (Foucault & Deleuze, 1977). This separation can be read as a situated historical construct, reflective of a positivist compartmentalization of philosophy and science (St. Pierre, 2014). Consequently, it is problematic for me to present this chapter as an opportunity to lay out a series of processes that I will follow in order to collect, categorise and analyse a series of data. Instead, this chapter articulates how I have grappled with an intersection of theory and method, or a seemingly inherent urge to reconcile ‘multiplicity’, both theoretically and methodologically. I am consequently using the term ‘bricolage’ to describe the theoretical and methodological approach employed in this research.

The term ‘bricolage’ is a French term commonly used to describe one person’s improvisational actions in the context of building or adapting something. Within the social sciences, the term was popularized by anthropologist Lévi-Strauss (1966, p. 11) who described the ‘bricoleur’, as someone (i.e. researcher) who will always make do with "whatever is at hand". This succinct description of bricolage can be read as one which situates research as a series of tactical responses performed within a given social context working toward an inferred pre-
determined destination. When we consider this description cognizant of an erasure of the knowing ‘I’ (Denzin, 2014; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008), these tactical responses are informed by available discourse which is historically situated, multiple and fluid.

If one calls bricolage the necessity of borrowing one's concept from the text of a heritage which is more or less coherent or ruined, it must be said that every discourse is bricoleur. (Derrida, 1978)

Derrida’s appropriation of the term bricolage elicits consideration of discourse as being reliant on multiple sources of input. One way of expressing these multiple sources of input is to utilize his concept of Différance (Derrida, 1978) to emphasize the inherent space between conceptions of meaning generated by a web of writer(s), reader(s) and writer(s) and so on. Each subject in this web is historically deferred from one another enabling discourse to simultaneously shift and solidify. The emphasis on knowledge being non-static, made visible through discourse places a question mark on the capacity for a single pre-described method to be applied lock-step like a cooking recipe in search of a destination which is replicable.

An association of bricolage with multiplicity was picked up by Denzin and Lincoln (2011) who drew on the metaphor of a ‘montage’ to argue that the inherent complexity of social science research engenders the use of multiple theoretical perspectives and methods to sense-make (do analysis). As a means to illustrate the multiplicity, they proposed the personas of ‘theoretical’ and ‘methodological’ bricoleurs within a broader selection of persona-like classifications including the ‘interpretive’, ‘narrative’, and ‘political’ bricoleurs. Each of these personas are reliant on the researcher using a multitude of the characteristic that is named in the persona title. For this thesis, I have articulated a conceptual framework drawing on an assortment of orientations or critiques shared by theorists labeled as poststructural (Parkes et al., 2010). Whilst I have drawn largely on selections of Foucauldian theory (Foucault, 1972, 1979, 1982), I have situated this work in relation to an assortment of writers who have been influenced by (or who have influenced) his work. Concepts such as discourse,
power and agency are non-static throughout Foucault’s works, particularly when they are read in recognition of différence or the death of the author. The shift in meaning is then magnified when I have re-read these concepts through other writer’s work, which have subsequently informed my conception of Foucault’s theories. The conceptual framework is inevitably a theoretical bricolage; despite any naive attempt I may have made at trying to solidify a collection of theoretical perspectives labelled under a banner of Foucauldian poststructuralism.

There is an unavoidable tension in attempting to work with multiple theories and acknowledge this multiplicity in a reflexive manner (where the performative ‘I’ is under erasure), when theory is viewed as separate and situated exclusively as a one-time informant to analysis/sense making. In simplest terms, a bricolage of theory informs the initial selection/formation of method(s), which (when applied) is informed by theory, which (when theory applied) becomes a go to point to chart the next methodological decision. And so the story continues.

Jackson and Mazzei (2012) drawing on the work of Deleuze and Guattari (2001), coined the approach ‘plugging in’ as a means of explicitly working with multiple theoretical perspectives in order to disturb this artificial binary and the modernist linear relationship between theory and method. This flattening of binaries enables a form of reflexivity where the evolving ongoing intersection between theory and method is made visible. It is an attempt at resisting the work being positioned as linear where the conceptual/theoretical framework is an entity in itself, situated solely as a pre-analysis stage. The researcher ‘plugs theory in’ by sense-making or re-reading the text/data with a particular theoretical perspective. The researcher gradually moves from one theoretical perspective to another, informed by the sense-making that has occurred in each previous reading. There is no attempt to homogenize the reading of the data as being a result of the pre-conceived theoretical framework via the production of one sense-making narrative. Moreover, it is a means of using theory to support an emergent codification as opposed to a traditional exercise of codification that occurs prior to sense-making. Plugging data in (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) is extremely relevant to this research as it is an attempt at transgressing the
traditional divide of theory and method, and it utilises multiple theoretical perspectives in a manner that enables complexity to emerge and not be resolvable.

In contrast to Jackson and Mazzei (2012), I have not explicitly engaged with individual theorist’s ideas as individual layers or folds to plug in during sense-making (analysis). I have performed the sense making of each auto-ethnographic chapter through conducting two different readings. The first was through reading with the poststructural critiques and the second with an assortment of Foucauldian theoretical concepts. This approach sits in a space somewhere between the lock step linearity of theory-informing-method, and that of plugging theory in as presented by Jackson and Mazzei (2012).

Guided by a research question which is looking at agency as a discourse, I initially relied upon various re-writings of Foucault and contemporaries such as Derrida and Kristeva, from Lather (2003), Davies (2010), Britzman (1995), Maclure (2006), Richardson (2000), St. Pierre (2000) and Jackson and Mazzei (2012) to construct a conception of human agency within a broad discourse of poststructuralist thought. The conceptual framework became the first space for ‘plugging theory in’, where the multiple re-writings of Foucault enabled me to assemble a bricolage of interconnected theories. Assembling these re-readings at the stage of writing a conceptual framework and using it to perform a first sense-making read of the data, served as my means of making do with what is at hand. The second stage of sense-making could be described as building a theoretical bricolage drawing on the major works of Foucault on knowledge, power and subjectivity. I am specifically using the term ‘bricolage’ to acknowledge the high degree of malleability that was applied to a selection of Foucault’s concepts as a means to perform auto-ethnographic sense-making. Theoretical concepts were selected as a means to read the auto-ethnographic text in relation to the given problem of pedagogical agency. The given concept was used for a period of time that extended as long as I was able to continue re-writing the auto-ethnographic text. This method for auto-ethnographic sense-making is explained in detail later in the section ‘Sense-making – the discourse
Locating a methodological starting point

The thesis positioned as a methodological bricolage reflects the iterative development of a conceptual framework throughout the candidature period. As the conceptual framework has been incrementally refined, it has engendered incremental critique of the relationships between theory, the research question, and the existing methodological decisions. Higgins, Madden, Berard, Lenz Kothe, and Nordstrom (2016) use the metaphorical binary of (pre)tailoring vs patch-working to express the type of tension that I felt where I couldn’t see how I would be able to conduct the research in a linear manner using a sequence of fixed methodological components. This thesis quickly evolved from one of (pre)tailoring to one dominated by patch-working. Richardson (2000) drew upon a poststructural view of subjectivity as non-static and objectivity as contestable, to contend that there is a continual co-creation of self and social science; and that a researcher’s capacity to work with and within social science is dependent on their understandings of self and vice versa. This conception of the researcher as a discursively constituted subject engenders a blurring of the line between data and analysis, and it also highlights the interdependence between research method and analysis (Higgs & McAllister, 2001). It was this rationale which initially drew me to produce a thesis which relies heavily on the use of words I had written; about occurrences I had been involved in. Writing as a method of enquiry was my methodological starting point.

Writing as a method of enquiry – a product and process

Writing as a method of enquiry (Richardson, 2000) blurs compartmentalisation of writing passages of text (commonly referred to as data) and performing analysis. As the researcher writes about past events, s/he is performing analysis (Duncan, 2004). The method is no longer conceived as the technique/process of
collecting and gathering data that is to be completed prior to any performing of analysis.

The practice of writing poststructuralist texts is not simple reporting since the writing itself is understood as a constitutive act, as is the collection and analysis of data. (Davies & Gannon, 2005)

Writing as a method of enquiry is typically associated with auto-ethnographic writing as it is both a product and process (Ellis et al., 2011). Writing as a method of enquiry expressed as an assimilation of product and process is noteworthy, as it is easy to explain its impact through the co-occupation of researcher and research subject in auto-ethnographic writing. The social science researcher is always present (Richardson, 2000) in any research endeavor, irrespective of any attempt to claim otherwise. One means of acknowledging this immovable presence is for the researcher to declare a position of interpretive observer. In such a declaration, the researcher is typically engaged in a ‘dance’ with the data where they are moving between a subjective and objective vantage point to make sense of what is observed, written and represented (Higgs & McAllister, 2001). It is a dance that is performed irrespective of whether the roles of researcher and research subject are co-occupied. When the researcher is working within a poststructuralist conceptual framework there is a dismissal of the capacity for a researcher to perform such a dance, as objectivity is outright rejected and subjectivity is not a singular concept. Thus, writing as a method of enquiry is not being used to justify a co-occupation of researcher and research subject. This ethos is being used to emphasize the iterative process of analysis that has informed both the journal passages (nominal data) and sense-making passages (nominal analysis).

The auto-ethnographic chapters are a collection of five discourse analyses each written in response to a different problem of pedagogical agency. Each of these chapters utilises extracts from a reflective journal that I wrote over the course of a year, whilst working as an educational development subject in a Victorian TAFE. This journal is the initial analysis of pedagogical actions I performed as an educational development subject working with a group of TAFE teaching
subjects to develop their capacity to facilitate e-learning related peer learning. These vignettes included emails I had written to myself, short passages via pen and pencil in an exercise book and crafted reflections I had made via an online blog (that I was writing at this time). In early 2014 I re-read this assemblage of reflective vignettes and subsequently collated them chronologically into a sole word document of approximately 50,000 words. The journal read as a single document and could now function as a linear reflective narrative. The remainder of this section will endeavour to explain how this journal as both a form of initial analysis and data has been used to inform the production of five auto-ethnographic chapters.

**Distinguishing auto-ethnography from traditional ethnography**

Auto-ethnography is typically described as a methodological approach where the researcher is trying to understand a culture through analyzing their own personal experience within the nominated culture (Ellis et al., 2011). Auto-ethnography is initially distinguishable from ethnography through emphasizing the dual role of researcher and research subject. These texts are typically written in the first person (Ellis & Bochner, 2000) as a means of acknowledging the researcher/subject dual role and offering the reader a window of intimacy and immediacy, not normally present in research endeavors that claim objectivity (Ellis, 2004). When we consider a poststructural conceptual framework which places skepticism on claims for objectivity (Lather, 1991), this apparent binary of other (ethnography) and self (auto-ethnography) is contestable as the traditional ethnographer is generally awarded some form of insider status in order to analyze the nominated cultural context (Duncan, 2004). This blurring of polarity between ‘other’ and ‘self’ engenders critique of traditional ethnography, as an attempt at silencing the author’s voice (Holt, 2003), where the researcher is resisting a role as ‘contaminant’ (Richardson, 2000) in order to maintain a form of scientific authority (Clough, 2000) where the subject is constituted by the
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researcher (Gannon, 2006).

**Auto-ethnography – tentatively embracing the evocative**

Auto-ethnography is typically practiced through the production of ‘narrative expressions’ (Denzin, 2014) which are written by the researcher reflecting on or recounting their experience within a culture. These ‘narrative expressions’ are both retrospective and selective recounts which initially enable parallels to be drawn between auto-ethnography and auto-biographical work (de Freitas & Paton, 2008). However, auto-ethnography works beyond the personal, as these narrative expressions are typically situated in a cultural context that is explained through openly working within a set of epistemological assumptions (Ellis et al., 2011). One way of classifying the extent of personal vs social in the auto-ethnographic text is to utilize the binary of evocative and analytical (Ellis & Bochner, 2006). At one end, an evocative auto-ethnography places the experience of the researcher as research subject at the center of sense making; while at the opposite end an analytical auto-ethnography acknowledges the role of the researcher as participant examining a social setting drawing using an ethnographic realist stance (Anderson, 2006). An ethnographic realist conceptualises a separation of researcher with sociocultural structures, processes, and instances (Lewis-Beck, Bryman, & Futing Liao, 2004), whereby not reliant upon an anti-foundationalist critique common to poststructural thought (Denzin, 2006). In contrast, the evocative auto-ethnographer typically employs a writing device or technique to problematise or work across the fact-fiction dichotomy (Denshire, 2013). It serves as an acknowledgement of an anti-foundational position positing truth claims as being historical and discursive (Brinkmann, 2012). Such writing devices or techniques are often used as a consequence of the researcher drawing upon literary theories to construct a text which can be read beyond the confines of an academic discipline (Denshire, 2013). In order to garner an evocative response from readers, these auto-
ethnographies typically position presence and experience as elements which are inherently operable in the creation of meaning (Denzin, 2014).

Consequently, the significance of ‘auto’ swiftly moves beyond researcher as research subject, toward an emphasis being placed on the reflexive intention of the research (Duncan, 2004). When the researcher is considered a singular agent speaking for one’s self, it could be read that this emphasis on reflexivity is a call for transparency. Such a call engenders the reading of auto-ethnographic texts as confessional tales, where the use of ‘I’ and the present tense exert a sense of vulnerability in the writer’s voice (de Freitas & Paton, 2008). This criticism of auto-ethnographic texts derives from a poststructural anti-essentialist conception of subjectivity, where a person is multiple discursive subjects constituted in multiple discourse. Davies et al. (2004) describe a poststructural reflexivity as a type of ‘critical literacy’ where the researcher acknowledges that the words they write have the potential to operate within multiple discourse, where readings of the text (they have written) will inevitably (re)constitute people (including themselves) as multiple contradictory discursive subjects. In regards to the auto-ethnographer, this description of reflexivity can be read as an acknowledgement of the paradox in aiming to capture or represent the self, whilst knowing that there is no ‘stable’ self to write (Kaufmann, 2011).

A deconstructive auto-ethnography

A deconstructive auto-ethnography is an attempt at placing presence and experience under erasure (Denzin, 2014; Gannon, 2006; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008) and examining the discursive multiplicity of subjectivity. Whilst the ‘deconstructive’ tag could infer that it is a Derridean approach, it can be broadly applied to a post-structural influenced conceptual framework where people exist as subjects in multiple discourse. This approach requires the researcher to analyse/explore how their subjectivity is an effect of multiple discourse which are historically non-static, complex and inherently contradictory. Gannon (2006) links this form of auto-ethnography to Foucault’s (1997a) description of the
ancient Greek practice ‘care of the self’, where writing is used as a means of continually re-examining and refining ones actions as an ethical subject.

I think the postulate of this whole morality was that a person who took proper care of himself would, by the same token, be able to conduct himself properly in relation to others and for others. (Foucault, 1997a, p. 287)

Gannon’s (2006) association between the practice of ‘care of the self’ and deconstructive auto-ethnography posits the researcher as research-subject modelling a form of post-structural agency. This is enacted by the deconstructive auto-ethnographer charting the ‘dispersal’ (Gannon, 2018) of subjectivities emergent from their engagement in a cultural setting as researcher/research subject. The deconstructive auto-ethnographer views their situated interactions as an individual under erasure, problematising the singular unified human subject (I) as multiple discursive subjects (Gannon, 2006; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008). This practice is a form of uncomfortable reflexivity (Pillow, 2003), where the researcher is constructing an image of the ways in which language is constituting a multitude of subjects within a given cultural context (Davies et al., 2004). There is an inevitable tension for the deconstructive auto-ethnographer representing their experiences under the day to day fiction of a unified singular human subject using the pronoun ‘I’ (Gannon, 2006; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008).

Gannon (2018, p. 23) contends that this notion of singularity be redirected from the subject, toward the ‘moment’. This re-direction enables the auto-ethnographer to be seemingly writing about the same thing as different subjects constituted at different moments. Whilst these momentary representations of experience are subjected to critique via discourse analysis performed at a later stage of sense-making, there is a need to articulate the conditions that the auto-ethnographic subject may work within at the point of textual conception.

Foucault’s (1983) re-interpretation of the Greco-Roman term ‘parrhesia’ as a form of candid free speaking, offers a set of conditions or ethos of sorts for the research subject to initially represent an analysis of their experiences. Parrhesia is a form of ‘care for the self’ in that the focus is on the parrhesiastes (person
practising parrhesia) demonstrating a set of moral qualities which enable others to accept that s/he is providing a credible or truthful account (Peters, 2003). For the auto-ethnographic subject to be considered the parrhesiates, s/he must first make it clearly understood by others that they are stating their opinion of which they are the subject. Secondly, the parrhesiates is knowingly placing themselves at risk by telling truths which may be counter to normative discourse that can ultimately result in having an adverse effect on their career or health. Thirdly, these truths must be presented as critique to a defined group or individuals with whom have the capacity to inflict adverse effects on the parrhesiates. Finally, the parrhesiates must view that they have a duty to construct and deliver this critique as they are intended to serve a greater good (Foucault, 1997b). Parrhesia as a form of active critique is both epistemological and ontological, as there is emphasis placed both on the modes of thought and the practices made possible through these modes of thought (Adams St. Pierre, 2014).

The utility of ‘parrhesia’ in the practice of deconstructive auto-ethnography is that it enables an acknowledgment of the interconnectedness between one’s intentions, actions and qualities, as opposed to solely trying to examine the actual truth claims made by the individual. The construction and communication of truth claims recorded in parrhesian textual passages are later examined via a discourse analysis which problematises the notion of a unified self. In this thesis, the parrhesian text are journal passages I wrote whilst working as a neophyte educational development subject in a Victorian TAFE in 2009. The aforementioned use of parrhesia to articulate an ethos for documenting the auto-ethnographic account can be read as separating deconstructive auto-ethnography into two stages of provisional (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008) subjectivity and dispersed (Gannon, 2018) subjectivities. It is simply an attempt at articulating how the post-structural auto-ethnographer may initially represent experiences under the fiction of a singular subject and then commence problematizing self as a multiplicity through performing a discourse analysis thinking with a plethora of theory. Throughout both these stages of auto-
ethnographic work the researcher as research subject is writing as a method of enquiry (Richardson, 2000).

One of the ideals of a deconstructive auto-ethnographic approach is to resist reconciling the multiplicity of self (Gannon, 2006; Kaufmann, 2011). This ideal arguably engenders a non-linear aesthetic or style where the text is being used to represent more than one actor/author. It is typically performed as a means of reducing capacity for the text to be read as a realist self-narrative where the reader can easily assume that the subject is singular and has access to a form of objective human agency (Davies et al., 2004). In response, the parrhesian text is visually differentiated from the sense making elements through the use of alternate fonts, indents and spacing. Moreover, each chapter uses a different problem of pedagogical agency as the discursive field to examine the research question. This is structured as such to reduce the capacity for each chapter serving as the progressive conceptualisation of a single or dominant subjectivity.

Even when, after the deconstruction of the authority of the ethnographic realism, the ethnographer produces a more self-conscious text, the text produced is a text. It still refers; it still incites and fulfils the desire for reference to a reality outside the text, As such, it is still open to further deconstruction. (Clough, 2000, p. 161)

While the use of a non-linear sequence reinforced by a range of aesthetic devices is an attempt at resisting the self being reconciled, these can only be viewed as techniques to engender, not ensure an intended outcome of multiplicity. These techniques only serve as the entrée or veneer of a sense making endeavour where the auto-ethnographer is applying the aforementioned poststructural conceptual framework.

**Sense making – the discourse analysis**

To this point I have articulated how a deconstructive auto-ethnography can be crudely presented as a dichotomy of representing a singular subjectivity using
the ideals of ‘parrhesia’ (Foucault, 1983) followed by an exploration of the multiplicity of subjectivity through some form of discourse analysis. It is a means of explaining how this particular deconstructive auto-ethnography can provide evocative moments (Ellis & Bochner, 2006) where the representation of experience using the pronoun ‘I’ is a ‘provisional strategy’ (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008, p. 304) for enabling the enactment of a form of poststructural agency where the individual locates multiple discursive constitutions of self (Davies, 1991). The constant throughout has been an ethos of writing as a method of enquiry (Richardson, 2000), where analysis is iterative.

I am now going to explain how I conducted the discourse analysis, which I have labelled as the sense-making exercise. This exercise commenced with a stage of coding or associating parrhesian excerpts from the journal with each of the pedagogical problems of agency emergent from the literature review. It continued with a stage of speculative analysis by thinking with the three common poststructural critiques of foundationalism, universalism and essentialism (Parkes et al., 2010) to write passages of sense-making text between individual journal excerpts. The sense making concluded with a third stage of re-writing each auto-ethnographic chapter, thinking with a scattering of theoretical concepts situated across Foucault’s triple historical ontology (Deleuze, 2006) with axes of knowledge, power and ethics/self (Foucault, 1984b). The remainder of this chapter will outline how the sense making was performed at each of these three stages.

**Stage 1 - Associating parrhesian text with problems of pedagogical agency**

The literature review in chapter 4 ‘Academic development as a substitute’ was structured using various problems of pedagogical agency that were operable in the literature. I commenced the sense-making by using these problems of pedagogical agency as the initial point of reference for re-reading the journal. After uploading the journal into the ‘NVivo’ qualitative data software package, I initially associated passages of parrhesian text with one or more of the pre-
identified pedagogical problems of agency. Subsequent re-reads of the journal were used to construct further associations between extracts of parrhesian text and binary-esque divisions used to classify and rationalise educational development pedagogy. This process could have been replicated using multiple hard copies of the journal and physically cutting the passages into individual segments and then physically arranging them on the floor. The software simply removed reliance on a photocopier and the need to occupy a large physical floor space.

The data was now read in a non-linear manner, where the journal extracts associated with each pedagogical problem and binary-esque classification/rationalisation were each read as individual narratives. As many passages of journal text were operable in multiple discourse, this read of the journal was notably longer. Various interrelationalities (Ellsworth, 2005) emerged through re-reading single journal extracts as part of multiple narratives. I consequently opted to commence working with five problems of pedagogical agency. These served as the starting points for providing five differing perspectives on how educational development pedagogy is governed by an educational development subject's local and momentary conceptions of agency.

The five discourse as pedagogical problems of agency were:

1. Contestation – pedagogy emergent from an educational development subject being solicited to define their role.

2. Marginalisation - pedagogy emergent from an educational development subject navigating a problem of being excluded or outside of pedagogic decision making.

3. E-learning as a product - pedagogy emergent from an educational development subject navigating a product-based conception of e-learning.

4. Compliance - pedagogy emergent from an educational development subject navigating a problem of engendering and being marked by a status of compliance.
5. Pedagogy as generic - pedagogy emergent from an educational development subject navigating a problem of pedagogy conceptualised as a set of generalised techniques.

**Stage 2 - The speculative analysis through thinking with three poststructural critiques**

The second stage of sense-making focused on constructing a new narrative which provided a speculative analysis of the interrelationality between each of the journal extracts associated with a respective pedagogical problem of agency. The sequencing of journal extracts and analysis of their relation to one another within the respective discursive field, was guided by a synthesis of poststructural discourse comprising critiques of foundationalism, universalism and essentialism (Parkes et al., 2010). As a means of re-applying an ethos of writing as a method of inquiry (Richardson, 2000), I thought with the aforementioned poststructural critiques to author sections of sense-making text between each journal extract. This work was performed using a word processor while referencing the original journal and a separate document for each problem of pedagogical agency. The ‘NVivo’ software automatically labelled each excerpt at the time of exporting a physical document, and this enabled me to easily locate each excerpt’s origin within the overall journal. Both of these documents were printed as hard copies, while I typed directly into a word processor and made no further use of the NVivo software. The journal enabled me to re-read each excerpt in situ so that I could view the text in relation to a unified self and juxtapose this with the reading that emerged through viewing the text excerpt in relation to a specific discursive field.

I drew upon Derrida’s (1978) concept of Différence as a means to firstly, engender a cautionary reading of the journal excerpts where there is an understanding that what is written is historically momentary; and to secondly create spaces for contestation of meaning through repeated intertextual conceptualizations of phrases and actions in different discourse. The intent was
to decenter textual meaning through looking for the associative meanings that are often unsaid, but operable in the construction of meaning. Often referred to as ‘the trace’, Jackson and Mazzei (2012, p. 21) describe it as "the absence presence of sometimes imperceptible imprints on our words and their meanings before we speak or write them". Reading each journal excerpt in relation to one another, I constructed textual binary oppositions as a concrete means to speculate about the absent presences at play. The binary opposites were created by either locating an opposition to a signifier in the journal, or through drawing on my knowledge of the educational development field and/or the Victorian TAFE landscape (articulated in the literature review and historical background) to construct one. Each binary opposition was initially viewed as two opposite entities, to be gradually conceived of as polar opposites along a momentary discursive spectrum or horizontal plane. The use of binary oppositions to visualize Différance, enabled me to problematize the singularity of the language within the journal.

Articulating the absent presence was a tactic to locate two or more forces in a Foucauldian conception of relational power (Foucault, 1978, 1980b, 1982) and demonstrate how the seemingly static meaning associated with each opposite/force, is highly contingent on the intersections of multiple discourse. I was able to locate or create binary opposites for recurring reflective statements and normative pedagogical acts. This collection of binary opposites (featuring repetitious reflective statements and pedagogic acts) were used to start articulating subjectivities or discursive positionings (Davies & Harré, 1990) which were operable within the given discourse. These emerging subjectivities were often conceptualized as a series of binary oppositions so that their utility within the discourse could be easily articulated. The rationale was that by being able to articulate what a subject is seemingly ‘not’ or ‘unable to be’, that it would serve as a leverage point to identify rules for producing the statements in the discourse(s).
Stage 3 - Sense making through thinking with Foucault (and Spivak).

To this point there were five separate sense making chapters that each explored how an educational development subject navigated a different problem of pedagogical agency. Within each chapter there was a form of speculative analysis visible in the sequencing of journal extracts bound by passages of sense making text. In the third and final stage of sense-making I re-imagined each of these auto-ethnographic chapters by explicitly thinking with Foucault's triple historical ontology of knowledge-power-self (Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1984b). Knowledge-Power-Self is often used to denote or differentiate three elements, periods or areas of Foucault's work. In this thesis I am using these three axes as a means of conceptualising how subjectivity is emergent from the ongoing interplay between the construction and use of 'knowledge' (Foucault, 1972, 1980a), relational 'power' (Foucault, 1978, 1980b, 1982) and an ethical relationship to 'self' (Foucault, 1982, 1992, 1997c).

The axes of knowledge-power-self almost always served as the points of entry for re-imagining each of the auto-ethnographic chapters and these are each articulated in greater depth in the section below. The exception to using knowledge-power-self was in the first half of chapter 7 which explored a problem of pedagogical agency related to notions of marginalisation. At this point I commenced thinking with Spivak's (1990) concept of marginality to destabilise an educational development subject's conceptions of being structurally outside and subordinate based on an assumed identity as an 'educational developer'. A Spivakian view of marginality problematises the 'marginal' status of a seemingly fixed role or identity category on the basis that it requires some form of validation by individuals that are characterisable as occupying the 'centre' (Spivak, 1993, p. 61). This conception of marginality solicits a reflexive examination of the knowledge and practices operable at an idealised centre, that the educational development subject as 'marginal' inadvertently utilises or leverages in order to maintain a discursive positioning as marginal.
Thinking with an axis of knowledge

Thinking with an axis of knowledge (Foucault, 1972, 1980a), I was concerned with the function of discursive objects. These are typically behaviours, actions or processes which emerge as classifiable 'objects' of knowledge, by effect of their changing relation to a set of societal norms. Through referring to these objects of discourse as 'statements', emphasis was placed on the 'enunciative function' that a phrase or proposition (as a statement) serves within a given discursive field. The enunciative function (Foucault, 1972, p. 88) refers to the conditions of existence, subject-positions, associated fields and materiality of statements within a particular socio-historical context. It leverages a practice-based non-grammatical conception of discourse, whereby statements are understood through their relations to other statements within a given discursive formation.

I drew upon various methodological tools from Foucault's (1972) 'Formation of Objects' section in The Archaeology of Knowledge to visualise conditions by which discursive objects such as educational development and e-learning emerge for the neophyte educational development subject. The intention was to gradually visualise how these discursive objects are the historically contingent effect of a field of multiple statements. This was performed by first exploring the 'margins of tolerance' (Foucault, 1972, p. 41) and 'fields of initial differentiation' (Foucault, 1972, p. 41) for the object at the various surfaces of its emergence (Foucault, 1972, p. 40). The 'surfaces of emergence' are the pre-existing discursive fields where an object first appears. These are typically social locations, groups or sub-cultures where various knowledges or assumptions are able to emerge and solidify. Working within the context of an auto-ethnography, I have re-positioned these surfaces of emergence as the neophyte educational development subject’s initial relation with a legal or formal artefact articulating the function and purpose of a discursive object.

---

14 Neophyte is used here to place emphasis on the subject being new to the field/role of educational development.
A margin of tolerance refers to the means by which an object is defined by what it is a reaction against or rejection of. These differences and breaks in continuity serve as 'fields of initial differentiation' which enable the denotation of a discursive object in a given context. For each emergent statement I then proceeded to establish the 'authorities of delimitation' (Foucault, 1972, pp. 41-42) as the accepted institutions, groups or subjects defining and categorising the discursive object. Through examining relationships between each authority of delimitation and the established points of initial differentiation, I then attempted to visualise a 'grid of specification' (Foucault, 1972, p. 42) as the multitude of rules or differentiations that are used to structure and classify the discursive object.

**Thinking with an axis of power**

I thought with an axis of 'power' at moments throughout the sense-making to examine how an educational development subject’s interaction with teaching and management subjects was governed by available knowledges, and how the exertion of force within these interactions constitute local knowledges. Throughout the sense-making I used two conceptions of relational power to examine the interplay of knowledge-power in the pedagogies of an educational development subject.

The first conception was Foucault's (1980e, pp. 93-94) power-right-truth triangle which posits power as the conduit between 'rules of right' and 'effects of truth'. Rules of right' are the socio-historical specifications of power visible in formal instruments such as rules, contracts and socio-structural status. Effects of truth are knowledge claims that can be made through leveraging such formalised classifications of power. The re-application of the rules of right subsequently solicit re-consideration of the ‘rules of right’. The power-right-truth triangle was utilised at various points throughout the sense-making to examine how an educational development subject's pedagogical rationalisations and acts are
governed by the use of formal structures in day to day interactions with teaching and management subjects.

The second conception of relational power utilised throughout the sense-making exercise was the tactical productivity and strategical integration couplet (Foucault, 1978, p. 102). Tactical productivity refers to the effects of power-knowledge emergent from the exertion of force, while strategical integration refers to the conditions of knowledge-power which have solicited an exertion of force. The couplet served as an accessible means to visualise how power functions as a chain (Foucault, 1980e) of possible actions upon actions. It enabled me to visualise a 'system of differentiations' (Foucault, 1982) that affect and are an effect of an educational development subject's pedagogies.

**Thinking with an axis of self**

I thought with an axis of self to examine how the educational development subject's pedagogical acts and rationalisations are a means of self-governance. I initially drew upon Foucault's (1988b) concept 'technologies of the self' to develop associations between an educational development subject's pedagogical acts and rationalisations in relation to various problems of pedagogical agency. Technologies of the self are forms of reasoning that an individual employs to govern their own thoughts, feelings and behaviour in an attempt to achieve a particular state of being (Foucault, 1988b, p. 16). In the latter auto-ethnographic chapters I utilised Foucault’s (1997c) four aspects of an ethical relationship to self to explicitly examine how an educational development subject's pedagogy is a means of self-transformation. The first aspect is the 'ethical substance' (Foucault, 1997c, p. 263) which is the component of self, deemed to be concerned with moral conduct and is the anchor that the subject uses to continually define an ethical relationship to self. The second aspect 'modes of subjection' (Foucault, 1997c, p. 264) are those particular instances which solicit the subject to acknowledge their moral responsibilities in relation to the ethical substance. The third aspect 'self-forming activities' (Foucault, 1997c, p. 265) are
those actions that the subject performs as a means of enacting or achieving a 'telos' or idealised state of moral being. These four aspects of an ethical relationship to self were utilised as a means of examining how an educational development subject's pedagogical acts and rationalisations as self-forming activities are an agentic endeavour.

**Ethical considerations**

As auto-ethnographic studies acknowledge the dual role of the writer as researcher and research-subject, this broad method of enquiry has been labelled as an ethical response to traditional ethnographic studies (Ellis et al., 2011; Holman Jones, Adams, & Ellis, 2013). This positioning is largely rationalised using a general argument that the researcher is writing their version of events using their voice and not appropriating others (Lapadat, 2017). The thesis was subsequently not considered to require institutional human-ethics approval, due to the aforementioned argument of the research only representing an account of self. Despite the research question being primarily concerned with the pedagogy of an educational development subject as researcher, those documented acts and rationalisations were inevitably performed in relation to an assortment of institutional colleagues. This question of ‘relational ethics’ (Dauphinee, 2010; Ellis, 2007; Lapadat, 2017; Sikes, 2015; Tolich, 2010) considering the impact of the research on others served as the major point of ethical consideration in the research design. Meanwhile, those ‘vulnerabilities’ (Lapadat, 2017) associated with the researcher performing a role as research-subject was deemed to be a minor concern. The main rationalisation for this contention was the research having been clearly labelled as examining a historical account of pedagogy performed in 2009 by early-career (neophyte) educational development subject. In the remainder of this section I will outline the various strategies that were incorporated into the research design as a means of acknowledging ‘relational ethics’.
The concept of relational ethics (Dauphinee, 2010; Ellis, 2007; Lapadat, 2017; Sikes, 2015; Tolich, 2010) was primarily considered in formulating strategies to protect the identity of institutional colleagues who I interacted with whilst working as a neophyte educational development subject. The major concern was to achieve ‘internal confidentiality’ (Tolich, 2004) whereby any remarks made my colleagues in confidence would not be able to be identifiable by their institutional colleagues (Sikes, 2010, 2015). The first strategy employed to ensure internal confidentiality was to de-identify colleagues and refer to them as either management, teaching, ELF (e-learning facilitator) or educational development subjects. These broad identifiers were used to refer to the predominant role that the person was deemed to be playing in a particular journal excerpt, as many colleagues traversed multiple roles. The second strategy was to resist and subsequently cease using journal excerpts where I had recounted interactions with individuals using secondary attributes that may enable institutional colleagues to identify the person who had been written into the text. During the final stage of sense-making I made significant edits to the five auto-ethnographic chapters by removing journal excerpts which could not be deemed to be focusing primarily on the pedagogical conceptions, rationalisations and actions of the educational development subject, performed in relation to events and actions that are generalisable. I was able to scrutinise the journal and sense-making text to remove passages which arguably represented personal tensions and conflict not pertinent to the research question. In closing, I have genuinely tried to work with an understanding that any of the colleagues I worked with at this time may read the text.

In closing

This chapter has provided a retrospective account of the major methodological decisions that were made in the production of this thesis. I explained how these decisions have emerged from a conceptual framework comprising poststructural critiques of universalism, essentialism, and foundationalism (Parkes et al., 2010).
and the Foucauldian notion of power as relational (Foucault, 1978, 1980b, 1982). I drew on Davies (2010) to contend that the conceptual framework was a call to look at the effects of discourse on the educational development subject(s) and the ways it operates through them. My response, was to explain how I was applying an uncomfortable reflexive mindset (Pillow, 2003), where I would aim is to represent my/self as multiple subjectivities constructed through workings of power (Jackson & Mazzei, 2008).

The thesis was labelled a theoretical and methodological bricolage in recognition of the assemblage of theories utilized under a broad banner of a Foucauldian poststructuralist conceptual framework. This label was used as a leverage point to articulate the interplay of theory and method in the construction of each component of the thesis. Writing as a method of enquiry’ (Richardson, 2000) served as a general ethos to explain how theory and method intersect in the constitutive act of writing (Davies & Gannon, 2005). The second stage of the chapter centered on explaining the methodological decisions that were made in the production of the five auto-ethnographic chapters. An emphasis on specifically defining the poststructural auto-ethnography, resulted in it being conceptualized as an attempt at placing presence and experience under erasure (Denzin, 2014; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008) through examining the discursive multiplicity of subjectivity. I utilised Gannon’s (2006) description of poststructural auto-ethnography as a form of care for the self (Foucault, 1997b), to articulate conditions for constructing the researcher as research subject seeking to represent the fiction of a singular subjectivity. I then detailed a series of sense-making tactics that I used to perform two stages of writing passages of analysis in the auto-ethnographic chapters. The chapter concluded with a brief outline of the ethical considerations that governed the production of the auto-ethnographic chapters.
Intermission

Reading the auto-ethnographic chapters

The intermission provides a succinct overview of the focus and structure of the five auto-ethnographic chapters.

Problems of pedagogical agency

The collection of problems of pedagogical agency that were emergent in the literature review have been distilled into a group of five discourses. Each of the five auto-ethnographic chapters uses one of the problems of pedagogical agency as an enabler for sense-making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent problems of pedagogical agency from literature review</th>
<th>Auto-ethnographic chapters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being governed by a history of educational development</td>
<td>Educational development as a contestable identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational development as fragmented</td>
<td>e-learning as an umbrella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining the purpose and role of e-learning</td>
<td>Educational development as marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being marginalised along ‘Fault lines’</td>
<td>Problems of compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in centralised educational development units</td>
<td>Pedagogy as an ethical relation with self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerialism and compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy as a generic set of techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four types of text passages

Each ethnographic chapter features four different types of text passages; the journal excerpts, the archival, the sense-making narrative and the pedagogic pauses. An overview of each passage type is presented below using the formatting scheme employed across all five auto-ethnographic chapters.

The journal excerpts

The journal excerpts are the parrhesian (Foucault, 1983) representations of my lived experiences working as an educational development subject in a Victorian TAFE. These serve as provocations of a singular subjectivity, to problematize within the confines of a discursive field via the sense-making text passages. These excerpts are formatted using italicised text, to infer that they were originally written in an ad-hoc manner.

Archival text

Journal excerpts which feature archival text from emails, lesson plans and institution documentation. These excerpts are formatted using a typewriter font to indicate that they are an older source of text originally intended for an audience beyond the author.
The sense-making passages

The sense-making passages are the third type of textual passage, serving as the place where I am performing the discourse analysis\textsuperscript{15}. They are an attempt at making my working out visible in the final text, as a means of practicing a form of uncomfortable reflexivity (Pillow, 2003). These passages are an examination of the momentary ways in which the educational development subject constitutes their pedagogical agency. Sense-making text utilizes the standard typeface featured throughout the broader thesis to indicate that it is the working text, and that it is the dominant form of text throughout each auto-ethnographic chapter.

The pedagogic pauses

The fourth form of text is the pedagogic pause, which is a partial synthesis of the previous passage of sense-making. These short passages of text are positioned as a means for fellow educational development subjects to readily access critical partial insights that have been derived from the previous section of sense-making text (discourse analysis). The pauses are formatted in a text box with a light grey background and can be read within the overall chapter, or as a stand-alone sequence. I have produced these pauses cognizant that the conceptual framework is rejecting an intention to provide a series of generalizable truths or insights about educational development pedagogy, as they focus on succinctly drawing together seemingly disparate discourse and making visible irreconcilable tensions. Nonetheless, I still acknowledge that the succinct nature of these passages may be interpreted as an attempt at providing generalizable statements.

\textsuperscript{15} See: ‘Sense making – the discourse analysis' section of the previous chapter ‘Methodological Decisions’.
Chapter 6 - Educational development as contestable

Introducing a problem of contestability

Educational development is an umbrella term used to describe a myriad of performances which are shaped by localised institutional agendas and priorities (Fraser et al., 2010). In other words, the term educational development is deemed to be contestable as there is not a standardised array of acts performed by its subjects (individuals), and this variability of pedagogic acts is easily explained as being a consequence of educational development subjects being directed by localised priorities and agendas. There is little consideration of the role that educational development subjects contribute to this state of contestability via their pedagogic acts and associated conceptions of self.

In this chapter I will attempt to problematize this linkage between educational development contestability and a dominant-logical rationalisation of this state of play being a consequence of localised agenda setting. I will be drawing upon Foucault’s three historical ontologies of Knowledge-Power-Self (Deleuze, 2006) as a means of visualising a discursive terrain of educational development as contestable, where contestability is a macro-level explanation for a multitude of micro-level effects. In chapter 5 'Methodological decisions', Knowledge-Power-Self was positioned as a means of conceptualising the ongoing interplay between; available knowledge enabling particular socio-historical relations to others and self (Foucault, 1972, 1980a); the actions upon actions exerted within such relationships (Foucault, 1978, 1980b, 1982); and the subject (individual) continually reconstituting a relationship with self (subjectivation) (Foucault, 1982, 1992).

In this chapter I will be examining how a person self-identifies as an educational development subject within a discursive field of contestability. By examining various modes of self-identification, I am seeking to explore how educational development contestability serves as a pedagogical problem of agency for the
educational development subject. As a starting point, I will chart the emergence and intersections of multiple statements enunciated by a neophyte educational development subject over the course of a calendar year\textsuperscript{16}. I am using the term ‘statement’ to articulate the enunciative function (Foucault, 1972) that a phrase or proposition serves within a particular discursive exchange. Emphasis is placed upon a phrase or proposition’s function within a given discourse, rather than searching for or defining an essential meaning.

**A disjuncture between the official and day-to-day expectations**

Drawing on Spivak (1993), educational development could be described as a ‘catachresis’ or a master word denoting an impossible ideal/true subject. The use of this master word as a problematically-necessary means of classification, arguably engenders conceptualisations of educational development which focus on essential traits, role or function. In this section I will explore how initial conceptions of educational development as a master word may serve as a starting point for examining the contestability of educational development as a problem of pedagogical agency.

Reading an advertised position description for a position labelled ‘Educational Developer’ served as a ‘surface of emergence’ (Foucault, 1972, p. 41), as a context where I would first conceive of educational development as a discursive object. Reading and making sense of this position description would serve as my initial point of reference for conceptualising educational development as something that had meaning and purpose.

\begin{quote}
I find one of the biggest struggles in my job is to actually define what I do, and this is not just in regard to the teachers but those who employ me.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{16} The italicised text throughout this chapter are extracts from a journal that I wrote as a neophyte educational development subject in 2009. This is explained in greater detail in ‘The research setting and approach’ section of chapter 1.
I had entered the space of educational development on the assumption that management subjects who had authorised or drafted the position description, were the ‘authorities of delimitation’ (Foucault, 1972) as those subjects authorised to define ‘educational development’. Management subjects were typically absent during interactions with teaching subjects, whereby necessitating me as an educational development subject to continually construct provisional definitions of the role and rationale of educational development. The position description had not served as an efficacious means for the educational development subject to communicate the function and purpose of their role to management and teaching subjects. The constrained utility of the position description had an effect of de-stabilising or problematising the initial positioning of management subjects as the sole authorities for defining educational development.

I tried to make the point that I feel I am more active in working with teachers than the person who they decided to give an ongoing position to.

In the above journal excerpt the educational development subject is reflecting upon the news that an educational development colleague had been awarded ongoing employment. While there is some form of continued acknowledgement that management subjects function as an authority of delimitation, the educational development subject has used their initial reading of the position description as a means to contend that ‘collaboration with teaching subjects is a foundational act in educational development’.

A manager and manager would rather acknowledge that my colleague (another educational development subject) is busy developing a piece of software which has a deadline...almost like we don’t have deadlines either...

A justification for expressing dissatisfaction with this decision was made on the basis that actions performed by the educational development colleague sat outside a ‘margin of tolerance’ (Foucault, 1972, p. 41) for educational
development. A margin of tolerance is a definition of a discursive field through use of something it rejects. This margin of tolerance initially relied upon reference to ‘software development’ as a means to visualise what educational development is absolutely not. A discursive field of ‘educational development contestability’ is emergent via this disjuncture between an educational development subject’s conception that management subjects are the authority to define educational development enacted via authoring and/or approving the official position description, and a localised conception of educational development which includes actions such as software development that did not feature in the position description. The act of software development is only of relevance here as a means of exploring how the contestability of educational development is emergent for the educational development subject.

So, running workshops, developing pedagogic resources and meeting with teachers is not worthy? What is the job in their eyes?

A conception of software development being beyond a margin of tolerance for defining educational development is contingent upon ‘collaboration with teachers as students’ as a ‘field of initial differentiation’ (Foucault, 1972). The relevance of an educational development subject’s actions can be self-measured in terms of their proximity to this function. It is not a fixed position, as it describes an idealistic function more so than an outcome or action. It is reliant upon the aforementioned statement which was ‘a declaration that collaboration with teaching subjects is a foundational act in educational development’. This exclusionary means of defining educational development is operable in the previous journal extract on the basis that software development is unlikely to serve as an enabler for an educational development subject to collaborate with teaching subjects in a manner where the teaching subject is positioned as the learner/student.

A field of initial differentiation of ‘collaboration with teachers as students’ can be used by an educational development subject to classify and/or evaluate the
relevance of their everyday actions and outcomes. Listed below is a series of actions I completed during one working day late in 2009.

Got response proof read (before I sent it an email to a teacher)

Sent response to managers re: ELF\textsuperscript{17} attendance and providing update on what we are doing

Responded to teacher in automotive regarding a point of view\textsuperscript{18} camera

Responded to the travel blog as part of the Flexi Fest\textsuperscript{19}

Looked at Converge 09\textsuperscript{20} application details - still need to compile an application

Assisted admin staff member with their use of Google Docs\textsuperscript{21}

Added the lunch time training (paper bag) dates to my calendar

Responded to teacher in Further Ed re: Point of view camera enquiry

Attended an Elluminate\textsuperscript{22} session

Compiled voting widget for Flexi Fest Activity and sent a copy of voting page to the web coordinator and briefly promoted it on Yammer

\textsuperscript{17} ELF is an acronym for ‘e-learning facilitators project’. In 2009, I served as an educational developer facilitating a program for a group of Technical and Further Education (TAFE) teachers with a primary objective of upskilling this group of teachers so that they could play a role as an educational development subject in their respective department.

\textsuperscript{18} Point of View (POV) are small cameras fixed to the head of the user.

\textsuperscript{19} Flexi-fest was a professional development initiative facilitated by the former central learning and teaching unit at the TAFE institution where I was previously employed.

\textsuperscript{20} Converge was a professional learning conference for VET/TAFE practitioners centred on the use of e-learning.

\textsuperscript{21} Google Docs is an online office suite featuring a word processor, spreadsheet and slideshow.

\textsuperscript{22} Elluminate (now Blackboard Collaborate) is a virtual classroom platform used to facilitate synchronous instruction.
Briefed learning and teaching centre colleague re: second session of Employability Skills to be held tomorrow (9.30-12.00)

Sent email to Flexi-Fest participants informing them of the vote

On a first pass read, the majority of these tasks could be crudely classified as administrative as they involve composing responses to email-based enquiries. In reference to an initial differentiation (Foucault, 1972) of ‘collaboration with teachers as students’, the function of many of these tasks remain distant as they are closed enquiries. Such enquiries typically require a logistical-esque response, don’t require a relationship of collaboration, and certainly don’t visualise a subject-position as teacher for the educational developer. Contributing further to a sense of contestability, it is questionable whether these acts require the competencies commonly outlined in educational developer position descriptions which had initially served as a surface of emergence (Foucault, 1972) for the educational development subject. One such example of this, is the position criteria that management subjects wrote for the e-learning facilitator role. This set of position criteria closely resembled that with which I was originally employed.

Demonstrated pedagogical knowledge and understanding in using e-learning technologies to support learning

Understand the online flexible delivery options available

Currently (or recently) involved in aspects of e-learning development and / or delivery

Motivated to actively promote e-learning options

---

23 Employability skills are a set of tacit skills, including communication, problem-solving and teamwork which are embedded into VET training package curricula. They serve a similar purpose to graduate attributes in Australian Higher Education.

24 The E-Learning Facilitators (ELF) were a network of teachers whom we employed fractionally by the central learning and teaching unit for a year to support departmental colleagues in their use/adoption of e-learning.
In this social-historical instance, these points function as a ‘margin of tolerances’ (Foucault, 1972) used to define educational development by what it was commonly not. For example, the aforementioned points could be re-imaged as:

- Educational development subjects were generally not drawing upon any previous practical application of e-learning within their teaching practice to inform the advice they provided to teaching subjects.
- Educational development subjects were generally not able to classify e-learning technologies in a manner which enabled teaching subjects to subsequently select the appropriate technology for their particular learning intention.
- Educational development subjects were not actively teaching units of study where there was a heavy reliance upon e-learning.
- Educational development subjects were not working collaboratively with teaching subjects in the design and/or facilitation of units using e-learning.

While none of the original points articulated the function or intended actions of an educational developer, their re-imaging (reading) as a margin of tolerance (Foucault, 1972) articulates an inversed set of outcomes which all rely upon components of the initial differentiation ‘collaboration with teachers as students’. The first and third points enable a broader array of authorities of delimitation including management, teaching and educational development subjects, to evaluate the depth and currency of an educational development subject in relation to their teaching experience using e-learning. The second point serves as a means to verify this experience through an educational development subject needing to construct some form of abstraction of e-learning in a format such as a taxonomy. The final point is absolutely reliant upon the educational development subject forging collaborations with teaching staff who have an expectation or receptiveness to learning via interaction with an educational development subject. In its original form, the inability to easily
articulate ‘well respected’, seemingly limits the utility of this final point for contributing to a coherent definition of the educational development role. It is an aspirational status, or recognition of a person’s role within a social context that could be associated with any occupation.

The use of this collection of criteria for measuring the relevance of an educational development subject’s everyday actions can be conceived of as a ‘grid of specification’ (Foucault, 1972, p. 42). A grid of specification is a system of differentiations used to structure and classify a discursive object. In relation to the aforementioned journal passages, educational development as a discursive object can be structured and classified by the educational development subject self-evaluating the proximity of their pedagogical acts to one or more of the constituent criteria in relation to an initial differentiation (Foucault, 1972) of ‘collaboration with teachers as students’. In terms of an educational development subject’s self-conception of pedagogical agency, this grid of specification serves as a means for an educational development subject to consider their degree of capacity to operate in relation to emergent criteria such as demonstrable teaching experience using e-learning, capacity to diagrammatis e-learning technologies and practices, and a capacity to chart a sequence of learning for teaching subjects to utilise e-learning within a particular teaching context.

Throughout the year I had been facilitating a professional development program for a group of TAFE teaching subjects as a means of assisting their work as department based educational development subjects. Labelled as ‘E-learning Facilitators’ or ELFs for short, they expressed three major struggles that they were experiencing in their role.

*Lack of time to become an expert*

*The difficulty in getting their peers interested in e-learning*
The time eaten up performing admin type functions such as SMS\textsuperscript{25}, booking Elluminate\textsuperscript{26} rooms, ordering Blackboard\textsuperscript{27} units and assisting with use of technology such as data projectors.

A field of initial differentiation (Foucault, 1972) of ‘collaboration with teachers as students’ was also operable in these points which served to conceptualise and categorise educational development. The first statement of ‘expertise being an unachievable requirement’ can be read as an effect of the educational development subject evaluating the efficacy of their pedagogical actions on the basis that they were able to occupy a subject-position of ‘teacher’. The second point functions as a statement of ‘teaching subjects not entering into a relationship as student with an educational developer’. The accompanying rationalisation of ‘teachers having a lack of interest in e-learning’ functions as a strategy for resisting a ‘failure’, in relation to an aforementioned position criterion of ‘well respected by their peers’. The administrative function described in the third point draws greatest synergy with the aforementioned list of tasks for one day of my work as an educational developer. The disclosure of these points serves as another point on a ‘grid of specification’ (Foucault, 1972), where educational development as a discursive object is structured and classified. In terms of a discourse of contestability, it is another example of a juncture where an educational development subject is unable to neatly conceptualise their actions as functioning within the field of initial differentiation of ‘collaboration with teachers as students’.

\textit{There’s nothing particularly painful here, but on days like today when you are not running a workshop, meeting with a teacher, I can feel really disconnected from what I can see going on outside of the office with students walking around etc.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} I am referring to a Telstra notification service used by the TAFE institution to send students SMS text messages
\item \textsuperscript{26} Elluminate (now Blackboard Collaborate) is a virtual classroom platform used to facilitate synchronous instruction.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Blackboard is a Learning Management System commonly used by tertiary institutions to deliver and administer online units of study.
\end{itemize}
It is timely to revisit one of Foucault’s descriptions of discourse where he described it as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972, p. 49). An educational development subject’s navigation of aforementioned junctures serves as a means of enabling a discourse of educational development contestability to function and manifest. In the previous journal excerpt I had listed ‘facilitating workshops’ and ‘meeting with teachers’ as idealised educational development tasks, despite having earlier visualised a challenge of not being able to define or communicate a cohesive definition of an educational development role. An idealisation of educational development based on functions typically performed in a teacher-student relationship is an example of an educational development subject conceptualising educational development in a particular form as a means of navigating a discourse of contestability.

There can be a distinct disjuncture between the pseudo-legalistic definition of educational development as articulated in official position descriptions, and the tasks performed by educational developers on a daily basis. This disjuncture is an obvious flash-point for educational developers to conceptualise a problem of agency where they are unable to perform the role as described in their contact with the employing institution. It is a problem which cannot be eliminated by enhancements aimed to solidify the position description, or subsequent communication of these enhancements to the teachers whom educational developers are expected to work with/for.

An educational developer plays an active role in contributing to this problem of agency via their ongoing conceptions of the role/field. These conceptions of the field are subsequently used to categorise and evaluate the worth or relevance of pedagogic actions on the basis that they sit within or outside an acceptable field of educational development. One of those conceptions of the field is that an educational developer is ideally engaged in pedagogic relationships with teachers, where the teacher is student and educational developer is teacher. An educational
developer is not able to readily materialise such relationships to those authorities (managers) who define the role via the position description. An agentic problem intensifies, misdiagnosed as a consequence of there not being a unified definition of educational development.

Working with a view of power as ‘interests’ held

Towards the end of the working year, the director of the learning and teaching centre attempted to create a single position description that re-defined the role of an educational developer. The group of educational development subjects were informed that the rationale for this move was to consolidate the current e-learning and curriculum specific educational development position descriptions into a single role. After a series of meetings with the group of educational development subjects, my initial reaction was:

We got our new PDs (position descriptions) today approved and ready to sign. I don’t have any major issues with this as it is so broad, people (educational development subjects) are going to gravitate to the things that they are able to deal with. Yeah it could be used to performance manage someone to the point of distress, as they could be expected to be an expert on a heap of different tasks...but this is unlikely.

Within this journal excerpt, I denounced the relevance of the position using the contention that educational development subjects would likely gravitate to the tasks that they feel most comfortable to perform. On first read, it is conceivable to suggest that this rationalisation is largely contingent upon an ’explanatory humanism’ (Paden, 1987) where an ahistorical sovereign self, freely acts as governed by their own internal reason. When this contention is read using an initial differentiation of ‘collaboration with teaching subjects as students’, it functions as another point or juncture within a grid of specification (Foucault,
where educational development as a discursive object is structured and classified. The contention can now function as a statement of ‘educational development subject acknowledging that they are likely to gravitate to the tasks where s/he is able to work from a subject position as teacher or expert’. For instance, the new position description contained a series of functions or capabilities such as ‘provide leadership’ and ‘provide advice’. I was able to go through this position description and place a tick against each dot point, to indicate that I had previously performed actions over the previous two years which could be categorised using each of these umbrella terms. When this set of capabilities was read in parallel with a list of tasks performed in a typical working day, the position description read more as a suite of functions that an educational development subject will ‘eventually’ or possibly ‘hopefully’ undertake. A statement of ‘the position description as aspirational’ is emergent.

Position Title: Educational Developer

Provide leadership and advice on, and assistance with, the interpretation and implementation of Training Packages, senior secondary, VET and undergraduate curricula.

Provide advice on, and assistance with, the design, development, delivery and evaluation of innovative and customised education resources and services.

Manage projects which involve the planning, development, implementation and evaluation of innovative and flexible learning and teaching initiatives.

Plan, deliver and evaluate education professional development programs which model contemporary educational methodologies, including online learning and teaching approaches.
Identify, negotiate and manage resource requirements for identified programs/projects.

Produce tenders and submissions in conjunction with the University and external clients.

Advise staff on strategies to support effective integration of information and communication technologies into course development and delivery.

Support teaching staff in meeting compliance requirements, including corporate design guidelines, accessibility and quality assurance processes.

Contribute to the review and development of University plans, policies and procedures related to learning and teaching.

Provide representation on relevant internal and external committees.

Maintain extensive professional knowledge of current curriculum innovations and major developments in learning and teaching.

Provide specialist skills, as appropriate, within the University and the wider community in Victoria, nationally and internationally.

Conduct action research and prepare briefing papers on curriculum, learning and teaching, or management as appropriate.

Contribute to the effective operation of the Central Learning and Teaching Unit.

Contribute to the effective financial operation of the Central Learning and Teaching Unit.
As with the earlier reading of the E-learning Facilitator position description criterion where a series of criterion were re-imagined along a ‘margin of tolerance’ (Foucault, 1972); these actions are also difficult to quantify, or to represent to subjects not actively involved in the initial exchange. Many of these intended outcomes require pedagogic acts which can only be performed as a response to enquiries or invitations initiated by a teaching and/or managerial subject. There is seemingly little possibility for an educational development subject to regulate the rate or number of relationships which function within a field of initial differentiation of ‘collaboration with teachers as students’.

At this juncture, it is conceivable for an educational development subject to conceptualise this problem of agency within a view of Marxist power as ‘interests’ (Foucault & Deleuze, 1977) where power is ‘held’ by particular ruling groups or individuals defined by their interests. Within such a reading, a statement of ‘educational development serving the interests of teachers’ emerges, as emphasis has remained on a conception of a subject with essential traits or qualities. Through viewing power as something owned, the educational development subject needs to mitigate a perceived reliance upon teaching subjects to direct the focus of their actions. Production activities (i.e. producing learning objects, software applications) become enticing for the educational development subject, as these can be self-initiatory. There is a tangible perpetually-available product which can be categorised using a series of seemingly stable signifiers. It may serve as a tactic for an educational development subject seeking an impossible win in a structural-humanist agency game of educational development, via seeking a level of control over their measurable outputs.

One leverage point for describing educational development as contestable is the inability to define the field through provision of a succinct list of pedagogic acts. Attempts to define educational development via official documents such as position descriptions, may result in a list of overarching functions and/or objectives without necessarily specifying a succinct list of pedagogic actions. An
An educational developer may view this lack of clarity in defining the pedagogic acts to be performed, as an opportunity or expectation to freely select what tasks they will perform based on their interests or expertise. For an educational developer working within a conception of power as something owned, a problem of agency emerges. Many of the intended outcomes or functions listed in a position description require pedagogic acts which can only be performed as a response to enquiries or invitations initiated by a teaching and/or managerial subject.

The educational developer can see that the field is officially defined by the managers, and the capacity for performing pedagogic acts which address the broad position criteria is seemingly governed or controlled by teachers. These blunt structural rationalisations of agency may engender an educational developer to engage in activities such as resource development where they don’t rely upon teachers to be the initiating party. Such strategies can be conceived using rationalisations as free choice, but they are actually selected on their basis as being able to function within existing points of differentiation such as ‘educational development as collaboration with teachers as students’.

A pedagogic tactic of vanguard to achieve a subjectivity of expert

One of the ways in which Foucault (1980e) attempted to introduce the notion of power as relational was through visualising a triangle of power-right-truth. The triangle operates via specifying two extreme limits as the ‘rules of right’ from ‘effects of truth’. The former refers to socio-historical specifications of power made visible in instruments such as rules, contracts and classifications of socio-structural status. At the other extreme, are ‘effects of truth’ which are those knowledge claims of truth made possible as an effect of such formalised classifications of power, which then subsequently induce refinement to the ‘rules of right’. Through the triangle of power-right-truth, Foucault visualised a relational form of power which is contingent upon the production of knowledge (truth) both as an effect and enabler for formalised rules and structures.
Foucault’s (1978) conception of power as relational, contests structural and humanist conceptualisations which posit power as a stable thing, capacity or quality which can be captured and possessed. In a practical sense, Foucault (1980b) was placing emphasis on the exertion of everyday strategies, performed as a means of resisting something else. This something else is ‘force’, whereby any relationship of power requires more than one force to engender a reaction or movement. Force is only able to be characterised in relation to its capacity to ‘affect’ other forces, and to be ‘effected’ by other forces (Deleuze, 2006). It is this inherent requirement of multiple sources of force which serve as power’s ‘condition of possibility’ (Foucault, 1978) where a perpetual state of inequality induces resistance.

Drawing upon the aforementioned description; it is conceivable to read the first half of this chapter as an attempt to visualise a problem of agency for educational development subjects as a disjuncture between the rules of right (Foucault, 1980e) defined in the official position description and the capacity for an educational development subject to achieve those obligations through constructing rationalisations which reflect an ‘explanatory humanism’ (Paden, 1987). This problem of agency could now be reduced to a conception that teaching subjects are the structural/hierarchical gate, governing the capacity for an educational development subject to perform pedagogic acts which sit within a field of initial differentiation of ‘collaboration with teachers as students’. I would now like to problematize the rigidity of this structural gate, by visualising relational power at work via the strategies and tactics utilised by an educational development subject in discursive exchanges with teaching subjects.

One of the most frustrating things I find is that teachers often ask, ‘can you just show me how to use tool X?’ I normally say ‘no worries, happy to do so’ because most of my work relies on relationship building.

In the previous passage, the educational development subject responded to this structural-humanist problem of agency via adopting a tactic of ‘relationship
building’. It is a temporary gesture intended to engender an on-going relationship with the teaching subject based on a form of knowledge which posits the teaching subject as the structural gate. However, this action doesn’t function in a bubble where there is no impact upon the future capacity for an educational development subject to act.

While I am employed as a teacher, post some requests it is hard to not feel that you are an IT service desk assistant who should be walking around wearing a black polo shirt and a lanyard. As much as I would like to say ‘what the hell do you think I am? Call IT (using the four-digit number)’. I just don’t see that this would do me any good on the relationship building stakes.

Thinking with a view of power as a chain (Foucault, 1980e) characterised by possible actions upon actions; enacting the aforementioned tactic of ‘relationship building’ alters the field of possible/future relations between teaching and educational development subjects. The field is altered through a ‘tactical productivity’ (Foucault, 1978), whereby the action/tactic has engendered effects of power and knowledge. In this instance, the educational development subject has constructed a form of knowledge which associates a subject position-function of technical assistant/service provider with a necessary requirement to form relationships with teaching subjects. The tactic of relationship building can now be rationalised as a necessary long-term investment on the basis that an initial subject position of technical assistant or service provider is temporary, and that a subject-position of teacher or collaborator can be established via continued entry through the metaphorical gate of meeting with teaching subjects.

Instead of jumping in and rattling off a heap of tools…I asked him/her what they thought their staff needed.

A pedagogic strategy of asking a teaching subject to self-diagnose a problem, is one means of attempting to engender a shift of subject-position for the educational developer from that of technical assistant to teacher. It functions as
a form of ‘strategical integration’ (Foucault, 1978) whereby the strategy has become necessary due to a relationship of force between a capacity to act governed by closed-questions of a technical nature, and an idealised function of educational development with a subject-position of teacher as collaborator. Earlier in the chapter I attempted to visualise how an ‘initial form of differentiation’ (Foucault, 1972) of ‘collaboration with teachers as students’ is an ‘effect of truth’ emergent from various forms of ‘rules of right’ (Foucault, 1980e) specified in official position descriptions. While this form of tactical knowledge idealised a subject-position of teacher, an associated subject position such as technical assistant emerges as an effect of power-right-truth.

In effect we are trying to create a demand not respond to demands

The educational development subject has now re-conceptualised the required tactic as one of ‘creating demands’ where the focus of the enquiries can be shaped via the facilitation of problem identification or through demonstrating processes which are not normalised. The tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978) is that it engenders an educational development subject to conceptualise functions or processes which a teaching subject should be performing. For the educational development subject, this conceptualisation will sit somewhere in-between a binary opposition of ‘vanguard / expert’ (Webb, 1996b). At its extremity, a ‘vanguard’ position refers to actions performed by an educational development subject in a manner where s/he is promoting and modelling new forms of teaching. It is an initiatory position where an educational development subject can utilise aforementioned skills such as resource development. Use of these skills enable the educational development subject to achieve a measurable outcome through not being reliant upon entry through the structural gate (teaching subject wanting to collaborate).

The expert position is a reactionary position where the educational development subject is nominally granted access to situations to provide expertise that is deemed necessary by the teaching subject. At its extremity or ideal, the expert is asked to provide guidance or advice which is conducive with an initial point of
differentiation of ‘collaboration with teachers as students’. On one hand, vanguard-expert can be read as a humanist agentic fault-line for educational development subjects to conceptualise their capacity for action, based on their status of being self-initiated or teacher-solicited. On the other, the extreme points of this binary can be viewed as vanguard (tactic) / expert (idealised subjectivity).

In the second half we looked at the commoncraft video on wikis, and to show the basic ‘edit / save / link’ process I set up an Etherpad which is a real time text editor. While it’s not a wiki, it’s good to show the collaborative potential particularly when we had the guys in (Town Name Removed - another TAFE campus in regional Victoria) editing the document at the same time as those in (Town Name Removed - TAFE campus where I was located). Most of the teachers in the group said they did not have assessable collaborative tasks, were sceptical regarding the value and those tasks they did run that were collaborative, often were so, because of access to resources in classes/workshops.

Characteristic of the vanguard tactic, the strategy was to present a procedural solution to problems or challenges that had not been identified or accepted as such. I was using the workshop demonstration as a visible and economically efficient site to enact the vanguard tactic.

I then gave a brief overview of PB wiki and this was really just to show them a working wiki so that I could at least show the opposite end of the spectrum with wikis as this one has a lot more functions.

---

28 Common Craft is a U.S based production company who specialise in the production of instructional videos, which often rely on paper-based hand-illustrated artefacts.
29 Wiki is a common label used to categorise collaborative websites that enable users to modify content via the web browser.
30 Etherpad is a collaborative online text editing application where users can remotely edit a text document in real-time.
31 PBwiki (now PBworks) is a collaborative online editing application.
and is often used instead of the LMS\textsuperscript{32}. One of the ELFs who has previously taught in high schools said that s/he could see the value in this.

When power is conceived as something owned and tied to individuals, an educational developer may view teachers as the main player controlling their agency. The teacher becomes the ‘structural gate’ managing their capacity to achieve an ideal of working collaboratively with teachers, in a manner where the educational developer is able to occupy a pseudo-role as teacher. In contrast, when power is viewed as relational, this seemingly fixed status of agency for an educational developer starts to erode. This conception of teachers as ‘the structural gate’ engenders the exertion of a sequence of pedagogic strategies. It is not a fixed sequence, but a series of responses to a condition of possibility that the educational developer conceives at each juncture or socio-historic instance.

In the previous passages of sense making text, I have attempted to visualise this relational view of power by showing how an educational developer has initially employed a strategy of ‘relationship building’ as a response to the ‘structural gate’ and eventually reached a point of conceptualising a tactic of ‘creating demands’. I have drawn upon the binary opposition of vanguard-expert (Webb, 1996b) to conceptualise ‘vanguard’ as a tactic to achieve a desired identity or subjectivity as ‘expert’.

**Rationalising a vanguard pedagogy via a structural humanist conception of agency**

It is now timely to revisit the introduction to this thesis where I drew upon

\textsuperscript{32} LMS is a common acronym used to refer to Learning Management Systems, typically used for the provision and management of online courses.
Britzman (1991) and Ellsworth (2005) to conceptualise pedagogy as ‘the interconnected nature of the philosophical justification and tactical actions, utilised by an educational development subject in response to their positioning within multiple discourses of learning’. One way of exploring the ‘interconnected nature’ is through drawing upon Foucault (1978) to consider it as a relationship between strategies and discourse. In other words, what discursive conditions enabled me to re-exert (in the same workshop session) a vanguard tactic of demonstrating/showcasing technologies as solutions to problems not accepted as such?

First, in terms of ‘strategical integration’ (Foucault, 1978) the force relationship which solicited continued use of the tactic is that between vanguard and expert. In this instance, there was no indication that the educational development subject would be invited into a space where a teaching subject solicits their expertise for achieving an objective, they are committed to achieving. Secondly, the re-enactment is justified via a form of ‘tactical productivity’ (Foucault, 1978), despite the strategy having seemingly failed. A tactical productivity is an effect of power/knowledge which is emergent from the exertion of force within a given discourse. In this socio-historical instance, the educational development subject used one teaching subject’s interest in the demonstrated process through referencing their structural status-credential as a qualified school educator. The remainder of the teachers were assumed as being credentialed to teach in TAFE via vocational teaching qualifications at Certificate 4 or Diploma level.

Classification of the ELFs (teaching subjects) using credentialing not only functioned as a means to justify the vanguard tactic, it also engenders solidification of the ‘rules of right’ (Foucault, 1980e) for educational development visible in official documents such as position descriptions and criteria. It is contingent upon an ‘effect of truth’ (Foucault, 1980e) which posits those teaching who had not earned an undergraduate teaching degree, as not being able to determine the value in the solution as demonstrated via the vanguard tactic.
I suppose they are all feeling a little overloaded with being exposed to new tools most sessions and we really need to stop and take stock a little earlier than we had originally planned.

Subsequent failures of the vanguard tactic to engender future opportunities for performance conducive with the expert ideal, were rationalised through an imbalance of ‘the number of technologies demonstrated’ in relation to ‘taking stock’. The statement of ‘take stock’ refers to a strategy of ascertaining what processes (as demonstrated) that the ELFs/teaching subjects can see as having utility in their own teaching practice. To quote Freire (1972), this strategy of taking stock can be rationalised via a metaphor of ‘banking’. The teaching participants have been banked with information via repeated demonstrations, contingent upon the teaching subject(s)’ subsequently self-identifying ‘the deposit’ as a solution for an issue they must define or locate.

For some (ELFs / teaching subjects), I think this project has just seen them learn a few skills for sure but not yet be able to either work out how to embed it into their own teaching and/or being unable to redesign their face to face teaching to accommodate the online.

The ‘it’ within the statement ‘embed it into their own teaching’, could be read as the deposits made by the educational development subject. The deposit as discursive object is not simply the e-learning technology, but the affordances or functions of the particular e-learning tool as selected and demonstrated by the educational development subject. The selection of function is not objective, but is informed by a strategy. One available tactic is that of vanguard, where an educational development subject is seeking entry to spaces or relations where a subject-position of ‘expert’ can be performed. Given that the demonstrations are made for a group of teaching subjects teaching into qualifications across a diverse range of levels and discipline areas, a desired subject-position of ‘expert’ is contingent upon a teaching subject being able to translate the generalised affordance into a pre-existing learning design. The ‘it’ or ‘deposit’ serves an enunciative function (Foucault, 1972) of ‘advocating affordances and capabilities
for various e-learning technologies to solicit future collaboration with teaching subjects as students’.

6. Identify two key priorities – to be negotiated between the e-Learning Team Leader, the HOD (Head of Department) and the ELF.

*My job here will be to support whatever these guys decide, although a departmental plan should make this point redundant. Except, the only difference is that they have to negotiate with a manager.*

A relationship of force which continues to necessitate exertion of this strategy, is that between an idealised subjectivity of ‘expert’ emergent from a vanguard tactic, and a humanist conception of agency reliant upon structural conditions. In this socio-historical instance, the main structural condition is an absence from the generation of objectives related to the use of e-learning. A vanguard strategy of providing demonstrations can now be read as a means of influencing the individual teachers’ choices (e-learning facilitators) on how they intend to use e-learning technologies to achieve their key performance indicator. This humanist-structuralist conception of agency functioned throughout the lifespan of the ELF program.

*I rarely feel like I get a chance to speak in forums such as this and (consequently) rely upon building goodwill with teachers who then put in a good word for me to their peers.*

At the conclusion of the e-learning facilitator program I was let through this metaphorical gate to speak about my role in the program to the group of management subjects. These were the management subjects who had initially negotiated the key performance indicators with a manager for the ELFs. In the introduction to this chapter, I drew upon Fraser et al. (2010) to describe educational development as an umbrella term used to aggregate a myriad of performances shaped by localised institutional agendas and priorities. Working with such a conception, it is conceivable to contend that this audience of management subjects are the major agents behind a state of educational
development being contestable. It is a classic problem of Marxist agency as ‘interests’ (Foucault & Deleuze, 1977) where the educational development subject is at risk of rationalising the effects of contestability as a struggle of competing ideologies, foregoing consideration of what effects their pedagogic acts have made within this discourse.

As visualised in earlier sense-making passages, vanguard pedagogy is an initiatory tactic that is emergent in a discursive field of contestability in educational development. Through an initial point of differentiation (Foucault, 1972) of ‘collaboration with teaching subjects as students’, the field of educational development is classified via intersections between the ‘rules of right’ (Foucault, 1980e) for educational development in official documents such as position descriptions, and the activities actually performed by an educational development subject. The ‘effects of truth’ (Foucault, 1980e) which are emergent from these intersections often rely upon humanist conceptions of agency based on structural conditions. These effects of truth have been explored via a relational view of power as a chain of possible actions upon actions (Foucault, 1982). Each action has been viewed as strategic, through consideration of its ‘tactical productivity’ (engendered effects of power/knowledge) and ‘strategical integration’ (the relationship of force necessitating action) (Foucault, 1978).

An educational developer is typically marginalised from the construction of outcomes that are derived institutionally or by individual teachers. In the case of individual teachers, such outcomes are derived from pedagogic decisions (related to e-learning) made prior to engaging with an educational developer. It is the dominant structural condition which can be drawn upon as a means to justify a vanguard tactic. This tactic remains in play through conceptions made by an educational developer post-performing each pedagogical act/strategy. One conception is a status of failing to achieve the binary opposite identity or position of ‘expert’. This failure can be rationalised by drawing upon the professional
credentials of teachers who have visualised some form of interest in the demonstrated process. Through associating the teacher’s interest with their credential, the educational developer can justify the focus of their vanguard tactic on the basis that those persons not possessing the same credentials, are likely to take longer to grasp the demonstrated process.

Workshops serve as an accessible pedagogic site for educational development subjects to exert greater force over the focus of their work. At this site, an educational development subject can showcase their knowledge in the hope of soliciting the teachers to collaborate with them in contexts where they have exerted force over the focus and are positioned as an expert. For a vanguard strategy of ‘demonstrations’ to have some level of success, it is typically reliant upon a teacher being able to situate the presented affordances within a learning design in an existing unit of study. While ‘vanguard’ can be conceptualised as a binary opposite to the aspirational position as ‘expert’, this binary is only operable when educational developers view their agency via a structuralist humanist stance. It relies on conceptualisation of educational development as a stable identity.

In closing – navigating educational development as contestable

In this chapter, I have attempted to think with Foucault’s three historical ontologies of Knowledge-Power-Self (Deleuze, 2006) as a means of visualising a discursive terrain of educational development as contestable, where contestability is a macro-level explanation for a multitude of micro-level effects or practices. This macro-level justification engenders a tactic of ‘vanguard,’ intended to achieve a subjectivity of ‘expert’ for educational development subjects. A subjectivity of ‘expert’ is contingent upon a point of initial differentiation (Foucault, 1972) of ‘collaboration with teachers as students’. It is a conception emergent from the juncture between official documents as the ‘rules of right’ (Foucault, 1980e) that officially define the role of educational
development, and the everyday actions performed by educational development subjects.
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Introducing a problem of being outside

In the previous chapter I explored how a discursive field of contestability engendered a pedagogic tactic of vanguard, where the educational subject attempted to cultivate relationships which enable the subject to work in a way reflecting an idealistic unified notion of ‘educational development’. Emphasis was placed upon the exploration of pedagogic strategies which were acts of resisting the knowledge/power (Foucault, 1980d) emergent from various discourse which posit educational development as contestable. In this chapter the agency game emphasis will shift from the educational development subject searching for a unified identity, to the subject exerting force against conceptions of being outside or marginalised via the use of multiple proximate normative subjectivities.

I will be thinking with a Spivakian conceptualisation of marginal (Spivak, 1990) to explore the in-between space (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) of the margin between an idealised centre and outside. I am using the term ‘catachrestic conceptualisations’ as a derivative of ‘catachresis’ (Spivak, 1993) to refer to idealised-generalised conceptions of a variety of common employment roles situated in a TAFE institution. These catachrestic conceptualisations serve as intermediate reference points for an educational development subject to be discursively positioned. Thinking with knowledge-power-self (Foucault, 1982), I will examine how the use of catachrestic conceptualisations engender and govern an educational development subjects pedagogical acts, performed as a means of resisting various subjectivities which denote a status of being outside the margins. I will conclude the chapter by exploring how an educational development subject can utilise various conceptions of marginality as an in-between space to rationalise and defend pedagogical strategies and actions.
Outside an idealised centre of pedagogic decision making

Discourses which posit educational development as contestable seemingly diminish the capacity for an educational development subject to succinctly articulate their role, function or utility. Enunciations made by educational development subjects in an attempt to define their field, are often delivered in response to a teaching subject seeking clarification of their utility at a point of personal introduction.

*Whenever I was introduced to teachers they would ask 'so what do you actually do?'*

There is an absence of a readily accessible catachrestic conceptualisation of educational development, which can be used as a pragmatic first place for conceiving what utility or function an educational development subject can provide. In contrast, it is conceivable that there is a diminished necessity for such a question to be uttered toward a teaching subject, on the basis that there is an available generalised set of actions to characterise award unit teaching. In such an instance, the enunciating subject can draw upon this catachrestic conceptualisation of ‘award unit teaching’ to construct a rudimentary understanding of what the other subject does in their role.

*Their comments/questions (teachers) would entail references to IT such as 'So you're good with computers' or 'I've got this problem with my laptop...you reckon you could come by and have a look at it?*

These enunciations posed by a teaching subject serve to marginalise the educational development subject away from a ‘centre’ of award unit teaching. The questions function as a strategy to confine the scope of action for educational development within a margin consummate with a catechistic conception of ‘IT officer’. The aforementioned questions posed by the teaching subject can be read as an attempt to locate work for the educational development subject that does not jeopardise their autonomy (control)
regarding pedagogic decisions. Thinking with Spivak (1985a), use of this catachrestic conceptualisation of ‘IT officer’ engenders an effect of ‘othering’, where the educational development subject is positioned as a subordinate ‘other’ to the teaching subject. An effect of this othering is that the educational development subject is excluded from pedagogic decisions which are solely the domain of teaching subjects. It is this pedagogic knowledge/space which is considered the sole property of the teaching subject.

A catachrestic conceptualisation of ‘IT officer’ functions as one switch in a ‘system of differentiations’ (Foucault, 1982) within a discursive field of educational development as marginal. The use of this switch momentarily defines the scope of available actions upon actions for an educational development subject. To this point you could conceivably summarise the previous passages as an attempt at introducing its tactical use by a teaching subject, exerted at an educational development subject. I would now like to broaden this conception focusing on ‘knowledge-power’ to now encompass ‘self’, whereby emphasis can be placed on how the ‘educational developer’ constitutes their self as a subject of effect via this ‘system of differentiation’. One site where this differentiation functioned, was during workshops I facilitated with the group of e-learning facilitators (ELFs).

Title - E-Learning Facilitator Challenges, Issues and Questions

1. Blackboard issues
2. Managing multiple groups
3. Creating blackboard shells
4. Getting word documents to open in blackboard
5. Transferring quizzes

33 Blackboard is a proprietary learning management system used by Tertiary institutions in the provision and management of online units of study.
6. Releasing assignments/assessments using selective release

7. Transferring content from one shell to another

8. What is SCORM?

9. “Really s##t” ... “clunky” – non-intuitive as it takes half an hour to move items (icons) in menu

10. Finding the link to institutional tutorials and external links to tutorials

11. Why Blackboard?

12. What’s Moodle?

13. Creating Icons - How

14. Where to get started

15. Dealing with students who are dropping out

16. Java?

17. Submitting assignments

18. Adding assignments

19. (which) Browser?

20. Layout limitations – looking appealing to students

---

34 A function within Blackboard that enables a teacher to automate the availability of learning materials and assessment tasks.
35 A ‘shell’ refers to a single unit of study in a learning management system.
36 SCORM (Sharable Content Object Reference Model) is a series of standards used to produce learning objects that can be used in multiple learning management systems.
37 MOODLE (modular object-oriented dynamic learning environment) is an open source learning management system.
38 Graphical icons for section headings within a Blackboard unit of study (shell).
39 The JAVA runtime environment is a software application that needed to be operable on a desktop computer in order for a teacher to upload learning materials into the Blackboard learning management system.
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21. Banner Templates?

22. Changing results

23. Why only support (9-5)?

24. TAFE VC\textsuperscript{40}: How is it managed? (24/7 support), which one do we choose?

25. What’s its selling point? TAFEVC not metered\textsuperscript{41} for students

26. TAFEVC is free for profile\textsuperscript{42} delivery

27. TAFEVC student use is metered.... what’s the contingency if they use their quota and you use TAFEVC?

Working within this system of differentiation (Foucault, 1982) leveraging a catachrestic conceptualisation of ‘IT Officer’, I had commenced my line of questioning in line with the diagnostic model that an IT officer would employ to locate and subsequently fix a technical problem. I asked this group of teaching turned educational development subjects to outline the things they found most challenging related to performing their new role as de facto-educational development subjects. The majority of their responses were constrained to technical issues and procedural (how do I do x?) questions which are indicative of the ‘IT Officer’ catachrestic conceptualisation. Another effect of the ‘IT officer’ catachrestic conceptualisation functioning as part of a system of differentiation (Foucault, 1982), was that it directed the objectives sought by teaching and management subjects in training needs analysis type interactions. Requests to facilitate workshops for faculty/department groups were often constrained by the proposal of a specific question, or desire for the demonstration of a particular process or software application.

\textsuperscript{40} TAFEVC (now TrainingVC) is a learning management system that is available to all registered training providers (RTOs).

\textsuperscript{41} Refers to students being able to access TAFEVC without being charged for their data use while on the system.

\textsuperscript{42} A term commonly used to denote the funding a TAFE institution would receive from the Victorian state government based on the number of contact hours associated with a unit of competency and the number of students enrolled in each unit across a calendar year.
It’s hard not to get frustrated running sessions such as these when you are bought in to demonstrate how to use a tool that is goddamn easy to use in isolation to the bigger picture. Luckily, I’ve worked with almost everyone in the group...but in these cases you just feel like you’re the IT guy bought in.

The catachrestic conception of ‘IT officer’ as a form of differentiation remains strongly at play in regard to the focus being restricted to enabling implementation or maintenance of e-learning technologies. However, the mode and location of the workshop serve as a first plank for exploring a move toward inhabiting a Spivakian conception of marginality (Spivak, 1990). It is here where the educational subject starts to occupy a space in-between the catachrestic conceptualisations of ‘award unit teacher’ and ‘IT officer’. In this socio-historical instance, an effect of ‘othering’ (Spivak, 1985a) remains in play through an educational development subject’s conception of self, expressed via the enunciation ‘isolation to the bigger picture’. I am going to speculate that this bigger picture is the selection of e-learning technologies in relation to a teaching subject’s pedagogy. There is a re-inscription of othering exerted via both the teaching subject’s defining of the workshop scope and the educational development subject’s conception of the ‘centre’ being the pedagogic decision-making process in award unit teaching.

There is just no time made to discuss the pros and cons...and more importantly there is no sense of being excited to teach

The enunciation ‘pros and cons’ can be read as a pedagogic strategy for the educational development subject to gain greater access to this ‘centre’ of pedagogic decision making. It is a means for the educational development subject to simulate how a teaching subject can associate e-learning technologies with their pedagogy. A ‘strategical integration’ (Foucault, 1978) or force relationship engendering this strategy is that between the subject’s conception-desire of ‘centre’ and the state of being ‘outside’ this pedagogic space; seemingly confined to a focus on technology via a system of differentiations.
(Foucault, 1982) emergent from use of a catachrestic conceptualisation of ‘IT officer’. For the strategy to be successful, it is foreseeable that a teaching subject needs to disclose their practice in a workshop environment comprising colleagues across multiple departments in the TAFE. In regard to othering, such a confession could be read as an acknowledgement that an educational development subject is not subordinate to the teaching subject. In the aforementioned journal excerpt, the educational development subject denotes a ‘lack of time’ as the major reason for not being able to facilitate a ‘pros and cons’ discussion. This rationalisation avoids re-inscribing a state of marginality emergent from an othering of the educational development subject, enacted by a teaching subject’s refusal to confess their pedagogy.

The need for an educational developer to define their field is necessitated by the lack of a replicable generalised conception of the role. The act of a teacher or manager asking an educational developer to produce such a definition serves a function of subordinating the educational developer to the teacher. This state is compounded by the follow up questions made in response to such a definition being guided by a proximate generalised role of information technology support officer. The use of this generalised role-based description serves an intermediate means of categorising an educational developer’s utility, engendering an educational developer to conceptualise their status as being outside a centre of pedagogic decision making in award units of study. A conception of being outside engenders pedagogic strategies such as facilitating ‘pros and cons’, where the educational developer can lead an evaluation of e-learning technologies in a workshop setting with a group of teachers. The strategy of shifting the direction of a workshop initially requested on the basis that participants (teachers) will learn to operate a given e-learning technology, is reliant upon teachers disclosing their practice. It is this disclosure of practice which would serve as an acknowledgement that the educational developer is not subordinate to the teacher. Similarly, an educational developer acknowledging that a teacher is...
unwilling to disclose their pedagogic decisions is a further acknowledgement of the educational developer’s subordination to the teacher.

A pedagogy of resisting catachrestic conceptualisations

To this point I have introduced a state of marginality (Spivak, 1990) for an educational development subject characterized by functions associated with catachrestic conceptualisations of ‘award unit teacher’ and ‘IT officer’. The distance of an educational development subject’s marginality from an idealized ‘centre’ of ‘pedagogic decision making in award unit teaching’, is not fixed to a position in a structural hierarchy. However, use of the catachrestic conceptualisations as utility placeholders by both educational development and teaching subjects, serve as a means of re-inscribing a state of ‘othering’ (Spivak, 1985a) where the educational development subject is seemingly subordinate to the teaching subject.

At this point I would like to briefly explore how this ‘centre’ is operable as a means of marginality and othering within a group or collective of educational development subjects. Within the centralised-institutional learning and teaching unit, educational development subjects were classified within one of two groups. I was situated within the group labelled via a catachresis of ‘e-learning’, while the corresponding group were referred to via a catachresis of ‘curriculum’. Both groups were organisationally positioned at the same level, enabling all educational development subjects to receive the same level of remuneration.

My colleague who works as an e-learner is not in favour of it (removal of the two strands) as s/he reckons our skills will be watered down...but I think that we need to do this as the curriculum folks all have different strengths and the divide is not realistic. After doing that session with the ELFs I came away crystal clear that unless we
are working on helping staff with overall unit design than we are just seen as an add on or fix it service.

Through being organisationally positioned under a catachresis of ‘e-learning’, the educational development subject is seemingly susceptible to an effect of othering in relation to both teaching subjects and educational development subjects categorised under a banner of curriculum. Technology via the ‘e’ in the position nomenclature can be considered as an introductory point in a system of differentiations (Foucault, 1982) where a binary of ‘technology vs teaching’ can serve as a means of efficient exclusion. If we continue to consider a ‘centre’ of pedagogic decision making in award units, a catachresis of ‘curriculum’ can be viewed as highly proximate given that it is a core component of teaching practice. In contrast, a catachresis of ‘e-learning’ can be considered as an optional or aspirational component of TAFE teaching subject’s conceptions of their practice. As it was articulated earlier in the thesis, a desire for flexible learning (which later encompassed e-learning and online technologies) has been constant in policy documents since TAFE’s inception in 1974 (Kangan & Australian Committee on Technical and Further Education, 1974b). It is not a pedagogy which has been widely instigated and advocated for by TAFE teaching subjects.

The best bit is that we will be seen as equals with the curriculum people as I’m sick of this perception that the e-learning people only know about using technology and that we don’t know anything about the real work (teaching). I’m not the f##king IT guy!

A strategy of ‘nomenclature’ enacted through advocating for the removal of a catachresis of ‘e-learning’ from that of ‘educational developer’ may be viewed as somewhat trivial given that there is no consideration of the means in which an educational development subject has contributed to a marginal status through their resistive acts. This seemingly trivial strategy is significant as a means of resisting effects of othering (Spivak, 1985a) that are emergent from the application of the catachrestic conceptualisations ‘award unit teacher’ and ‘IT
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One of my colleagues who is a bit sceptical toward some of our colleagues regarding their ‘lack of teaching’ said s/he giggles when I use examples ‘when I was teaching’ to make this point.

Working with this nominalised definition (and by association, division) of educational development roles, there is a level of ‘tactical productivity’ (Foucault, 1978) for the educational development subject to declare a former occupation of the catachresis (award unit teaching) which is being used as a means of othering. This strategy of ‘occupation’ is an efficient proposition for the educational development subject seeking access to a centre ‘of pedagogic decision making in award units’. Through using few words to associate with the master catachresis, the educational development subject is avoiding or postponing a need to problematize the nominalist status of the catachresis being used to define the utility of educational development. This act is an extension of the aforementioned strategy of ‘nomenclature’ to resist the subjectivity consummate with the ‘other’ or ‘outside’ catachresis of ‘IT officer’.

The most positive session so far and I felt like the many of the ELF were impressed that I actually can pull apart a unit descriptor (from a
training package)\(^{43}\) and make sense of it...in that I think I asked some reasonable questions and tried to acknowledge everyone’s contributions on the board.

A continuation of this strategy of ‘former occupation of a catachrestic conceptualisation of teacher’, was to model a process of adapting an existing face to face unit to one which is taught in a blended\(^{44}\) mode. This guided facilitation initially centred on interpreting curriculum from national VET training packages and subsequently moved toward modelling how a teaching subject can create a learning design for the unit. Learning design commonly refers to the endeavour of ‘educational notation’ (Dalziel et al., 2016), where a teacher/academic attempts to document their intended pedagogy in a visual format that can be easily shared and interpreted by colleagues. In crude terms, a learning design is a pedagogical interpretation of the curriculum and is a form of confession or disclosure from a teaching subject. It is a graphical representation of an idealised ‘centre’ of pedagogic decision making in award unit teaching. Through systematising this disclosure of pedagogic decision making, there would be a structure of individual components for teaching subjects to subsequently associate technologies to individual aspects of their unit (i.e. an assessment task). Thinking with a Spivakian marginality (Spivak, 1990), learning design as a concept and tactic models a transgression for educational development between a centre of pedagogic decision making and a margin of technical support that is indicative of an ‘IT Officer’ catechesis. A tactic of ‘modelling learning design’ enacted via a workshop session on interpreting curriculum enabled me to continue demonstrating a capacity to occupy a ‘centre’ of pedagogic decision making in award units.

Throughout the previous sequence of journal excerpts and sense making passages, I have attempted to visualise a tactic of occupying a centre of

\(^{43}\) Qualifications situated in National Training Packages are comprised of constituent units. A Unit Descriptor commonly refers to the core elements of curriculum contained within each unit of study.

\(^{44}\) Blended Learning typically refers to the provision of a sequence of learning where students are required to engage with a combination of online and on-campus based components.
‘pedagogic decision making in award units of study’. This tactic thus far has encompassed strategies of ‘nomenclature’ and ‘demonstrating capacity to occupy a catachrestic conceptualisation of teacher’. In other words, the educational development subject has attempted to resist the power/knowledge (Foucault, 1978) emergent from the opposition of catachrestic conceptualisations ‘award unit teaching’ and ‘IT Officer’ by advocating for changes to their position title, and then through modelling use of a learning design process to demonstrate that s/he has the capacity to perform a task which is an intersection of e-learning with award unit teaching.

I will now briefly explore how the educational development subject attempts to validate or solidify this claim through leveraging ‘rules of right’ (Foucault, 1980e). ‘Rules of right’ are socio-historical specifications of power visualised in instruments such as rules, contracts and classifications of socio-structural status. In this context, a strategy of ‘applying rules of right’ is enacted through the educational development subject making references to formal credentials such as teaching qualifications and remuneration classification scales.

I didn’t learn much in mine (studying teaching degree) and I only worked as a teacher for five years… I didn’t want to get stuck teaching year eight home room groups or being a token male in a primary school, so I did more study and ended up teaching a few days a week in TAFE, some H/E work and some VET in school45. It’s easy for these little bits of experience to be talked up and legitimised in combination with a teaching degree. So, what is all this telling me… maybe we are struggling for an identity and we are clutching to the one we think is closest and put on the biggest pedestal. I’m paid at the same level as someone who manages programs (i.e. course coordinator) and I’m employed as a TAFE teacher…. but it somehow doesn’t feel like we are part of the same group.

45 VET is School (VETIS) are typically certificate 2 and 3 qualifications that can be undertaken by senior secondary school students in Victoria.
Foucault (1980e) utilised a triangle of power-right-truth as a means of articulating a relational concept of power. One way of utilising this triangle of relational power is to consider the inter-relationship of the ‘rules of right’ and ‘effects of truth’. ‘Effects of truth’ are those knowledge claims of truth enabled as an effect of the formalised ‘rules of right’. The metaphor of a triangle symbolises the recurring or iterative effect each point has with one another. In the previous journal excerpt the educational development subject acknowledges utilisation of the ‘rules of right’ as a means of validating claims of occupying a centre of ‘pedagogic decision making in award unit teaching’. Use of a ‘rule of right’ does not engender the intended effect of occupying this centre, as there is an unintended ‘effect of truth’ on the subject. The educational development subject subsequently utilised the ‘rules of right’ to locate an ‘effect of truth’ as a disjuncture between their associated organisational-remuneration status and the perceived value others had placed on their work.

Thinking with Spivak (1996b), this disjuncture is in-part symbolic of her deconstructionist reading of the Marxian doublet use-value and exchange value. In a reductionist reading, the use-value is based on core material properties or measurable attributes such as labour. Meanwhile, the exchange-value is the nominal figure associated with the commodity to enable its exchange. Value is calculated as the exchange value subtracted by the use-value. If we posit the institution as the consumer where an educational development subject’s salary is the exchange-value, it then engenders the question ‘what are the core properties which constitute the use-value of educational development?’ In this reductionist reading, we would need to determine these qualities so that we can calculate value. Thinking with Spivak (1985b) use-value can be re-considered as the application of local knowledge, where the use value no longer precedes exchange-value as an essentialist construct. This application of local knowledge is reliant upon conceptions of exchange-value, while simultaneously enabling the construction of local knowledge. I had previously relied on the catachrestic conception of teacher to resist a subjectivity which is derivative of an othering as an IT officer/servant. Within a reductionist conception of value, this catachrestic
conception of teacher serves as a benchmark of (self) use-value to inevitably determine value. A reductionist reading of value can engender forms of self-knowledge where an educational development subject is seemingly striving to achieve an impossible subjectivity.

The proximate generalised roles of ‘IT officer’ and ‘award unit teacher’ engender the marginalisation of educational developers from both teachers and their educational development colleagues. This is most visible through sub-classifications of educational development using additional position titles such as ‘curriculum’ and ‘e-learning’. For the educational developer situated within the e-learning team, s/he is subordinate to the curriculum educational developers through their proximity to an idealised centre of ‘award unit teaching’, as curriculum is a core or foundational concept. In contrast, e-learning is an additional and/or optional component whereby the educational developer can view nomenclature as an instrument of marginalisation. This conception of agency engenders a strategy of advocating for the removal of marginal nomenclature such as ‘e-learning’ and in declaring a former occupation of an idealised centre of award unit teaching. Continuing this strategy of occupation, an educational developer can demonstrate the capacity to occupy the ‘idealised centre’ through modelling learning design processes.

A subsequent strategy of self-referencing formal credentials (i.e. as a qualified teacher) in interactions with teachers serves as a means of strengthening or validating this claim of having capacity to occupy the ‘idealised centre’. In parallel, this strategy can be applied by the educational developer on their self, engendering conceptions of agency and success which are destructive. For example, the educational developer can draw upon qualities associated with their credentials such as remuneration and question how s/he is able to justify receiving a higher level than the teacher who seemingly occupies the idealised centre. Each of the aforementioned strategies are exerted as a means of resisting a sense of being marginalised from an idealised centre of pedagogic decision
making, however this centre is reconceptualised or rounded to encompass a role-based descriptor of award unit teacher. An effect of this ‘rounding of the centre’ is that an educational developer is attempting to occupy a role, more so than actualise a function which is interdisciplinary. This engenders the construction of local knowledge where an educational developer ‘is seemingly striving to achieve an unachievable identity’.

**Locating the ‘in-between’ spaces of organisational fault-lines**

To this point I have explored how an educational subject may navigate conceptions of othering (Spivak, 1985a) emergent via the workings of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1980e). I attempted to visualise this power/knowledge through exploring how catachrestic conceptualisations of ‘award unit teacher’ and ‘IT officer’ function as efficient, but problematic idealised proximate points of differentiation (Foucault, 1982). For an educational development subject, they function as leverage points of resistance against effects of marginality (Spivak, 1990) to an idealised centre of ‘pedagogic decision making in award units of study’.

From this point onward, I will shift attention from idealised proximate roles, toward exploring the marginal in-between space between institutional learning and teaching centres, and traditional subject/discipline-based centres such as faculties, schools and departments. Central learning and teaching centres are often organisationally detached from the faculties, schools and departments similar to services such as the library and IT services; whereby individuals working in these centres can be feasibly working with teaching subjects across all of the discipline/subject areas. Employment in a central learning and teaching unit is more than simply a structural position on an organisational chart. With an idealised centre of pedagogic decision making in award units of study, the organisational status can function as a ‘rule of right’ (Foucault, 1980e) formalising a marginal status for educational development subjects.
My previous manager talked about them (the central learning and teaching unit) like they were an absolute joke and when they (educational developers from the central learning and teaching unit) asked me to run some sessions on collaborative learning tools s/he was very comfortable telling them ‘no’.

As discussed earlier in the chapter, ‘rules of right’ simultaneously engender relational power and function as an ‘effect of truth’ emergent from the exertion of force in such power relations (Foucault, 1980e). The previous journal excerpt is indicative of a teaching/management exerting force in a manner where the ‘rule of right’ can be succinctly characterised as a binary fault line. Given that an educational development subject is likely to view pedagogic decision making in award units of study as an idealised centre, this binary fault line can be conceptualised as a form of knowledge which will engender conceptions of othering (Spivak, 1985a) which induce particular pedagogic actions for an educational development subject. It can serve as a leverage point for educational development subjects to rationalise capacity (for), or effects (of) action.

We are not really viewed as being part of ‘core business’... we are just seen as getting a free ride by some and irrelevant to many others. I think this can change, but it’s very hard to not say what you think... as saying nothing just seems weak when teachers tell you what they think of the Taj. I feel like I’m walking a little tight rope that if I say the wrong thing...I’m hung.

Outsider status associated with employment in the central learning and teaching unit is expressed by faculty-based teachers in a range of ways. For example, I used the term ‘core business’ faculty-based teaching, mirroring its use by teachers who use the term to express their dissatisfaction with the central learning and teaching unit. ‘Core business’ becomes a point of differentiation (Foucault, 1982) to justify and reinforce the fault line between the faculties and central learning and teaching unit. Thinking with Foucault (1988a), the
conception of core business functions as a ‘technology of the self’, whereby self-use of an exclusionary term has an effect of constituting the educational development subject. For example, the statement ‘core business’ is often coupled with a subjugatory theme of privilege. ‘Free ride’ is explained most easily by the central learning and teaching unit not having a student load; subsequently bringing in limited revenue in comparison with the faculties. If we re-visit Spivak’s (1985b) re-reading of Marx’s concept of use-value, I will speculate that through use-value being locally contingent and multiple, the educational development subject relies upon a conception of exchange value to constitute their self as subordinate or other.

We have a terrible reputation at the central learning and teaching unit. I like how we are referred to as the Taj as we supposedly have all the good facilities and equipment…. with the few teachers I have been able to become friendly with I’ve started referring to our office space as the Taj. I said to my manager ‘are you aware that we are referred to as the Taj?’ Looking confused, I was told to explain and then the penny dropped.

A statement of educational development being ‘privileged’ was most visible through teaching subject’s enunciation of the central learning and teaching offices as the ‘Taj’. This strategy of inverted-othering engenders the educational development subject to re-purpose the metaphor ‘The Taj’ as a means of diffusing a subjectivity of privilege. The educational development subject temporarily adopts the assigned-stigmatised identity (Mills, 2012) to construct a ‘counter discourse’ (Foucault & Deleuze, 1977) that posits management subjects within the central learning and teaching centre as the privileged. Re-use of the metaphor ‘The Taj’ directed at management subjects, leverages a structural-humanist conception of agency on the basis that an organisational position is the key indicator for determining ‘who’ has capacity to change the perception of the central learning and teaching centre. It was a leverage point to advocate for changes which engender a closer proximity to an idealised centre of pedagogic decision making. The educational development subject’s act of counter-
identification enables the visualisation of a marginal space where the educational development subject occupies a space between teaching subjects and management subjects in the central learning and teaching centre.

*Went along to one of the small campuses where many of my (central learning and teaching unit) colleagues have never ventured. Difficulties with getting a laptop to connect to the network and faces looking back at me thinking ‘see what s##t we have to deal with...good...you are feeling our pain...now overcome that’. While all the usual ‘we can’t connect crap was going on’*

A subjectivity of privilege functions as a ‘technology of the self’ (Foucault, 1988a) for the educational development subject as s/he articulates a sense of interest and perhaps responsibility for resource-related difficulties faced by teaching subjects. A subjectivity of responsibility is visualised through a relation between the quality of physical resources and direct generation of monetary income (student load). An emergent constitution of self in the previous journal excerpt is visible in the differentiation made between the educational development subject and their colleagues in the learning and teaching centre, on the basis of having visited (or not) the seemingly oppressed teaching location. The constitution of self as ‘having responsibility’ further problematizes the binary fault line of faculties-schools-departments and the central learning and teaching centre, through dispersing subjects in this organisational location along an in-between space, sitting between two margins of faculties-schools-departments and institutional management.

The organisational location of an educational developer can be efficiently situated along a fault line between a centralised learning and teaching unit/centre, and the faculties, schools and departments where award unit teaching is typically performed. With pedagogic decision making in award units of study functioning as
an idealised location for educational developers, the aforementioned fault line can engender seemingly fixed conceptions of marginalisation and agency. A notion of ‘core business’ serves as a key point for the educational developer to conceptualise marginalisation on the basis that s/he cannot succinctly rationalise their ‘value’ using non-monetary income related measures. This method can engender an educational developer to conceptualise and resist a partial identity of ‘privilege’ where access to equipment and facilities is seemingly not earned. The educational developer can attempt to resist this partial identity associated with their employment in a central learning and teaching unit, through re-appropriating labels denoting privilege as a counter-identity. Adoptions of a counter identity inevitably serve to fracture the fault line between central learning and teaching units and faculties, schools and departments. Points of fracture emerge where the educational developer is first differentiated from managers in the central unit, and later from educational development colleagues. These differentiations are made in relation to the manager or educational developer’s degree of acknowledging ‘privilege’.

**A pedagogy of navigating marginality via a centre-value-strategy triad**

Over the past few pages I have attempted to utilise knowledge-power-self (Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1982) as a means to visualise in-between spaces of marginality (Spivak, 1990) for an educational development subject in relation to their organisational employment location in a centralised learning and teaching unit. In terms of agency for educational development subjects, this visualisation has opened up multiple spaces of marginality which cannot be rationalised as a sole consequence of structure via an idealised fault line between a central learning and teaching unit and the faculties, schools and departments. At this point I would now like to explore the agonistic dimension (Foucault, 1982) of the faculty/central unit fault line, through examining acts of resistance and the
emergent conceptualisations of marginality.

Yes, I can run more projects in such a scenario but as we have seen, in the current climate it can be difficult to attract participants.

For educational development subjects organisationally situated in central learning and teaching units, conceptions of success are inevitably dependant on teaching subjects’ use of e-learning. In the context of the e-learning facilitators (ELF) project, success initially depended upon management subjects in the faculties and departments nominating teaching subjects to participate. There was initially some difficulty in getting each department to propose a teacher to participate in the e-learning facilitator’s (ELF) project and I found this difficult to explain, beyond referencing the fault line between the central unit and the faculties.

You would think that a position for a day and a half a week for 12 months where you can learn a whole heap of new skills would be a really attractive proposition. Well, I am very wrong! Nearly half of the positions have not been filled as yet and there was only one department where I know of two people putting their hands up for the gig.

I can only speculate that the strategical integration (Foucault, 1978) or force relationship necessitating the faculty based management and teaching subject’s aversion or hesitation to participate is multiple and partial. I am consequently more concerned with the effects on the educational development subject’s conception of marginality (Spivak, 1990) emergent from this resistive act. In the above journal excerpt the educational development subject specifies that the main benefit for teaching subjects is the acquisition of ‘a whole heap of new skills’ which they would learn via instruction from the educational development subject. This association of project participation affordances with the teaching subject’s act of non-participation, serves as a means for the educational
development subject to conceptualise their marginality based on subject matter. In this project, subject matter can be broadly classified as ‘e-learning.’

The PD asked for people who were savvy with e-learning and half this group have never seen Blackboard\(^{46}\) and have never used PowerPoint\(^{47}\)....

When the teaching subjects were eventually confirmed as participants in the e-learning facilitator (ELF) project, their level of engagement with the subject matter of ‘e-learning’ was utilised as a point of differentiation (Foucault, 1982) for determining the level of support a faculty/department was placing in the project. Through using ‘engagement with the subject matter of e-learning’ as a point of differentiation, the educational development subject was able to conceptualise faculties/department-based management subjects’ nomination of teaching subjects as resistive acts along the fault line between the central learning and teaching unit and faculties, schools and departments.

Training needs analysis is a recurring theme for me...that I should have done one. But, I’m not sure whether it would have helped or acted as a massive sledgehammer to a few...who unfortunately have been offered up by their departments as cannon fodder.

By the half way point of the year, I had come to the conclusion that some of the teaching subjects (ELFs) had been offered as ‘cannon fodder’, where it was likely that departmental management subjects were exerting force against the intended outcomes of the program and more broadly against the central learning and teaching unit. A conceptualisation of ‘cannon fodder’ as a resistive strategy engendered the educational development subject to consider the future use of diagnostic assessment as a pedagogical means of exposing and resisting the agentic restraints emergent from the exertion of such a strategy. As

---

\(^{46}\) Blackboard is a proprietary learning management system (LMS) commonly utilised by tertiary institutions worldwide.

\(^{47}\) Microsoft PowerPoint is a desktop application for producing digital presentations.
pedagogic decision making in award units of study has been utilised throughout this chapter as an idealised centre (location) for an educational development subject, it is conceivable to suggest that teaching subject’s application of e-learning at this centre is a means for the educational development subject to succinctly conceptualise their value or worth. While the fault line between the faculties/departments and the central learning and teaching unit functions as a proximate or structural means of rationalising agonistic struggles, the resultant conceptions of marginality don’t necessarily enable an educational development subject to explore how their reactions are shaped by their conception of marginality emergent from agentic forecasting. In this particular socio-historical instance, the educational development subject is ‘forecasting’ their agency based on a value which is derived or visualised from teaching subject’s actions.

As I don’t work in their department or answer to their head of department how could my opinion be taken seriously by the ELFs.... even if I have been in this situation when I was a teacher. I just wish my manager would get this and even though they are employed by the (Central Teaching Unit) for 1.5 days a week their allegiances will always be with their department...this is just a short-term gig and doesn’t represent reality for them.

A conception of success (visualised by teaching subjects use of e-learning) utilised in parallel with a structural fault line (faculty-school-department and central learning and teaching unit) function as a technology of self (Foucault, 1988a) for the educational development subject. The educational development subject is constituting a subjectivity of ‘despondency’ through utilising the hierarchical nature of the fault line, to advocate that it is pointless for s/he to occupy a conduit-like space between the management subject in the central learning and teaching unit and the faculty-department based teaching subject. In effect, the educational development subject is resisting a Spivakian conception of marginality (Spivak, 1990) through needing to maintain the rigidity of a binary-like fault line visualising an organisational hierarchy. It is a strategy exerted as a means of minimising the likelihood that the management subject in the central
learning and teaching space can argue that the educational development subject is capable of influencing, or is indeed responsible for the actions of teaching subjects.

The organisational fault line between a central learning and teaching unit and the
faculties, schools and departments responsible for award unit teaching is an efficient (but problematic) means for educational developers to explain a range of tensions and actions. In projects which rely upon the participation of teachers to act as champions or advocates of practices such as e-learning, the fault-line is able to be utilised immediately by the educational developer to conceptualise their marginality and associated capacity for action. For example, a conceptual association made between the subject matter to be learned in the project and the fault-line, enables an educational developer to make a determination of how agonistic the relationship is between the respective department and the central unit. It is a determination made through using each project participant’s prior engagement or level of competence with the subject matter of e-learning as the means of measurement. Such use of the fault-line engenders the educational developer to use pedagogical methods such as training needs analysis as a strategy of exposing a department’s level of resistance to the project and central unit. Enacting strategies such as training needs analysis are desirable for the educational developer to increase the feasibility of the teacher participating in the project being able to apply the subject matter (e-learning) at the idealised location of ‘pedagogic decision making in award units’.

I will speculate that this is a major point of visibility for determining the worth or value of an educational developer. In instances when the participating teachers’ level of prior competence offer little feasibility of successful implementation of e-learning at the idealised centre, the educational developer can again utilise the seemingly fixed structural status of the fault line as a means of shifting such expectations of success. While it can be read as a contradictory use of the fault line, it is a strategic position to achieve occupation of an idealised centre where teachers are actively applying e-learning knowledge that has been conceptualised through relations with an educational developer. While the idealised location and dominant conception of visible value will offer some form of stability, the use of the fault line will differ. Marginality functions as both an affect and effect of everyday relations through its use as a strategic position.
In closing - navigating problems of being outside

In this chapter, I have attempted to think with a Spivakian concept of marginality (Spivak, 1990) to visualise an educational development subject’s occupation of multiple spaces in-between an idealised centre and margin. These conceptions of marginality have been conceived through using Spivak’s (1993) notion of catachresis re-imaged as a role based proximate identity, and her re-reading of Marx’s concept of value (Spivak, 1985b) where use-value is seemingly placed under erasure through an inability to define a core conception of pre-exchange value. Thinking with Foucault’s three historical ontologies of Knowledge-Power-Self (Deleuze, 2006), I have been able to speculate that an educational development subject’s conception of their marginality is more than an effect of structural-hierarchical rules of right (Foucault, 1980e), and is a tactical position that can simultaneously function as agentic constrainer and enabler.
Chapter 8 - e-learning as umbrella

Introducing a problem of enacting e-learning

In the previous chapter I explored how an educational development subject is marginal (Spivak, 1993) through occupying a multitude of spaces in between an idealised centre and various margins. I drew upon Foucault’s three historical ontologies of Knowledge-Power-Self (Deleuze, 2006) in parallel with Spivak’s (1985b) re-reading of Marxist value, in order to speculate that marginality can function as a strategic effect/affect. This speculation was visualized via a metaphorical triangle of ‘centre-value-strategy’, whereby the idealized centre is pedagogic decision making and dominant conceptions of value are reliant upon a teaching subject’s use of knowledge (subject matter) emanating from an educational development subject at the idealized centre. An educational development subject’s emergent and multiple conceptions of marginality function as both strategic effect and affect.

In this chapter I am going to examine how an educational development subject’s conceptions of ‘e-learning’ are constituted as the aforementioned subject matter. As a point of initiation, I will consider e-learning as a catachresis (Spivak, 1993) or an umbrella term that offers teaching, management and educational development subjects with the capacity to neatly encapsulate, dismiss, resist and embellish a variety of discourse(s) associated with the use of online technologies. I will initially utilise Foucault’s (1972, pp. 40-49) methodological tools for the formation of discursive objects, to explore how this umbrella term can function as product-based solution to a series of institutionally derived performance targets or challenges. I will then shift to working with an agonistic view of power (Foucault, 1982) to visualise how an educational development subject's pedagogical acts are rationalised as a means of resisting an assortment of constitutive effects emergent from product and technological conceptions of
Chapter 8 - e-learning as umbrella

e-learning.

**E-learning as a product**

E-learning is a master word or catachresis (Spivak, 1993) for an educational development subject, as its use is unable to communicate or represent a clearly definable performance or identity. In this chapter I am attempting to visualise how an educational development subject resists the power/knowledge (Foucault, 1978, 1980e) and associated conceptions of self (Foucault, 1982) that are emergent from a multitude of discourses which are associated with this master word. I will commence this visualisation by charting the major points where a discursive field of e-learning becomes operable in the day to day actions of an educational development subject.

Identify, in consultation with the Head of department, a course / unit / niche program to be delivered remotely to provide flexibility and better access for the student cohort by reducing the need for them to be in the same location as the facilitator / teacher.

The excerpt above is one of the key performance indicators presented by a management subject to the group of participants in the e-learning facilitators project (ELFs). As previously stated earlier in the thesis, the educational development subject was positioned to assist these teaching subjects achieve their key performance indicators which are to be performed within a context of award unit teaching. One of the first contexts an educational development subject is likely to engage with a discourse of e-learning is at this point of interpreting a performance outcome. For an educational development subject, the response to this performance outcome could be conceptualised as their statement of ‘responsibility’ or accountability in relation to the achievement of an outcome initially directed at teaching subjects. It functions as a ‘surface of
emergence’ (Foucault, 1972), where e-learning as an object becomes operable within an existing field of award unit teaching.

Working within this existing field of award unit teaching, an ideal of ‘flexibility’ is a ‘margin of tolerance’ (Foucault, 1972) for defining a discursive field of e-learning. E-learning conceptualised via this margin of tolerance, is a consideration of the degree to which a teaching subject has used technologies to resist the physical classroom being awarded a status as the default or exclusive site for learning in award units.

In my previous position I found that many of the teachers I worked with who had good IT skills (or at least told you that they did) were harder to get the message across to. They are always touted as being the ‘early adopters’ because of their proficiency with technology, but is this what such a position is all about? No wonder e-learning can be a struggle for teachers not from an IT background if that’s what is deemed the necessary norm.

As e-learning encapsulates use of technologies to pursue a disruption of the physical classroom’s status as the default site of learning, a subject area or discipline of information technology functions as an enabling proximate body of knowledge. The subject area is a ‘field of initial differentiation’ (Foucault, 1972) for a discursive field of e-learning, as it categorises a proximate set of actions which can be used as a means of both defining and differentiating e-learning. In the excerpt above, the educational development subject first acknowledges that a discourse of e-learning encompasses use of information technology skills, before differentiating e-learning from this subject area on the basis that this is not the sole measure of preparedness for success. The enunciation ‘harder to get the message across to’ serves to strengthen the differentiation between information technology and e-learning through inferring that the ‘message’ or overarching strategy differs between the two fields. At this point we could speculate that the overarching ‘message’ is an ideal of ‘flexibility’, focussed on decoupling the learning location for students and teachers.
Where is the flexible in flexible learning?

A message of flexibility functioning as a ‘margin of tolerance’ (Foucault, 1972) is reliant upon a conception of the physical learning environment encompassing learners and teaching subjects as being ‘defective’. There is no stable bounded definition of ‘flexibility’, as it is relative to the conception of the learning environment which is being labelled as deficient. While ‘flexible’ as a term engenders subsequent descriptors such as elastic, adaptable, agile and responsive, it is only an aspirational status without this conception of the learning environment being deficient. For the educational development subject, this state of play seemingly reduces capacity to independently create universal definitions or templates of ‘flexibility’ prior to collaboration with a given teaching subject. It solicits a search to ascertain who has the authority to determine ‘deficiency’ and by consequence ‘flexibility’.

After moving past stating their (a senior manager) disappointment in there being a lack of patronage from the senior managers (departmental managers), s/he made an impassioned almost aggressive speech on the inability of teachers to use freely available resources such as flexible learning toolboxes distributed by the Australian Flexible Learning Framework. To justify why this needs to change he made reference to private registered training organisations (RTOs) who use such resources to quickly offer a range of qualifications online.

The journal excerpt above documents the educational development subject’s reaction to a speech given by a senior management subject to a broad group of teaching subjects, including the participants in the ELF project. The senior management subject succinctly introduces a problem of ‘financial sustainability’

---

48 The Australian Flexible Learning Framework was a federally and state funded national strategy for e-learning in Vocational Education. This body hosted a series of professional development events and developed a repository of free online learning objects.
49 Registered training organisations (RTOs) are training providers registered to deliver vocational education and training (VET) qualifications and units of study in Australia. A national register of RTOs is accessible at training.gov.au.
as a key driver necessitating ‘e-learning’. It is through the association made between matters of financial sustainability and a catachresis of ‘e-learning’, that this senior management subject emerges as an ‘authority of delimitation’ (Foucault, 1972). In this socio-historic instance the senior management subject exerts this authority through drawing upon the surface of emergence of ‘award unit teaching’, ‘flexibility’ as the margin of tolerance, and the field of initial differentiation as ‘Information Technology’; to contend that use of freely available online learning objects is an enabler for enacting e-learning as a series of ‘products’. A statement of e-learning as a product is emergent through the management subject referencing private registered training organisations leveraging free online resources as a means of generating revenue. The capacity for a unit of study or an associated learning object to function as a ‘product’ is one point in a ‘grid of specification’ (Foucault, 1972) for defining e-learning as a discursive field. It is an efficient outcomes-based means to define ‘e-learning’ through seconding the activity or development behind the garnered financial impact.

A status of e-learning as an umbrella term engenders educational developers to conceptualise localised versions or interpretations. This act of interpretation is often performed in response to a directive for a qualification and/or unit to be delivered/offered in a flexible mode. Flexibility is a determination of how far the status of the physical classroom as the default site for teaching has been disrupted. While a subject area of ‘information technology’ serves as the proximate source of knowledge for conceptualising the use of technology to enact flexibility, its localised application is inevitably reliant upon a conception of the given physical learning environment as defective. A major authority for determining deficiency are senior managers who associate financial sustainability targets with the notion of flexibility as a means to make such determinations necessitating e-learning. An effect of this link is a conception that e-learning is a product, where associates such as educational developers are susceptible to being
evaluated based on the financial impact of the product.

A pedagogy of navigating e-learning as a solution

S/he (a teacher) concluded by stating that e-learning should not be used as a vehicle to deliver sub-par training for the purpose of a short-term increase in student numbers within the new contestable training environment. I now felt like I was somewhat represented, despite not having said a thing, nor invited to say anything throughout the remainder of the presentations.

Through ‘product’ functioning as one point in a grid of specification (Foucault, 1972) for a discursive field of e-learning, there is capacity for an educational development subject’s pedagogic actions to be evaluated based on their capacity to contribute to income generation. This grid of specification shatters any capacity for a singular conceptualisation of worth for an educational development subject that is derived from a teaching subject’s use of e-learning post-engagement in professional development activities. Thinking with power/knowledge (Foucault, 1978, 1980e), I will speculate that sustained use of this ‘product’ as a point of specification would likely engender a shift away from the workshop as the dominant pedagogic location for an educational development subject. By endorsing the labelling of training solely initiated for the purpose of revenue generation as being ‘sub-par’ and ‘short-term’, the educational development subject is attempting to de-legitimise capacity for ‘product’ to function as a point for defining and classifying e-learning. The relationship of force or ‘strategic integration’ (Foucault, 1978) soliciting such a strategy can be crudely conceptualised as one between subjectivities of ‘developer of teachers’ and ‘developer of products’. In other words, an
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50 Contestable funding in this context refers to the partial deregulation of vocational education funding in Victoria, Australia from 2010.
educational development subject is resisting expectation to be evaluated in relation to the profitability of a sequence of learning as produced by one or more teaching subjects.

After the meeting I was having a brief chat with the ELF (teacher) and s/he was saying that while this unit is great (a new online offering) its ‘so not’ the reality in the department. I just gave a rather predictable answer in saying that at least it’s a bit of a model...something concrete for other teachers to base their work on. While s/he agreed, s/he was sceptical, as this opportunity (of delivering the unit online) was too good to miss...but there doesn’t seem to be any real driver to go further. But, s/he did think that what their work (the online unit) is doing is making things visible that already exist. I took this as meaning that there is a bit of a blur, in that putting this unit online and promoting its existence is promotion of the face to face work units already delivered? So, are we just using online units to promote ourselves?

While a strategy of associating quality with a purpose of flexibility is enacted as a means of resisting a subjectivity as ‘developer of products’, there is an emergent tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978) which re-positis the physical classroom as the core or foundational location for learning. For an educational development subject, this tactical productivity engenders conceptions of e-learning where it plays a supporting or ancillary role to physical location-based teaching. As an effect, the proximate knowledge of information technology is not necessarily applied to the unit or course of study by which flexibility as a margin of tolerance (Foucault, 1972) is applicable. For example, in the journal excerpt above the online unit is posited as a mechanism to promote the ‘real’ work performed on campus, for an audience of potential students who would otherwise not have elected to study at this institution.

I had a really interesting discussion with ##### (developer in learning systems department) floating a model based on the CCK connectivist
course\textsuperscript{51} where a subject area might offer a taster course free to students all over the world and then use it to promote their award courses. The students could complete the assessment like the CCK course and get at least partial award. I bet this becomes popular in the future.

After observing the innovative pedagogy of the CCK08 course, the educational development subject justified the emerging practice as a marketing tool to attract greater numbers of students for the main event of normalised on campus award unit teaching. This re-imagining of ‘product’ as a point in a grid of specification (Foucault, 1972) for e-learning, necessitates a re-consideration of ‘flexibility’ as a margin of tolerance. Earlier in the chapter, ‘flexibility’ was conceptualised as a consideration of the degree to which a teaching subject has used technologies to resist the physical classroom being awarded a status as the default or exclusive site for learning in award units’. With e-learning being posited as a means of marketing on-campus award units of study, a conception of flexibility is now reflective of the earlier seconding of the activity or development of e-learning as being subordinate to the garnered financial impact. In other words, e-learning can still be enacted as a means of resisting the normative status of on-campus teaching, but ‘flexibility’ as the margin of tolerance is inevitably determined through measures of financial impact. Acknowledging that the contestable training environment is a context which necessitates institutions to deliver a profit, the flexibility or agility of e-learning can be conceptualised as a ‘solution’.

I met one of the teachers from this area late last year when we hosted a showcase day at the central learning and teaching unit. I was leading a discussion on online collaborative learning and I didn’t hold back in speaking about how I find it sad that e-learning is often

\textsuperscript{51} The Connectivism and Connective Knowledge course (CCK08) was an openly available online course where the content was distributed and largely learner generated. It is widely viewed as the first MOOC, with a participant base of approximately 2200.
A statement of ‘e-learning as a solution’ is a source of local knowledge emergent from ‘flexibility’ functioning as a margin of tolerance and senior management being an authority of delimitation (Foucault, 1972) in a discursive field of e-learning. This statement seemingly posits e-learning as an institutional management-initiated endeavour to be implemented or achieved by teaching and educational development subjects. An educational development subject acknowledging the existence of the statement ‘e-learning as a solution’ to an audience of teaching subjects can be viewed as a pedagogical strategy. A strategical integration (Foucault, 1978) or force relationship necessitating the strategy is one of ownership or direction for e-learning. A statement of ‘e-learning as the solution’ clearly positions management subjects as the authority of delimitation as they are determining the problem which is to be solved. In terms of authority, it is paradigmatically at odds with a conception of e-learning as simply a mechanism for educational enhancement, where teaching subjects would be the likely authority. This conception of ‘value-add’ is visible in addition of ‘e’ in ‘e-learning’, and in the widely used acronym TELT ‘technology enhanced learning and teaching’.

Thinking with Foucault (1988a), a statement of ‘e-learning as the solution’ functions as a leverage point for enacting a form of ‘political rationality’. It is utilised by a management subject from the central learning and teaching unit
presumably as a means of engendering teaching subjects located at remote campuses to produce e-learning products. Many of the teaching subjects located at these ‘other’ campuses were initially employed by TAFEs, which were later assimilated into the current iteration of the TAFE. The TAFE we were now all employed by was originally established at the city/campus where the central learning and teaching unit (I was employed in at the time of writing the journal) is located. For an educational development subject who inevitably needs to work collaboratively with teaching subjects to perform subjectivities of ‘developer of products’ and ‘developer of teachers’, ‘e-learning’ functioning as a form of political rationality engenders aforementioned strategies of ‘acknowledgement’ as a means of disassociation. It is a tactic of disassociating e-learning as a flexible product and thus economic solution, from the implementation ideally enacted via collaborative pedagogic decision making between educational development subjects and teaching subjects.

This is why my initial frustration has been raised as often teachers will be at a staff meeting and are told to ‘engage with e-learning’. Managers are delivering this message, acutely aware that their budgetary situation quickly turns to e-learning as the great fall-back solution; but often have very little understanding of what it is all about.

At the start of the chapter I labelled e-learning as a catachresis (Spivak, 1993) as a means of denoting its function as a master word or umbrella term. Use of this umbrella term does not strictly denote a series of fixed practices and associated skills. These practices and skills are inferred through the proximate subject area of information technology functioning as an initial point of differentiation (Foucault, 1972). The application of these skills and knowledge is largely shaped by the localised intersection between ‘flexibility’ as the margin of tolerance and the notion of ‘e-learning as product’ functioning as a point within a grid of specification. In short, the technical competencies and pedagogy which an educational development subject is expected to treat as the subject matter in professional development interactions with teaching subjects, is contingent
upon a discourse of e-learning as a solution of flexibility for a problem to be
determined by a management subject. For educational development subject’s
whom facilitate e-learning related training in response to a request from
management subjects, they are working with an umbrella term that is unlikely to
be solely assessed on its pedagogical potential or merit.

We all seem to feel like we would like to be able to identify a purpose
that we agree with as rational for doing something. In this case we
happen to be talking about e-learning but the pressures at the
moment on the schools/faculties are immense and I would hate for
people in this room to think that just because I’m employed to work
mainly in e-learning that I am single minded in pushing this agenda
not respecting the challenges faced by those on the ground (so to
speak).

E-learning transcends the physical object of an online unit, as its function as a
product is necessitated by an institutional problem or purpose to be determined
by an authority (i.e. management subject). For the educational development
subject e-learning is an agonistic site of resistance and/or compliance whereby
pedagogy can be conceptualised as a means of navigation.

It is conceivable for an educational developer working under a banner of e-
learning to question whether they are the developer of teachers or products. The
latter classification enables an educational developer to question the utility of
facilitating professional development for the primary purpose of building
teacher’s pedagogic capacity in e-learning. This tension can induce an educational
developer to attempt to fragment any relationship between notions of flexibility
and income generation in e-learning. Such attempts of fragmentation can have an
unintended consequence of reinforcing a status of the physical classroom as being
the normative or dominant site of learning. For example, an educational
developer may attempt to re-appropriate this link between flexibility and income
generation through advocating the production of online training as a means of
promoting the main event of normative award units. While the problem of institutional income generation being associated with a solution of e-learning is typically defined by managers, an educational developer’s aforementioned resistance to this association can function as an acknowledgement.

E-learning as a solution is paradigmatically opposite to the notion of e-learning as being an add-on or enhancement. It is tied to institutional change agendas and the reward of ‘survival’ can be utilized as a point of inducing teacher participation in e-learning. In contrast, when e-learning is posited as an enhancement it is still largely directed by teachers. Cognizant of this apparent struggle for ownership or direction between management and teachers, an educational developer may enact a strategy of acknowledgement as a means of garnering ongoing collaboration with teachers. Without collaboration with teachers, the educational developer is seemingly confined to the capacity to develop products and not teachers. I can now contend that e-learning is a localised performance that transcends the physical object of an online unit and cannot be defined by a proximate body of knowledge and skills. It is a site of resistance and compliance.

e-learning as a technological catachresis

To this point in the chapter I have attempted to visualise how a statement of e-learning ‘as a solution’ is emergent within a discursive field of e-learning. In terms of e-learning functioning as a catachresis (Spivak, 1993) or master word, ‘e-learning as a solution’ does not engender a definitive picture of the pedagogy or skills to be performed under its banner without consideration of the income generation aspiration or target necessitating the solution. At this point I would like to explore how e-learning is enacted when there is little or no consideration of this association between pedagogic skills and the initiatory localised institutional drivers. In other words, I would like to explore e-learning as a technological catachresis and locate the associated effects of knowledge-power-self (Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1982) for an educational development subject.
Anyway, one teacher who would have to be nearly 70 in their grumpy as f##k voice said, ‘because we’re sick of hearing that we should be using these things and want to see how we could use them in our teaching’.

In an environment where e-learning can be conceived of as a product measured by quantities and a profit margin, teaching subjects regularly ask an educational development subject to provide working examples. I will speculate that such examples provide teaching subjects with an immediate physical means of assessing the capacity for the e-learning to function as the pre-determined solution. It is highly likely that any demonstration of a working product will feature use of a learning management system. These systems became popular in tertiary institutions in the late 1990s (Siemens & Tittenberger, 2009) and have since become the dominant delivery mode for online education in tertiary education worldwide (Downes, 2005; Mott, 2010; Siemens, 2010; Weaver et al., 2008).

Each of the ELFs briefly introduced themselves and despite being asked to talk about their regular role, almost all made a point of talking about how they currently use or not use Blackboard (a learning management system) in their teaching.

The learning management system (LMS) serves as another field of initial differentiation (Foucault, 1972) for categorising a discursive field of e-learning, as it is used by teaching subjects to succinctly identify whether they are e-learning ‘active’ (or not). The journal excerpt above was written in relation to the first workshop that I facilitated (as an educational development subject) with the e-learning facilitators (a group of TAFE teaching subjects employed part time to act as de facto-educational developers). From the point of introduction, the vendor name ‘Blackboard’ was used as a catachresis (Spivak, 1993) or master word for denoting e-learning as a technological construct. A teaching subject’s

---

52 Learning Management Systems are typically used by tertiary institutions to manage and deliver online units of study.
enunciation of the learning management system vendor ‘Blackboard’ functions as a proximate physical visualisation of e-learning. It is a crude means of responding to the problem of defining ‘e-learning’ in lieu of being able to access an implementation (as solution) that addresses a previously identified problem or deficiency. A teaching subject’s pedagogic decisions are the bridge between problem and realised solution. For an educational development subject, an ideal positioning is as a collaborator, contributor or advisor to the teaching subject’s pedagogic decisions.

*Whenever the university learning management system (LMS) is mentioned in ELF meetings, it is like a firecracker has been lit. You count to three and boom! It is then logical to ask why something that is simply a boring old system... can elicit such heated discussion.*

It is difficult to conceive that mention of the learning management system would elicit such heated responses from teaching subjects, if it is solely defined as a system that is used to implement e-learning. At this point I would like to consider this monumentalising of e-learning as the learning management system as a form or problem of ‘rationality’ (Foucault, 1979). By labelling this as a problem of rationality, I am attempting to locate localised forms of rationalisation or knowledge that enables use of an LMS to function as the dominant conception of e-learning for an educational development subject. The immediate effect of this problem of rationality is that it restricts capacity for conceptions of e-learning not emergent from use of the learning management system.

*Once the LMS is mentioned it is very difficult to focus on possibilities as the teachers continue to mention their limitations and frustrations.*

A problem of rationality (Foucault, 1979) coupling e-learning with the learning management system is typically emergent in socio-historic instances where an educational development subject is attempting to cultivate access to pedagogic decision making in award units of study. For example, in the previous journal excerpt the educational development subject is seemingly constrained by a
subject-position of acknowledging and perhaps troubleshooting teaching subject’s procedural-usability related challenges with the use of a learning management system. It is an effect of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1980e) in a discursive field of e-learning, where a learning management system functions as a field of initial differentiation (Foucault, 1972). The gulf between a discursive positioning of troubleshooting procedural-usability related challenges and an ideal of collaborating in pedagogic decision making, function as a strategic integration (Foucault, 1978) or force relationship which induces an educational development subject to critique the normative status of the learning management system.

To their credit I don’t think they have much choice although it’s funny how much time money and effort is put into one system and this largely represents online learning and teaching. The LMS is relatively new (decade) but it’s a de facto standard where good luck to any institution who says “we don’t need this” we might do things differently.

The educational development subject’s critique of the system is directed at the institutionalised status of the learning management system. Through an utterance "to their credit I don’t have much choice", the educational development subject is acknowledging or reinforcing a form of political rationality (Foucault, 1988a) where the management subjects seemingly have no choice but to enact the decision that can be statistically rationalised for a population of teaching subjects and/or online e-learning products. The educational development subject’s critique utilises a form of economic rationalisation to determine that the amount of up-front expenditure placed in the learning management system enables the maintenance of its dominant status.

The manager was quite level headed at taking on everyone’s responses (course coordinators and heads of department) thus far as we were just going around the table. But a teacher who is young
relative to everyone in the room (bar me) currently acting as a head of department made some comments which got under a manager’s skin. S/he talked about how they were using a commercially produced online training program and associated resources as opposed to the LMS...points such as cost, intended purpose could have been easily used to rebut their points but the manager chose to get borderline aggressive by saying ‘the university has spent a lot of money on the learning management system...blah blah’

While it is conceivable to suggest that the dominant status of the learning management system is maintained through an absence of a counter-discourse which induces management subjects to direct funding to the use of alternate e-learning technologies, this absence is not simply a consequence of there not being any alternate technological conception of e-learning. This political rationalisation utilising an economic justification, functions as a form of tactical productivity or effect of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1978) for a multitude of force relations. For example, in the previous journal excerpt a management subject from the central learning and teaching unit utilised this political rationalisation to de-legitimise the selection and use of an alternate e-learning pedagogy and technologic platform. There was no emphasis placed on criticising the utility or characteristics of the given system and pedagogy. The political rationalisation justifying the dominant status of the learning management system is the collateral space (Foucault, 1972) or reference point for de-legitimising the teaching subject’s selection of an alternate e-learning technology and associated pedagogy. Without being able to resist the aforementioned political rationalisation, there is limited opportunity to evaluate the feasibility or merit of alternative e-learning technologies and pedagogy.

The LMS should be used for all accredited delivery so that there is a single access point for students.
My problem is...that teachers should be able to decide how they use or what they use...not the central learning and teaching unit. I might be teaching a unit where I simply need to use the LMS to provide access to some supplementary materials. In addition, what a manager has done is said that we can continue with using the social network but that the LMS is the central tool and that it needs to be used in all units and for all required aspects of student work.

Thinking with Foucault (1980e) the aforementioned political rationalisation used to justify the learning management system as the primary technologic conception of e-learning functions as an effect of truth simultaneously engendering and reinforcing a rule of right status. The rule of right is the formalised mandate to use the LMS in the provision of award units of study. The two textual excerpts above have been coupled as a means to illustrate a problem of agency for an educational development subject as an effect of the interplay between the aforementioned effect of truth and rule of right. In this instance, the educational development subject has attempted to conceptualise a means of facilitating a unit of study using a social network and has been advised that this alternate approach is only permissible as a means of augmenting the use of a learning management system. The problem of agency is an effect of the immediate restriction on using (or promote the use of) a non LMS as the primary e-learning technology in an award unit of study. For the educational development subject, this problem of agency is one of probable diminished access to pedagogic decision making. The mandated primary status of the LMS seemingly reduces a need for teaching subjects to solicit advice from an educational development subject on selecting the most appropriate technologies in relation to a pre-identified teaching intention.

53 The educational development subject is referring to Ning.com an online social network where users can create their own discrete closed groups where group members interact.
The learning management system is a succinct means of declaring and determining use of e-learning as it is almost always the foundational piece of educational technology. Its foundational status is an effect of various forms of political and economic justifications, which in turn enable and are reinforced by a mandate for its use in all award units of study. This state of play where e-learning is communicable as the learning management system, is a technological conception without choice. An educational developer seeking entry into a teacher’s pedagogic decision-making acts or process is likely to view the learning management system as an impediment to access. There is a limited need for teachers to seek an educational developer’s advice on selecting technologies as there is no choice of foundational technology. This self-conception of agency is an educational developer’s response to a technologic conception of e-learning, where there is an absence of accessible means to visualise and examine the capacity of the proposed technology (or its constituent components) to enable implementation of a series of pedagogic intentions.

e-learning as a pedagogy of using three axes of differentiation

In the previous section of sense-making passages I attempted to visualise how the vendor name for the learning management system being used to denote e-learning, is an effect of e-learning conceptualised as technological. This conception of e-learning as the LMS is indicative of it being the mandatory-foundational technology for the provision of units of study offered via an online and/or distance mode of study. Mandatory-foundation status of the LMS was classified as a problem of rationalities (Foucault, 1979) as this state of play is subsequently reinforced by a series of political and economic rationalisations or justifications (Foucault, 1988a). In response, a problem of agency is emergent for the educational development subject who conceptualises a diminished need for teaching subjects to seek their input in pedagogic decisions. This conception
relies upon a technologic conception of e-learning which is seemingly fixed and pre-determined as use of the learning management system. From this point onward I would like to explore how an educational development subject attempts to resist this particular problem of agency, and locate emergent effects of power-knowledge-self (Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1982) on the educational development subject.

Both a fellow developer and I gave an overview of the e-learning Ning site (social network) and there were some confused faces and a few questions regarding the rationale. In effect once we were asked follow up questions, it felt like we were being asked ‘so why not just use Blackboard’ for this. And then comments from a manager justifying Blackboard turned what was meant to be a simple intro into a discussion where I felt like I was being viewed as making some kind of statement against Blackboard and that what we were doing was some kind of threat to existing practice. I get that what we are trying to do is meant to be a ‘f##k off’ to learning management systems but also to get people to see the value in collaborative learning.

In the journal passage above, the educational development subject has attempted to resist a technological conception of e-learning as the LMS through presenting an alternative e-learning technology. In order to rationalise the presentation, the educational development subject associates the alternative technology with a pedagogic aim of collaborative learning.

A discourse of collaborative learning typically posits learning as a social endeavour whereby authority and responsibility for learning is shared or interchanged between learners and educators (Panitz, 1999). An earlier identified problem of rationality (Foucault, 1979) with the LMS as e-learning, and the emergent conception of self as being other to pedagogic decision making, can be considered as the strategical integration or force relationship (Foucault, 1978) necessitating an association of the pedagogic aim with the alternative

---

54 Ning is an online platform that enables users to create customisable social networks.
technology. This association of ‘collaborative learning’ offered a level of tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978) for the educational development subject, as any rebuttal or response was able to be situated along differentiation points of technology and pedagogy.

I showed an example of a unit I worked on with a lecturer at the last uni. I worked at where a wiki was used in conjunction with social bookmarking⁵⁵, skype⁵⁶ and blogs⁵⁷. The idea was to show how students can comment on almost any aspect of the unit, collaboratively author pages and share their work via social bookmarking without having to send anything but instead by being followed. A manager was visibly uncomfortable with me showing the group this example as it made what we had been talking about a little more real…. perhaps legitimate.

The educational development subject utilised a teaching subject’s desire to view working examples as a means to ‘legitimise’ the aforementioned pedagogical and technological points of differentiation (Foucault, 1982). In particular, the educational development subject places attention on a student’s capacity to contribute to the learning experience of a group through adding comments and authoring pages. These affordances clearly differentiate the given technologies from the learning management system along both technological and pedagogical axes.

Whilst I could sit here and come up with a heap of negative comments critiquing the teaching, the main takeaway for me was that when a manager spoke about the institution, s/he said ‘we’ and then say the institution name…for example ‘we…institution name introduced video conferencing four years ago’. And I noticed that the same use of ‘we’ happens when Blackboard is mentioned…meanwhile

---

⁵⁵ Social Bookmarking applications enable users to store and share their web browsing bookmarks/favourites.
⁵⁶ Skype is an online video chat and voice call service/application.
⁵⁷ Blogs are typically journal like websites where each entry/post is displayed in a reverse-chronological sequence.
the social network is referred to as ‘the network Steve and ###### set up’.

A rule of right (Foucault, 1980e) status as mandatory (or not) functions as a third point of differentiating or categorising an educational development subject’s use of e-learning technologies with teaching subjects. In other words, this point of differentiation engenders teaching, educational development and management subjects to conceptualise the feasibility or worth of an e-learning technology and associated pedagogy on the basis of whether it is ‘institutionally endorsed’. In the journal excerpt above the educational development subject conceptualises a subjectivity as ‘anti-institutional’, in response to a management subject utilising a mandatory (or not) status to categorise the educational development subject’s use of an emerging technology as a personal pursuit.

*I felt marked as representing some kind of anarchical form of e-learning which in their eyes could not co-exist, even threaten the form of e-learning the managers at the central learning and teaching unit had worked hard to establish and resource.*

The educational development subject attempts to navigate their subjectivity as anti-institutional through adopting a similar process of associating ownership to the rule of right (Foucault, 1980e) status. In this socio-historical instance the educational development subject posits institutionally endorsed technologies as a personal pursuit for management subjects. This re-application of ownership is an educational development subject attempting to resist probable effects of marginalisation emergent with a subjectivity of being ‘anti-institutional’. For example, a subjectivity as being anti-institutional is unlikely to engender teaching subjects to utilise e-learning technologies and pedagogy being advocated by the educational development subject. Through re-appropriating ‘institutional’ as a personal pursuit for management subjects, the educational development subject is presenting a conception of e-learning where teaching subjects use of e-learning can be evaluated based on its alignment to a sponsor.
It’s a f##king joke and the worst thing I can do is simply roll over and let #### (manager) push the schedule because it won’t help…all that will change is that they will only be introduced to tools which #### management have paid for.

A status of ‘sponsor’ functions as a point of differentiation (Foucault, 1982) in e-learning as a technological and pedagogical endeavour. The development of a workshop schedule for a professional development program is one site in which this point of differentiation functions as both effect and affect. As effect, it is an artefact that serves as a score sheet between sponsors who are seemingly locked in an agonistic battle for influence over a pedagogic-technological conception of e-learning. As affect, this binary like differentiation induces an educational development subject to conceptualise their level of influence in e-learning as being measurable via this point. This conception of influence engenders an educational developer to exert resistance against workshop topics which are easily categorised as being sponsored by the management subject.

In the end it took me no more than 10 mins to quickly replicate what we created with Wimba58 (institutionally endorsed) using eXe59 (including downloading the software and installing it). Three of the ELFs were really keen to lock down times over the next few days to have a better look at it. I just don’t know why we have to persist in showing the ELFs software which has a cost when there are free tools, I wonder if it would be any different if the tools were found by a manager and manager?

A second site where ‘sponsor’ functions as a point of differentiation, is in the subsequent facilitation of a workshop. In the above journal excerpt the educational development subject attempts to balance the status of sponsorship through presenting openly available alternate e-learning technologies which serve a similar function to an institutionally endorsed e-learning technology. The

58 Wimba Create is a proprietary application that enables users to create web content from word documents.
59 eXe is an open source desktop application for teachers to author online learning content.
educational development subject has utilised a form of economic rationality (Foucault, 1982) to solicit teaching subjects interest and support in the alternative technology, as cost is presented as the main point of difference between the two e-learning technologies. This measure of cost inevitably functions as a problem of rationality (Foucault, 1979) in a similar manner to the aforementioned rationalisation of up-front investment in the learning management system functioning as a deterrent to the use of alternate e-learning platforms being used as a primary or foundational e-learning technology.

The Wii-mote 75-dollar Smartboard\(^{60}\) I demonstrated to you (manager) was using a self-constructed pen minus a soldering iron, however you can purchase pens online for ten dollars. The main reason I gave you the impromptu demo was to show that the Wii does talk to the laptop and therefore with a contained pen (or one purchased) is a viable option for teachers to use Smartboard interaction in any environment (such as off site or in departments/areas which don’t presently have smartboards). These areas may receive Smartboards in the future, but now have an opportunity to change practice. Therefore, the aim is not to discourage smartboard use but to actually promote it.

The three axes of differentiation as the pedagogic, technologic and rule of right status are all at play in the journal excerpt above. In relation to rule of right status, the educational development subject positions the given e-learning technology as a leverage point to engender use of the institutionally endorsed e-learning technology. In regard to the technological-pedagogical, the educational development subject utilises locational-fluidity as an affordance. However, this act of locating an alternative technology was not initiated in response to a pedagogic intention, but a desire to induce opportunities for teaching subjects to solicit an educational developers input. It is a strategy enacted as a means of

\(^{60}\) Wiimote Whiteboard is an open source application which enables the use of a Nintendo Wii controller to simulate the main functions of an interactive smartboard. 
http://johnnylee.net/projects/wii/
navigating a problem of agency which was discussed at the start of this current array of sense making passages. The educational development subject is inducing teaching subjects to ask, ‘teach me how I can utilise this technology within my unit.’ This strategy inevitably utilises a form of economic rationality (Foucault, 1982) to justify an act which is engendered by technologically-dominant conceptions of e-learning.

An educational developer’s responses to a problem of agency emergent from the dominant status of the LMS as e-learning can be broadly classified along three axes. These axes of pedagogic, technological and institutional status function as points by which an educational developer can develop rationalisations to justify their pedagogic actions. Working predominately along the technological axis, an educational developer may elect to resist the aforementioned problem of agency through locating and promoting alternative e-learning technologies. As a means of navigating the other two axes of pedagogy and institutional status, the educational developer will rely upon denoting affordances in the absence of pedagogic intentions, while citing low or no cost as a means of rationality to navigate a status of ‘no’ or ‘outside’ along the institutional axis.

Enacting such strategies will likely engender resistance from teaching and/or management systems along the aforementioned axes. For example, an educational development subject may re-classify the axis of institutional as one of sponsorship where any technology deemed as institutionally endorsed is actually management sponsored. It is a strategy of resisting a contextual partial self-identity of being ‘anarchic’ where e-learning as a technologic agonism can be easily monitored via the status of sponsor. A professional development workshop schedule and subsequent workshops function as a key site for this battle of sponsorship to be fought. A key danger for an educational developer is the blind use of economic rationalisations to justify resistance against a technological state of play in e-learning which is also supported by such rationalisations.
In closing - navigating a problem of determining the focus and objective of e-learning

In this chapter, I have attempted to think with Knowledge-Power-Self (Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1982) to visualise a discursive field of e-learning in educational development. In the first half of the chapter I utilised components of Foucault’s (1972) archaeological topology to explore how e-learning as a catachresis or master word (Spivak, 1993) is an effect of it denoting a localized product based solution to a series of financial related targets or problems. In the second section of the chapter I utilized Foucault’s (1982) conception of power relations as agonistic to explore how an educational development subject navigates a predominately technological conception of e-learning where the learning management system vendor name is the master word. A problem of agency is emergent for the educational development subject through conceptualising a diminished need for teaching subjects to seek their input in pedagogic decisions. I concluded the chapter by exploring how the educational development subject attempted to resist this particular problem of agency along the pedagogic, technologic and rule of right status (Foucault, 1980) as three axes of differentiation (Foucault, 1982). Many of the pedagogic strategies exerted as a means of resisting this agentic flash point can be described as being indicative of a problem of rationality (Foucault, 1979). In this case the educational development subject uses a series of economic justifications to induce teaching subjects to enact a vision of e-learning which is a reaction against a normalised technological conception, which is also reliant upon such economic justifications.
Chapter 9 – Problems of Compliance

Introducing compliance as a series of problems

In the previous chapter, I utilised Foucault’s triple ontology of power-knowledge-self (Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1984a) to explore a discursive field of e-learning. I first utilised components of Foucault’s (1972) archaeological topology to explore how e-learning is a product based solution to a series of financial related targets or problems. With these targets being localised and difficult to succinctly enunciate and replicate, e-learning is often positioned as technological, via a learning management system vendor name serving as a master word. I subsequently explored how an educational development subject navigates a conception of diminished need for teaching subjects to solicit their input in pedagogic decisions as an effect of e-learning being a standardised technological construct. The educational development subject navigates this problem using three axes of differentiation (Foucault, 1982) encompassing the pedagogic, technologic and rule of right status (Foucault, 1980e). Many of the eventual pedagogic actions leverage and/or are justified using a series of economic rationalities (Foucault, 1979), whereby an educational development subject inadvertently reinforces a discourse of e-learning as a product.

In this chapter I will chart various discursive locations where an educational development subject grapples with a problem of compliance. A discursive field of ‘compliance as a problem’ could be categorised as various effects of power-knowledge (Foucault, 1978) emergent from a discourse of e-learning where the required outcome is local and multiple, but the required action is often replicable and singular. I am using the term ‘compliance’ to refer to socio-historical instances where an educational development subject conceptualises capacity to act, along yes-no type binaries using a juridical view of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) which posits an individual as the holder of power based on their location in a socio-structural hierarchy. In this current
chapter I am seeking to locate an educational development subject’s pedagogic acts performed as a means of resisting conceptions of ‘self’ related to a status of engendering, enforcing or being compliant. I will again draw upon a relational conception of power (Foucault, 1982) to chart how an educational development’s pedagogic acts of resisting conceptions of compliance solicit action from teaching and management subjects, which engender further problems of compliance for the educational development subject.

A grand problem of engendering teacher compliance

Educational development subjects are typically employed to assist teaching subjects to implement some form of pedagogical shift. In this thesis I am particularly concerned with pedagogical acts which are operable within a discursive field of e-learning, where educational development subjects are employed as a mechanism to engender and facilitate teaching subjects’ use of e-learning technologies. In the previous chapter a discourse of e-learning was visualised as a product-based response to localised strategic objectives or problems using standardised technological processes and applications. Drawing upon this visualisation, I am firstly contending that teaching subjects’ use of e-learning cannot be viewed solely as an act of using (or not-using) educational technologies in the provision of award units. Secondly, while educational development subjects are employed as a means to provide support for e-learning implementation, the actual implementation or ‘doing’ of e-learning inevitably requires action from a teaching subject.

Well initially a manager raised a short series of questions to the guest with the central themes being ‘how do we get teachers to do something they don’t want to do?’

The journal excerpt above succinctly introduces a problem of compliance as being characterised by teaching subjects not performing particular actions which an educational development subject has somehow deemed necessary. Thinking with Foucault (1978) this role based conceptualisation of the problem as a form
of ‘knowledge’, can be considered an effect of various relationships of ‘power’ where the strategies and tactics will inevitably differ. It is probable that a neophyte educational development subject is likely to be exposed to this grand problem of compliance via such enunciations, prior to actually being engaged in a socio-historical instance where such resistance is exerted by a teaching subject. This grand manifestation of the problem being seemingly fixed along roles of ‘teacher’ and ‘educational developer’ can be described as an effect of veridiction (Foucault, 1979). As an effect of veridiction or truth, educational development is categorised as an activity which requires the educational development subject to engender or coerce action from a teaching subject who is likely to resist such overtures.

If I had of gone in with a plan it would have been a complete waste of time today as when I arrived, I was actually given a presentation from one of the teachers I have as yet to meet. The teacher spent about 40 mins giving an overview of the past 8 years’ worth of work that s/he had put into the course, in particular how their use of technology has evolved. The teacher was almost militant in their description of Blackboard61 explaining that their head of department had instructed that they start using the system as this was now a requirement not an option. Without these words being used I was basically asked ‘so...have you got the guts to say that what we do is s##t and that we should be using Blackboard?’

The journal excerpt above documents an interaction that is indicative of the aforementioned effect of veridiction (Foucault, 1979), where a role-based grand problem of compliance is classified as a normal challenge associated with educational development. Thinking with a view of freedom as an agonism (Foucault, 1982) where there is a rejection of a humanist agency, insights are derived from exploring how specific actions are situated strategic means of resisting various effects of subjectivity. Consequently, I am concerned with

---

61 Blackboard is a proprietary Learning Management System commonly used in the provision of online education.
subjectivities which are reliant upon a structural-hierarchical conception of power where the problem of compliance is easily explained through referencing the organisational or credential-based status of each agent. For example, in the previous journal excerpt a rudimentary status of compliance (or not) functioned as a point of differentiation (Foucault, 1982). This means of differentiation enabled the identification of teaching subjects who needed to meet with an educational development subject to develop capability to comply via use of a learning management system. The initial objective (Foucault, 1982) pursued by the teaching subject was maintenance of an alternative approach to e-learning. As this alternate approach did not feature use of the learning management system, the teaching subject’s act of commencing the meeting with an overview of their current approach could be conceptualised as an act of resistance. The educational development subject can view the teaching subject’s acts as a means of resisting a status of ‘compliant’ in relation to a pre-defined directive to use the learning management system. By remaining cognisant of compliance ‘status’ as the initial point of differentiation (Foucault, 1982), the teaching subject’s act of demonstration induces an educational development subject to identify pedagogic deficiency as a condition for their use of the learning management system.

It was at this point that one of the ELFs asked what student feedback-based research existed and what are some recommended approaches to online learning based on this research?

A teaching subject’s request for research that provides a form of evaluating various pedagogic approaches to e-learning, is another act of resistance which can be easily rationalised as a problem of compliance. As a means of tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978), this relatively reasonable request to access a summary (of sorts) of student based research induces an educational development subject to justify the pedagogic decisions they have modelled or suggested. This means of justification requires the educational development subject to locate literature advocating pedagogic acts and justifications that correspond with those which were originally enunciated by the educational
development subject. Cognisant that such requests are likely to be an ongoing occurrence, research or advocacy that an educational development subject locates has capacity to function as a ‘form of institutionalisation’ (Foucault, 1982) in e-learning. The literature is an accessible set of pedagogic actions which an educational development subject can advocate to teaching subjects and subsequently justify, as a means of navigating a problem of compliance. The teaching subject will seemingly have reduced capacity to justify non-compliance.

I only read the exec summary, but it did make me think about how on one hand it says that Victoria is a leader in e-learning.... while we are told how (and I see) the relatively small-scale use of e-learning.

The educational development subject is referring to a report prepared for the Victorian State Government which attempted to articulate the levels of e-learning being used in vocational educational institutions. Documents such as the one referenced above function as a form of institutionalisation (Foucault, 1982), which inevitably engender localised rationalisations of the said results. In this socio-historical instance the educational development subject is not aware of the breadth and depth of e-learning use at other TAFEs and can only rationalise the said results in relation to the visible use of e-learning at the home institution. Through attempting to locate definitions of ‘normal’ e-learning pedagogy, the educational development subject has benchmarked the official institutionalised state of play against localised use of e-learning. A subjectivity of deficit for the educational development subject is emergent. Thinking specifically in terms of a problem of compliance, the educational development subject has accessed a set of official targets as the institutionalised norm for a discursive field of e-learning; and these institutionalised norms are not being achieved through their inability to convince teaching subjects to use e-learning at an equivalent level.

When talking to presenters after sessions, they spoke about similar struggles returning to the group saying things like “we’re just as good as everybody else”. It was almost as if they had been told they were
At the end of the calendar year I accompanied a group of e-learning facilitators to attend a conference centred on the use of e-learning. TAFE teaching subjects geographically located across Victoria presented their pedagogical approaches to conference delegates. These presentations provided the educational development subject and e-learning facilitators with an opportunity to rationalise the apparent discrepancy between idealised forms of institutionalisation in published documents, and observations of localised practice at the home institution. The regularly repeated enunciations derivative of ‘we’re just as good as everybody else’ visualised a subjectivity of deficit being at play amongst the group of e-learning facilitators (ELFs).

What barriers do you think you will need to overcome in order to achieve these goals?

Barriers that were raised went from access, the students, lack of time in their role and even the perceived value of e-learning was raised by one ELF as a barrier.

From the commencement of the ELF project, I (as the educational development subject) had made repeated attempts at asking these de facto-educational development subjects to identify ‘challenges’ and ‘barriers’ that they were likely to experience in the role. This pedagogic strategy of ‘identifying challenges and barriers’ leverages conceptions of educational development as being inherently shaped by a problem of compliance, and subsequent localised measures of e-learning generated via benchmarking local use against broadly disseminated case studies. A relationship of force or strategical integration (Foucault, 1978) necessitating this strategy, is the educational development subject resisting a subjectivity of deficit. This subjectivity is reliant upon the aforementioned conception of educational development as a change-based endeavour, where the subject will inevitably encounter a problem of compliance. As an effect of
veridiction (Foucault, 1979), this conception of a compliance based problem is operable within role or field based classifications of ‘educational development’.

Educational development pedagogy can be described as a strategic response to a recurring challenge of engendering teachers to perform tasks conceived as necessary to implement institutional agendas. When each instance of this challenge is viewed as a battle between teacher and educational developer, the challenge of engendering action is a problem of compliance. This problem of compliance functions as a form of knowledge to categorise educational development and rationalise pedagogic acts performed in every day exchanges between teacher and educational developer. As a point of categorisation, it initially informs the identification of teachers who an educational developer is asked by managers to work with. Within such interactions, the problem of compliance as a form of knowledge can be used as a means to speculate on the strategic intent of a teacher’s action/resistance. Such speculations may induce an educational developer to determine that locating deficiency in a teacher’s pedagogy is a pre-requisite for their compliance, and that they must justify any suggested pedagogy through drawing upon published research. An educational developer searching for research publications to justify pedagogic suggestions will likely encounter case study type reports which will induce a search to define ‘normal’ or ‘standard’ e-learning practice. The educational developer can use these definitions of normal as a means to benchmark the levels of practice at their home institution, to conceptualise a partial identity of deficiency. In other words, the construction of this partial identity strengthens a conception of the problem of compliance as being central to educational development.

**Resisting a subjectivity as an instrument of compliance**

To this point I have explored effects of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1978) which are emergent from a conception of the ‘problem of compliance’ functioning as a
normative concept or effect of veridiction (Foucault, 1979) in a discourse of educational development. The results and approaches articulated in e-learning oriented case studies were posited as a reference point for an educational development subject to justify pedagogic advice offered to a teaching subject, and as a means to conceptualise a subjectivity of deficiency. A subjectivity of deficiency is emergent from an educational development subject benchmarking localised use of e-learning with broadly disseminated case-studies of idealised practice. Thinking with Foucault’s (1980d) conception of a ‘general politics of truth’ I can thus far speculate that the problem of compliance is an accepted discourse, where benchmarking disseminated case study research against observed practice, functions as one mechanism for determining true and false statements. I will now explore the sites where acts of benchmarking e-learning pedagogy are sanctioned, the specific techniques that have utility and the status/role of those subjects who determine truth within this discursive field. I am particularly interested in locating the pedagogical strategies enacted by an educational development subject as a means of resisting subjectivities of compliance emergent from sites where this classification occurs.

I gave the intro address via a video recording of me sitting on a toilet followed by a couple of colleagues giving a safety demonstration like they were air hostesses to an audio recording of a narrative with a computer-generated voice. We just tried to be a bit positive despite all the negative press about at the time...try and celebrate the good things we already do and not always come across like everyone is in deficit.

In the journal excerpt above the educational development subject posits their collaboration with an educational development colleague to co-convene an institutionally focused learning and teaching conference as a means of resisting a subjectivity of deficit. The educational development subject acknowledges a subjectivity of deficit through rationalising the planning of the conference as a mechanism to ‘celebrate the good things we already do and not always come across like everyone is in deficit’. Earlier in the chapter the educational
development subject had conceptualised self as being in deficit through being unable to engender teaching subjects to perform e-learning pedagogic acts to a standard as defined in sectoral publications. Co-convening an official event that encompassed a formalised set of conference proceedings offers a level of tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978), as local teaching subjects use of e-learning is now classified as being ‘sanctioned’ (Foucault, 1980d) by educational development subjects and possibly the broader institutional leadership funding the event. There would now be an additional source of endorsed e-learning practice for educational development, teaching and management subjects to use as a benchmarking reference.

A manager sent out an email inviting Heads of Department to a presentation on the 26th of June. The idea is that the ELFs give a presentation to the heads of departments and any more senior managers who turn up, an overview of what they have achieved thus far.

The project presentation serves as another mode by which e-learning pedagogy can be sanctioned. Thinking with a juridical conception of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) where power is possessed and exercised relative to an individual’s status in a socio-hierarchical structure, the management subject is now seemingly posited as a final word of authority for sanctioning e-learning practice. The educational development subject has no official capacity to provide commentary, as e-learning pedagogy is evaluated through the commentary provided by the teaching subject of product-based outcomes s/he has generated through participation in a project (i.e. ELF project).

There was then a small sense of panic regarding the presentations, so I asked “so at the end of the day what do you think is being asked? And it’s really become apparent how comfortable most in the group are becoming at speaking their mind as there was a fair bit of debate and I tried to take all these notes down on the board. At this point I grouped all the responses into four categories and named each
category with a question. Most of the ELF wrote these four questions down in the hope that they may assist them to create (or become) the structure for their presentation.

The educational development subject’s access/capacity to exert influence over the classification of e-learning practice (inevitably used as a means of resisting a subjectivity of deficit), serves as a strategical integration (Foucault, 1978) or force relationship inducing a series of strategic pedagogical responses. These pedagogical responses are a means of exerting some form of influence over classifications of e-learning practice, and ensuring that the e-learning pedagogy practiced and reported by teaching subjects (who have collaborated with the educational development subject) reflects such normalised conceptions. In the journal excerpt above, the educational development subject created a presentation structure for the teaching subjects (ELFs) to use at an impending reporting event to an ensemble of management subjects from across the TAFE institution. This presentation structure comprised a series of questions which the teaching subject is compelled to utilise as a means of self-regulating their presentation to this group of management subjects. I will speculate that the educational development subject drew upon a juridical conception of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) to praise the teaching subjects on their comfort in ‘speaking their mind’. In other words, I am suggesting that the educational development subject is positioning these teaching subjects as the subordinate or oppressed agents in need of assistance. In terms of tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978), a discourse of teaching subjects as structurally subordinate/oppressed offers the educational development subject a means to rationalise pedagogic acts which inevitably serve a function of governing (Foucault, 1984a, 1997c) the behaviour of others.

*I was embarrassed by the undertone in the room and after lunch I saw the teacher entering the cafeteria and I apologised and tried to reassure him that I had nothing to do with this and felt like s/he was being set up. Judging by the tone in their voice...I don’t think this unit will float as a manager has planned.*
The journal excerpt above was written in relation to an interaction that the educational development subject initiated with a teaching subject soon after they both had participated in a tense meeting with a management subject from the central learning and teaching unit. At this meeting, the management subject proposed that a unit of study the teaching subject coordinated should be redeveloped as an online offering. The meeting was indicative of the grand problem of compliance visualised early in this chapter as an effect of veridiction (Foucault, 1979). While the adversaries in this instance were a teaching subject and an educational development management subject, a status of compliant (or not) in the use of e-learning in the provision of award units of study remained in play as the initial point of differentiation (Foucault, 1982). The educational development subject utilises a juridical conception of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) to differentiate the adversaries as individuals or agents, and a discourse of teaching subjects as structurally subordinate/oppressed emerges as a form of tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978). In this particular instance the educational development subject is utilising this form of power/knowledge to resist a subjectivity as an instrument of compliance.

Conceptions of ‘normal’ e-learning practice are an idealised benchmark by which an educational developer can self-evaluate their capacity to engender productive teacher engagement. Various sites where conceptions of ‘normal’ e-learning practice are visualised include institutional learning and teaching conferences and progress presentations to management subjects. While the institutional learning and teaching conference offers the convening educational developers capacity to act as an endorsee, progress presentations seemingly rely upon the manager performing this function. An educational developer may employ pedagogic strategies such as drafting reflective questions for the presenting teacher, as an attempt at exerting some influence over the act of defining-reporting-and justifying what is normal e-learning practice. The educational developer rationalises such pedagogic actions using conceptions of compliance based on a view of power being structural-hierarchical. This view of power as structural-
hierarchical offers the educational developer with a succinct means to resist or deflect a partial identity as an instrument of compliance. The educational developer can simply focus on the structural-status of the individual attempting to engender teacher use of e-learning, in order to declare that the proposed action is first and foremost an act of compliance.

A status of compliance for an educational development pedagogue

A common run of events here at (name of TAFE institute) for me is that the teacher I have worked with contacts my manager to say that they were happy doing x, y or z as a result from speaking with one of their staff (me). Even with a positive outcome for the teacher, I often would be asked to justify my advice.

A problem of compliance has thus far been situated as an inevitable agonistic struggle (Foucault, 1982) between the teaching subject and educational development subject. This conception of the problem is directed at a teaching subject’s capacity to resist the pedagogic actions recommended or advocated by the educational development subject. The journal excerpt above visualises a problem of compliance for an educational development subject to encompass management endorsement of the proposed pedagogic act. The problem of compliance can now be crudely expressed using two questions; "did the teacher agree to use e-learning?", and "did the educational developer propose a pedagogy of enactment which is endorsed?" I will now shift the focus to discursive sites where this second question is contested, by visualising effects of knowledge-power-self (Foucault, 1982, 1984a) that induce and/or are emergent from an educational development subject’s pedagogic strategies and rationalisations.
I didn’t even try and explain how the session was a success guessing that s/he will go and speak to my manager and I will get a please explain email or request for another meeting.

The educational development subject has opted to not report the success of a workshop, as a means of resisting an apparent necessity to justify or explain the pedagogic acts s/he performed. This tactic of silence is reliant on a perception that a juridical view of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) has currency as a form of knowledge. Exertion of this tactic of silence induces the management subject to escalate a failure to ‘report’ to another management subject located at the next vertical position on the organisational chart. In terms of visualising the emergent tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978), the management subject (as direct report) is induced to disclose some form of ‘failure’ in managing the educational development subject.

I acknowledge that you made various attempts to get me involved and seek feedback, however instead of ever asking why I am saying something, I would receive a closed comment stating that it has already been done or can’t be done. The most evident example I can come up with was when you asked me to present what I had achieved in my previous position to the team (in my first week of being at the central learning and teaching unit) and after completing my presentation was told that’s great, thanks for that...now these are things we need to do...which ones are you going to do?

The educational development subject has partially recalled an email that s/he had sent to a management subject in the central learning and teaching unit. The example situated in this journal excerpt is indicative of the second problem of compliance, as the educational development subject is seeking some form of endorsement of the pedagogical strategies, s/he has previously utilised. The management subject is seemingly exerting a form of juridical power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) through delivering a blunt directive stating ‘these are things we need to do...which ones are you going to do?’ The management
subject has utilised their rule of right status (Foucault, 1980e) as the formalised authority figure, to request that the educational development subject present their conceptions of pedagogical success to the broader team, and to then visualise a rejection of these pedagogic conceptions and strategies.

So instead of saying what I think, I just sent this email through where I say that I’m on study leave next week and that I’ll try and get to it...no point.

A management subject’s capacity to enact a form of juridical power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) is acknowledged by the educational development subject in the form of an email stating that s/he will ‘try’ and comply with the request. This momentary acknowledgement of compliance is complimented by a disclosure that the act will be performed whilst on study leave where there is no formal requirement that the educational development subject perform such tasks. The educational development subject subsequently declares an intention to not comply with the request and provide input into a strategic paper on the use of e-learning. In this brief email the educational development subject has re-employed a tactic of silence to reduce the capacity for the management subject to re-utilise a rule of right status (Foucault, 1980e), while in parallel delaying capacity for the management subject to classify the educational development subject as non-compliant.

Sceptical as to whether it’s just a case of us doing their job (management), as I’m continually excluded from any position put forward by the (central learning and teaching unit) regarding e-learning and so its lucky this place is pretty small as you can just put your own views forward via yammer or the blog.

A tactic of silence provides the means for the management subject to classify the educational development as non-complaint. As an effect of truth (Foucault, 1980e), the educational development subject is deemed as not being able or willing to contribute to the broader positions related to the use of e-learning and/or educational development pedagogy. This classification of ‘non-
compliance’ offers a form of tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978) for the management subject seeking to govern educational development pedagogy, as there is little capacity for critique which infers that the educational development subject has been intentionally marginalised. Thinking again with a problem of compliance using a juridical view of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e), this exclusion from authoring official positions induces an educational development subject to devise methods of disseminating or visualising their pedagogy in a location where this rule of right status (Foucault, 1980e) has limited utility. However, these back-channel enunciations will be made by an educational development subject navigating a subjectivity of non-compliance.

For an educational developer drawing upon a hierarchical-structural view of power, the problem of compliance is navigated at two fault-lines. The first is at those sites I have previously visualised where here there is an imperative to solicit cooperation from teachers in response to a strategic objective that they use or increase their use of e-learning. The second fault-line is visible at sites where an educational developer requires or seeks endorsement from a manager in educational development in relation to pedagogic acts performed as a means of engineering teacher compliance with e-learning. An educational developer may opt to navigate this fault line through employing a tactic of silence, as it minimises the capacity for a manager to utilise their structural status to de-legitimise the educational developer’s pedagogic acts and rationalisations. Through drawing upon a conception that a structural conception of power has currency, this tactic is also exerted on the basis that the manager who opts to report an educational developer’s non-compliance is simultaneously acknowledging a failure to ensure that the educational developer perform pedagogic acts as endorsed and/or mandated. Despite these affordances, a tactic of silence can result in marginalisation from planning and/or reporting activities where educational development pedagogy is officially recorded. This marginalisation can be justified on the basis that the educational developer is opting to not contribute and more broadly comply. An educational developer’s subsequent attempt to communicate
an alternate perspective of pedagogy are likely to be read by an audience reading the words of someone with a partial identity as ‘non-compliant’.

Constituting self as non-compliant

To this point I have focused on the educational development subject’s use of a juridical view of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) as a form of rationalising their capacity to act, while visualising tactics and strategies the educational development subject has enacted as a means of resisting emergent effects of knowledge-power-self (Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1982, 1984a). In this final component of sense making passages I will briefly visualise a variety of means by which the educational development subject specifically conceptualises ‘self’ as non-compliant. Thinking with Foucault’s (1997c) four aspects of a relationship to self, I will particularly focus on visualising ‘modes of subjection’, which are particular actions which induce or incite someone to identify and acknowledge their moral responsibilities. Foucault (1997c) uses the term ‘moral’ to encompass ‘effective behaviours’, ‘codes’ and ‘relationships to self’. Thus far in this thesis, I have explored effective behaviours as those pedagogic actions induced and performed as a means of navigating dominant forms of knowledge which are often visible as rules of right and/or effects of truth (Foucault, 1980e).

Despite yesterday having agreed in person during a chat with a manager that I would keep an attendance register accessible to him/her...I then got a follow up email making the same request almost like we never spoke.

I just replied:

Hi ######
quick question? I thought we spoke about this yesterday, more than happy to keep a hard copy, when I get it together, I’ll let you know where it is.

regards

Steve

It is feasible to conclude that this journal excerpt is simply recalling an event that is indicative of the previous instances where the educational development subject has employed a tactic of silence. Unlike those previous instances, the management subject is not seeking the insights or opinion of the educational development subject. The management subject has communicated the same directive to the educational development subject over the course of two days, and I will speculate that this would likely have continued until an attendance roll was submitted as a product of compliance. The previously exerted strategy of providing assurances no longer had utility, as the educational development subject is classified by default as ‘non-compliant’.

I just don’t know what a manager’s obsession with schedules is. S/he today sent out a schedule for what topics will be covered on the alternate weeks where attendance is ‘non-compulsory’. S/he did ask me to develop one yesterday, but I just couldn’t deal with him/her and decided to work on other tasks. Hence, s/he has just gone ahead and done it.

Through the management subject promptly completing a task that s/he had initially requested the educational development subject to perform, there is little capacity for the educational development subject to demonstrate compliance. The task has been completed and the educational development subject has been informed that there is no longer any need for s/he to undertake the task. Despite being a relatively small task, the exertion of a strategy of completing tasks soon after communicating the initial request, is particularly significant as a mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997). The educational development subject is induced to
ask whether they feel it is right for others to complete tasks they are responsible for. While the educational development subject could attempt to absolve one’s self from being responsible on the basis that the strategy is exerted as a means of coercing compliance, this form of absolution would require other parties to be capable or willing to invest the time and effort necessary to engage in nuanced consideration.

I then got a concluding comment in their email “Thanks, let me know if you are not comfortable in working with any of the above.” I am being set up to be performance managed...good luck and no coincidence that my annual performance conversation is still yet to occur.

The educational development subject has been invited to explicitly declare those components of a management subject’s conception of an institutional vision for e-learning and educational development that s/he will not enact. In this instance, the organisational plan is situated as an instrument for the educational development subject to determine or acknowledge their pedagogical obligations. It serves as a mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997c) as it communicates a vision that is used to advocate or rationalise the continued employment of the educational development subject. Through being asked to outline those components of the vision as ‘not in need’ to be complied with, the educational development subject is compelled to ask, ‘why do I resist performing tasks informed by a vision where I am a beneficiary?’

In today’s session we had roughly half the ELFs (teachers as de facto educational developers) come along and while I was getting the laptops out of the cupboard one of the ELFs asked whether people had bothered to fill in the survey and I was really curious to hear what they had to say. All but one had completed the survey and their reason for not doing it was that s/he is ignoring the emails coming from a manager as they are “long and painful”. I just laughed and then gave a half arsed “I shouldn’t laugh” and I explained how I felt...
The e-learning facilitators were asked by a management subject in the central learning and teaching unit to complete a monthly survey evaluating workshops that were being facilitated by the educational development subject. In the journal excerpt above, the educational development subject describes a feeling of being a ‘little set up’, thus rationalising the survey as an instrument for the management subject to collect evidence (i.e. rap sheet) of non-compliance. While this rationalisation of the survey as a compliance tool can be viewed as a strategy to deter the teaching subject’s participation in this process, this state of play where the teaching subject is positioned as the source of truth or jurisdiction has potential to engender a broad scattering of knowledge-power-self (Foucault, 1984a) within educational development.

As a mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997c), the educational development subject determines their moral obligation to act as being informed by the perceived needs of the teaching subject. In this instance the educational development subject uses this rule of ‘supporting’ teachers, as a means of resisting a subjectivity of ‘non-compliance’. If this mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997c) is applied more broadly than in instances where the educational development subject is resisting a subjectivity of non-compliance, it is feasible to speculate that the educational development subject’s pedagogic acts contribute to a state of play where compliance functions as a problem of veridiction (Foucault, 1979). In other words, it is unlikely that an educational development subject will be able to compartmentalise a conception that their pedagogic acts are justifiable on the basis of ‘supporting’ the needs of teachers to instances where the educational development subject is resisting a subjectivity of non-compliance. In short, the problem of compliance is both an affect and effect of educational development pedagogy. Thinking with Foucault’s (1997c) four aspects of a relationship to self, I will speculate that an educational development subject’s pedagogic acts and
rationalisations can be considered ‘self-forming activities’ where the educational development subject attempts to become an ethical subject. I will attempt to apply these four aspects of a relationship to self in the next chapter ‘Pedagogy as Effect/Affect’.

There are a variety of means by which an educational developer recognises a partial identity of ‘non-compliant’. For example, a manager may cease soliciting any input from the educational developer solely focusing on reminding the educational developer of the outcomes they have yet to complete. The manager may then opt to complete tasks soon after requesting that the same task be completed by the educational developer, whereby a status of non-compliant is reinforced and intensified. There is a distinct shift from a process of recognition based on observations of a manager’s behaviour, to a series of junctures where the educational developer constitutes or reinforces a partial identity as non-compliant. Firstly, the educational developer may ask their self whether it is fair that others have completed tasks which they were initially assigned. Secondly, an educational developer may be asked by a manager to state which components of an institutional vision s/he does not intend to comply with, whereby the educational developer is prompted to ask why they are resisting performing tasks associated with a vision from which s/he is a beneficiary. Finally, an educational developer may draw upon the perceived needs of teachers to question whether their pedagogic acts are admissible and defensible. Given the initial problem of compliance that was raised at the commencement of this chapter, this mode of constituting self as compliant (or not) has particularly wide-reaching consequences.

In closing – navigating compliance as a series of problems

In this chapter, I have attempted to think with Knowledge-Power-Self (Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1982, 1997) as a means to visualise a discursive field of
compliance in educational development. This visualisation explored how an educational development subject resists various subjectivities emergent from socio-historical instances where a teaching subject is being asked to use e-learning. This particular ‘problem of compliance’ is a normative concept or effect of veridiction (Foucault, 1979a) in a discourse of educational development where a neophyte educational development subject is likely to first encounter the problem as an abstraction. I speculated that this foundational concept can be re-imagined as a subjectivity of ‘deficiency’, which is emergent from acts of benchmarking localised use of e-learning against idealised practice contained within broadly disseminated case studies. A subjectivity of ‘deficiency’ is emergent from a search to locate a normalised picture of e-learning, which an educational development subject may deem is a necessary enabler for engendering teacher compliance in socio-historical instances where the problem of compliance is at play.

A subjectivity as an ‘instrument of compliance’ is emergent in socio-historical instances where the educational development subject utilises a juridical conception of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) to differentiate adversaries as individuals or agents. A discourse of teaching subjects as structurally subordinate/oppressed is emergent from this use of a juridical conception of power, offering the educational development subject a form of tactical productivity (Foucault, 1979b) in resisting a subjectivity of being an ‘instrument of compliance’. In the latter part of the chapter I explored the resistance and constitution of self, associated with a subjectivity of non-compliance. This subjectivity is emergent from socio-historical instances where a management subject has capacity to utilise their rule of right status (Foucault, 1980) as a means to judge the efficacy of pedagogic acts performed by an educational development subject. I located various socio-historical instances where the educational development subject employs a tactic of silence to negate the capacity for a management subject to enact a form of juridical power. Despite these intentions, the tactic of silence does engender a status of ‘non-compliance’ visible via the actions of a management subject. This status of non-
compliance becomes a subjectivity via various modes of subjection (Foucault, 1997c) which solicit an educational development subject to ideate their moral responsibilities.
Chapter 10 – Pedagogy as an ethical relation with self

Introducing a re-imagination of pedagogy as more than generic

In the previous chapter, I attempted to think with Knowledge-Power-Self (Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1982, 1984a) to visualise various socio-historical instances where an educational development subject’s pedagogic acts are enacted as a means of various subjectivities emergent from a problem of compliance. As problems of compliance, I was referring to an educational development subject’s conception of self as engendering, enforcing or being marked by a measure of ‘compliance’. These problems of compliance were often conceptualised by the educational development subject using a juridical view of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e), whereby inducing various pedagogic strategies such as identifying deficiency in teaching subjects practice, pre-emptively locating case study based research as a means of justification and defining ‘normal’ use of e-learning. These strategies were enacted as a means of navigating a triad of idealised subjectivities, encompassing self as ‘deficient’, ‘an instrument of compliance’ and as ‘non-compliant’.

In this chapter I will be utilising Foucault’s (1997c) four elements of ethical relations as a means to speculate how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is an agentic endeavour. I will continue to draw upon Britzman’s (1991) description of pedagogy as a ‘moment’ and Ellsworth’s (2005) concept of pedagogy as a ‘space’, in order to visualise an educational development subject’s pedagogy as a multiplicity of ‘locations’, ‘intended outcomes’ and ‘products’. At each multiplicity, I will attempt to visualise various ‘modes of subjection’ (Foucault, 1997c) where the educational development subject is induced to consider the morality of their actions. The capacity for an action to be conceptualised via an aforementioned problem of compliance, will function as the ‘ethical substance’ (Foucault, 1997c) or component of self, concerned with moral conduct. Pedagogic acts and rationalisations will be positioned as ‘self-
forming activities’ (Foucault, 1997c), where the educational development subject is attempting to transform ‘self’ as an ethical agent. In other words, it is an educational development subject’s attempt at enacting a form of Foucauldian agency through each pedagogic act being an attempt at achieving their ‘telos’ or ideal mode of being (Foucault, 1997c).

**Pedagogy as a multiplicity of locations**

In terms of pedagogy as a ‘location’, the workshop is arguably the most visible site of educational development work. It bears closest resemblance to the classroom, which is the most visible site of award unit teaching. The pedagogic location of ‘workshop’ is often posited as a means of developing teaching subject’s capacity to subsequently produce e-learning products and/or facilitate online learning. As a pedagogical location, the workshop is often constrained by pre-defined periods of time. In the absence of assessment, measures of ‘time’ enable teaching subjects to commence ideating the expectations to be placed on them as workshop participants.

Must be available for Wednesday morning professional development and networking sessions during all teaching terms (9:30-11:30)

A classification of ‘mandatory’ or ‘optional’ is often embedded within the communication or promotion of a workshop to a group of teaching subjects. This classification serves as an initial point of differentiation (Foucault, 1982), for situating the pedagogic space within the aforementioned ‘problem of compliance’. In the journal extract above, the educational development subject has transcribed a section of communication from a management subject to a group of teaching subjects about to commence a professional development program. The phrase ‘must be available’ enables the workshop to be positioned as a compliance requirement, while the associated measure of time articulates when the requirement is active. For the educational development subject who will be facilitating these workshops, this point of initial differentiation not only enables the workshop to be pre-classified as a pedagogic site of compliance, but
also engenders consideration from the educational development subject on their role as facilitator in association with the problem of compliance. Thinking with Foucault’s (1997c) four elements of ethical relations, this communication from the management subject is a ‘mode of subjection’, whereby inciting the educational development subject to consider their ethical obligations in relation to the problem of compliance. In other words, the educational development subject is forced to consider how s/he will act in the pedagogic space of ‘workshop’ cognisant of its association with a problem of compliance.

The main part of our planning became coming up with a suite of support structures so that the meetings/workshops hopefully don’t become the sole place for the project.

The educational development subject acknowledges an obligation to conform to the compliance requirements associated with the workshop by employing a tacit strategy of ‘dilution’. Instead of directly contesting the use of workshops, it is a strategy of introducing additional pedagogic spaces to dilute the centrality of the pre-defined mandatory workshop. This strategy can be described as a ‘self-forming activity’ (Foucault, 1997c) as its conceptualisation and use are an attempt at self-regulating access to affordances of compliance (from teaching subjects) offered by use of the workshop as a pedagogic space. Through positing the newly introduced pedagogic spaces as ‘support structures’, the educational development subject has articulated a fragment of an idealised or aspirational state of being. Foucault (1997c) referred to this idealised state of being as a ‘Telos’, and this is ideated in reference to the component of behaviour which is ethically problematic. As stated in the introduction to this chapter, I am positing a ‘problem of compliance’ as the ‘ethical substance’ (Foucault, 1997c) to be problematized. With the newly introduced spaces as support structures, I am considering ‘support’ as an idealised role of the educational development subject in relation to the teaching subject. The strategy of ‘dilution’ is reliant upon the introduction of new pedagogic locations as a means of the educational development subject attempting to achieve a Telos where s/he is an enabler for the teaching subject to achieve outcomes which they identify as ‘their’ own.
Just writing to remind everyone that there is no scheduled face to face session this week here at the central learning and teaching unit. The idea of having the week session free is to enable someone from the central unit to catch up with you and just simply provide a hand with any of the KPIs and/or any other things you would like to go through that are related to your ELFing role. Last year we did a similar thing and found that as you all work in a wide range of areas, a wide variety of needs could be identified and/or addressed (that simply can’t be addressed in the weekly face to face sessions).

The passage of text above is an extract from an email that the educational development subject sent to a group of teaching subjects participating in a professional development program as ‘e-learning facilitators’ (ELFs). As a self-forming activity (Foucault, 1997c) performed in relation to an ethical substance of compliance as a problem, this particular pedagogic strategy is self-rationalised as support-oriented by setting the ‘location’ as the teaching subject’s office and not determining a fixed measure of ‘time’. However, in terms of the aforementioned point of differentiation (Foucault, 1982) of mandatory (or not), this particular strategy is reliant upon the teaching subject determining that the educational development subject can assist their adherence/achievement with/of a key performance indicator. The educational development subject has explicitly referenced these KPIs in the email correspondence as a means of soliciting such rationalisation and subsequent action from the teaching subject.

I then was able to get to the chase and said that my agenda is just to work with people (teachers), so they feel confident enough to give me a call when they want to do something or are having trouble. It just seems to work better when teachers don’t feel like they are having a big stick waved at them.

In the journal excerpt above, the educational development subject provides a generalised description of the problem of compliance as teaching subjects
having a ‘big stick waved at them’. This particular acknowledgement of the problem was made by the educational development subject to a group of teaching subjects (as workshop participants) who were directed to attend a workshop (to be facilitated by the educational development subject). While the workshop as a pedagogic space has been positioned as a site of engendering compliance, the educational development subject utilises an affordance of ‘attendance size’ to re-ideate a telos (Foucault, 1997c) of ‘supporting’ teaching subjects. This idealised notion of an ethical self in relation to pedagogy as a space, encompassed two conditions. Firstly, the teaching subject is the initiator for interaction with the educational development subject. Secondly, the pedagogic act is performed with an intention to not provide a reason to discourage the teaching subject from initiating subsequent interactions.

‘Time’ was initially introduced at the start of this sequence of sense making passages, as a means for the teaching subject to construct a rudimentary measure of expectation. Once the workshop as a pedagogic site was associated with a problem of compliance, this measurement of time also stipulated when the requirement was active. For the educational development subject, this notion of time was also used as a means to rationalise a measure of pedagogic efficiency. As a self-forming activity (Foucault, 1997c), a measure of the teaching subject’s time is used to evaluate the efficiency of the workshop in relation to just-in-time interactions initiated by teaching subjects. In the journal excerpt above, this particular self-forming activity was performed as a means of rationalising counter-advice that the educational development subject offered a teaching subject, who was initially advised that s/he attend a workshop. In parallel with this use of time, a determination of efficiency leverages a notion of

F##k…I just wish that there would be a bit of acceptance that teachers generally don’t want to have to sit through a workshop to get to the few bits they need. In the end the teacher responded that s/he had a few questions that could be answered in 15 mins. Just hoping that we are not going to be asked to offer a suite of workshops.
outcome ownership residing with the teaching subject. Through the just-in-time location relying upon a teaching subject initiating the interaction, the construction of intended outcomes seemingly resides with the teaching subject. Thus, a measure of efficiency uses time to quantify a rationalisation initially made based on the outcome owner-initiator being a teaching subject.

I don’t make this point to pass off responsibility but to acknowledge that in order for all of us to get the most out of the program for 2009 we need to be clear about what our role is. I am their facilitator/trainer and this role is jeopardised if I am suddenly their manager as they do not know where they stand (which is what happened with #### one of the ELFs). This point was made clear by #### (external facilitator) in the coaching and mentoring session and therefore my continued raising of this point is not to say not my problem but that I am not the best person to deal with this.

The educational development subject’s juxtaposition of the workshop in relation to just in time interactions can be rationalised as a self-forming activity (Foucault, 1997c) in search of a telos where there is absolution from the creation of performance targets or directives. This juxtaposition of pedagogic spaces is an effect of the educational development subject attempting to locate a form of freedom in relation to a problem of compliance. The juxtaposition of pedagogic spaces is not an activity to compare and contrast physical attributes, as it is a mechanism to visualise ethical dimensions or responsibilities associated with an educational development subject’s pedagogy. For example, in the email excerpt above the educational development subject self-identifies as a ‘facilitator’ in an attempt to create distance away from having ownership or responsibility for the setting of teaching subject’s performance targets. This particular email was sent by the neophyte educational development subject prior to the journal extracts that have been utilised throughout this initial sequence of sense-making text.
For educational development, pedagogy as a location can be succinctly described as a juxtaposition between pre-structured workshops and just-in-time interactions. This juxtaposition can be described as a binary like effect emergent from an educational developer’s search to achieve an idealised freedom in relation to a problem of compliance. It is an idealised freedom where the educational developer is invited by teachers to support them to perform tasks which the educational developer has had no role in determining. The contrasting pedagogic locations are juxtaposed on the basis of their utility for supporting such an idealised freedom, whereby fairly rudimentary measures of time and number of participants can be used to strengthen claims that a just-in-time pedagogic space is more conducive for an ethical educational development pedagogy.

**Pedagogy as a multiplicity of intended outcomes**

I am now going to move from exploring educational development pedagogy as a multiplicity of ‘locations’ to that of a multiplicity of ‘outcomes’. As ‘a problem of compliance’ is posited as an ethical substance (Foucault, 1997c) or mechanism that an educational development subject uses to continually define an ethical relationship to self, the notion of ‘intended outcomes’ will be used to locate a series of moments where pedagogy is rationalised or critiqued as an affect. I am using the term 'affect' to refer to the intended outcome associated with a pedagogic act, in acknowledgment that it is a response to a momentary constitution of self, emergent from navigating a problem of compliance.

Earlier in this chapter I started to visualise an educational development subject’s telos (Foucault, 1997c) as one of ‘supporting’ teaching subjects to achieve outcomes that the teaching subject conceptualises as a responsibility or directive not enforced or initiated by the educational development subject. In terms of a problem of compliance I will speculate that this search for a pedagogy enabling an absolution of responsibility for the activities teaching subjects perform, is an
idealised form of freedom for an educational development subject. This search is undertaken cognisant that the employment of an educational development subject is at least partially rationalised on the basis that s/he will be working with teaching subjects who are being directed to perform tasks which they may be vehemently opposed to performing (i.e. offer a mode of online/distance education). In this section I will continue to use Foucault’s (1997c) four elements of ethical relations to explore how the educational development subject rationalises their pedagogic acts in relation to intended outcomes or ‘affects’.

I’m more than happy to run repeat workshops on all these tools if these are the topics they want to cover, but I feel like a doctored survey has been used to discipline and that it is not necessarily the opinions of the ELFs themselves….although I’m sure that a few asked for these things in response to KPIs that now specify ‘what tools’ not what outcomes.

In the journal excerpt above the educational development subject is questioning the merit of facilitating a series of workshops on the basis of affect or intended outcome. The presentation of a workshop schedule or set of training requirements from a management subject functions as a mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997c), where an educational development subject considers how they will approach the request on the basis of affect. In this particular moment the management subject’s use of a survey to solicit teaching subject’s conceptions of need, is critiqued on the basis of affect through differentiating (Foucault, 1982) software ‘tools’ from ‘outcomes’. Thinking with a telos (Foucault, 1997c) of supporting teaching subjects, this point of differentiation is reliant upon the role of the teacher as author. The reference to ‘tools’ refers to software selected by the management subject at the central learning and teaching unit, while ‘outcomes’ refer to objectives that a teaching subject selects or acknowledges as theirs. The survey instrument was multiple choice where the options were already pre-determined, thus cancelling out the capacity for the selections to be considered conducive with a telos (Foucault, 1997c) of supporting teaching subjects.
The best bit of feedback I got was from one of the ELFs and s/he explained how in hindsight if they were running the program, they would have had us all building a unit from day dot where it is broken into a series of logical steps. I don’t agree that this would go with what I thought the aims of the project were…but in terms of concrete outcomes…yes it would have been enabled the ELFs to each have a complete unit, particularly if it was limited to Blackboard62.

The questions a teaching subject poses can serve as a form of critique when they are not directly related to the execution of the particular process, deemed to be the focus of a workshop. This form of critique is a mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997c) for an educational development subject, as s/he is solicited to consider how their exertion of the autonomy afforded in determining the focus of workshop sessions has enabled the teaching subjects to achieve their outcomes.

Whilst ELFs had succeeded in the acquisition of a range of e-learning related skills, discussions in sessions had moved toward context, applicability, adoption barriers and pedagogy. In essence, there was a need to provide ELFs (teaching subjects as de facto educational developers) with the opportunity to evaluate the first part of the year and devise a schedule based on the now apparent demands of the ELF role.

In this moment, the educational development subject has ideated a desire for the focus of the remaining workshops (in the final six months of a professional development program) to be devised in response to intended outcomes enunciated by a group of teaching subjects. This ideation as a self-forming activity (Foucault, 1997c) could be described as a pedagogic rationalisation, or effect of the aforementioned mode of subjection emergent from a teaching subject’s critique.

---

62 Blackboard is a proprietary learning management system used in the provision of online learning programs across the tertiary sector.
I acknowledged (to the teachers/ELFs) that we had looked at too many different tools and while the purpose was to expose them to a range of new ways to viewing online teaching (e.g. collaboration, aggregation and non-reliance on resources) ...that I had failed the group by pushing this agenda similar to the agenda that a manager had pushed. I said that I thought people (teachers/ELFs) felt that the sessions were not geared enough toward supporting them to achieving the KPIs. I drew parallels with Freire’s Banking principle and this was something that many in the group seemed to be able to relate to. I said that I felt we now needed to draw a line in the sand and all have a part in developing the schedule.

The educational development subject has deemed that s/he has violated the afforded autonomy in selecting the focus of weekly workshops, by rationalising it as a personal ideation of intended outcomes. This self-critique of prior pedagogic acts as being personally motivated, engenders or solicits the educational development subject to initiate a shift in pedagogic strategy. In order to enact such a shift in strategy, the educational development subject has conceptualised pedagogic conditions which are conducive with a telos of supporting teaching subjects. This self-forming activity (Foucault, 1997c) utilised two points of differentiation emergent from a rudimentary reading of Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Freire, 1972). Firstly, the concept of ‘banking education’ is used to classify learning experiences on the basis of learners’ pre-association between problem and pedagogic focus. The educational development subject is questioning whether the teaching subjects as participants are entering the pedagogic environment seeking to learn an intersection of knowledge and skills that they have previously deemed necessary to respond to situated challenges. Secondly, the pedagogical activity is differentiated using an association between condition of ‘participatory’ and effect of ‘collective ownership’. The educational development subject is seeking to identify whether the focus of learning is emergent from a dialogic exchange between the ‘collective’ of teaching subjects,
thus resulting in an agreed focus of which all teaching subjects can claim some form of ownership.

*We didn’t really add much content per se to the mind map instead categories/nodes as I was a little scared to put many of the things being said on the board as I didn’t want the ELFs to feel that the mind map was the focus...that they might clam up and not talk.*

In the moment described above, the educational development subject has commenced facilitating the workshop with an expectation that the teaching subjects will be able to articulate an intersection of knowledge and skills that they deem as necessary to achieve outcomes they categorise as their own. In response, the teaching subjects commence articulating a series of frustrations, tensions and challenges often associated with particular management subjects. A tactic of participatory pedagogy is reliant upon teaching subjects articulating a shared set of problems or challenges to grapple with. Given that these challenges are likely to encompass references to teaching and/or management colleagues not performing particular actions, the educational development subject is forced to consider how s/he will represent the role of these colleagues in a written form, and how s/he will assist the teaching subjects to confront those colleagues. In the journal excerpt above, the educational development subject navigates this particular mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997c) by moderating the amount of detail to be documented in the mind-map containing references to challenges and their association with teaching and management subjects.

*Considering that I am going to be in a heap of s**t if we don’t come out with a schedule today, I tried to speed things up by summarising some of the potential topics that were listed last session and adding some which I know a manager wants us to cover and a couple which I think will help many of the ELFs*[^63] *with their KPIs. I told the group that*

[^63]: ELFs — E-learning Facilitators were a group of teaching subjects employed fractionally for a year to participate in an e-learning professional development program.
they should feel free to add or flag ‘problems, topics and technologies’ to be removed, they included:

1. ELFs voluntarily presenting their units for feedback from the group (this necessarily wouldn’t be a one session topic, but a recurring theme).

2. What student feedback-based research exists and what are some recommended approaches to online learning based on such research?

3. What is a quality online course? Evaluating e-learning delivery models (looking at a range of external and internal examples).

4. Options for acquiring and customising freeware and commercially available learning content for use in online delivery (e.g. LORN⁶⁴/Toolboxes, Open Courseware⁶⁵, YouTube EDU⁶⁶ etc).

5. Making e-learning affordable for students through the use of free and open source software (e.g. Portable Applications⁶⁷, Freeware Directories, Wii-Mote $75 smart boards⁶⁸ etc)

6. Bringing all the different tools into the one place (e.g. include widgets in Blackboard⁶⁹, RSS⁷⁰ and/or netvibes.com⁷¹

---

⁶⁴ LORN - The Learning Object Repository Network (now called the Toolbox object repository) is used by VET sector employees to access customizable re-usable online learning objects commonly referred to as Toolboxes.

⁶⁵ MIT Open Courseware is an online repository to access freely available learning objects used in award programs of study at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

⁶⁶ YouTube EDU was a former sub-site within YouTube specifically focused on educational video content.

⁶⁷ PortableApps.com is a website offering truncated versions of commonly used software that can be run directly from a USB memory drive.

⁶⁸ The Wii mote smartboard is a multi-point interactive whiteboard using a Nintendo Wiimote in conjunction with free software developed by Johnny Chung Lee.

⁶⁹ Blackboard is a proprietary learning management system used in the provision of online learning programs across the tertiary sector.

⁷⁰ RSS - Really Simple Syndication enables users to automatically receive updates to multiple websites via a standard reader without re-visiting the original websites.

⁷¹ Netvibes.com is a personal web dashboard to aggregate web content from multiple websites on the one interface.
7. Creating Quizzes that can be used in both Blackboard and Moodle\textsuperscript{72} with Hot Potatoes\textsuperscript{73}.

8. An Introduction to Moodle, the alternate learning management system the institution is looking at adopting.

9. Working with people during times of change. Tips from case studies on how change is managed in other environments.

10. E-Learning for students with special needs (e.g. WYNN\textsuperscript{74})

11. Real time classrooms (e.g. Elluminate\textsuperscript{75})

In the aforementioned series of journal excerpts, the educational development has recounted how s/he has devised a tactic of participatory pedagogy as a self-forming activity (Foucault, 1997c) in order to facilitate two workshop schedule planning sessions. The workshop schedule as an outcome or effect of these planning sessions, was intended to outline a series of mini-preparatory outcomes devised by the collective of teaching subjects. These preparatory mini-outcomes were intended for future use by the educational development subject as a ‘collective voice’ to justify the focus of the final six months of a professional development program.

To my surprise there was not a lot of arguments with the topics and I was unsure if this was that by putting all these topics in a list, I had killed off opportunity for discussion. I thought right there and then that I had made a massive blunder and felt really stupid that I had acted through fear and frustration associated with dealing with a manager.

\textsuperscript{72} MOODLE is an open-source learning management system commonly used in the provision of online learning programs across the tertiary sector.

\textsuperscript{73} Hot Potatoes is a suite of five applications which can be used by teachers to create online quizzes and learning activities to be accessible in a learning management system.

\textsuperscript{74} WYNN Reader is an assistive technology for students with learning difficulties.

\textsuperscript{75} Elluminate (now Blackboard Collaborate) is an online virtual classroom application.
At the conclusion of the two sessions that the educational development subject had facilitated, there was a draft workshop schedule that could be presented as an outcome to the management subject who had initially requested it. This moment directly prior to the delivery of a requested outcome functions as a mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997c) for an educational development subject as s/he considers the role of their actions in regards to an ethical substance of a ‘problem of compliance’. Directly after the second planning session had concluded, the educational development subject questioned whether a tactic of participatory pedagogy had actually been enacted. In this particular moment, the educational development subject is referring to their construction of a pre-populated list of topics that were an interpretation of the problems and challenges identified in the initial planning session.

I generally don’t pre-prepare notes etc for any of the workshops I am asked to run with a group I have yet to meet. Otherwise you just come across as a wanker with an agenda when the idea is meant to be that we are here to assist the teachers with whatever their needs are.

Throughout this chapter I have located an assemblage of moments where an educational development subject has ideated a telos (Foucault, 1997c) of ‘assisting’ or ‘supporting’ teaching subjects. The journal excerpt above is a succinct example of the educational development subject ideating this telos where the self-identified learning needs of teaching subjects ideally direct the pedagogic interaction. While the educational development subject’s facilitation of two planning sessions for teaching subjects to ideate their learning needs is an attempt at enacting a pedagogy in alignment with this telos, there is a self-conception of failure on the basis that the teaching subjects only ideated the perceived challenges. They were only afforded opportunity to select topics of necessity from a pre-prepared list that the educational development subject prepared, in response to their previously ideated challenges.
Yesterday afternoon I finished working on a draft of the schedule. I just added dates and a few more topics which we can change anyway...just so I can finally say I've delivered a schedule that the ELFs have had a fair hand in developing.

Despite an earlier conception of failure in enacting a participatory pedagogy, the educational development subject was able to rationalise the eventual schedule as an outcome informed by the participation of teaching subjects. It is rationalised as teaching subject authored on the premise that the teaching subjects (ELFs) had initially idealised challenges which informed the educational development subject’s conception of topics in the form of a draft schedule. Moreover, the collective of teaching subjects were afforded an opportunity to provide feedback and endorsement of the draft schedule, whereby enabling the educational development subject to at least rely upon a notion of endorsement.

The affordance of referring to the approach as participatory is primarily quantitative, as it is reliant upon 'x number of teaching subjects having an authorship status. This outcome of ‘participatory’ via quantification provides the educational development subject with a level of tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978) in any socio-historical moments where criticism is directed at the focus of an educational development subject’s pedagogy. Thinking with pedagogy as an affect, we could view a tactic of participatory pedagogy as a means of enacting a telos (Foucault, 1997c). In contrast, if we think about participatory pedagogy as an effect, the exertion of this tactic cultivates an effect of pedagogic agentic utility. In other words, pedagogy as an affect can be described as a tactic of self-governance informed by a telos of supporting teaching subjects; while pedagogy as an effect are the scatterings of situated affordances which may enable an ongoing pursuit of this telos.

One way in which an educational developer self-moderates their pedagogic decision-making is through ideating an affect for a proposed and/or enacted pedagogic action in relation to an aspirational being of supporting teachers. An
educational developer is solicited to consider this relationship at moments such as when a manager presents a workshop schedule or set of training requirements, and when teachers provide critique on an educational developer’s pedagogic decision making. At these reflexive moments, a status of teacher authorship is often used as a means of evaluating the relationship between affect and an idealised being of supporting teachers. For an educational developer who is nominally expected to play a role in determining areas of focus for teachers professional learning, a tactic of participatory pedagogy is enticing. This tactic is an educational developer’s attempt at cultivating pedagogic spaces and moments where teachers ideate the challenges and associated learning requirements associated with intended outcomes they acknowledge as theirs.

An educational developer can self-evaluate their pedagogic actions by questioning how the learning experience is being informed by the teachers’ pre-association between problem and pedagogic focus and whether the focus is collectively owned by teachers’ as authors. When an educational developer is unable to enact a participatory pedagogic tactic that achieves the first condition, the second condition of authorship status can be partially achieved by enabling teachers’ opportunities to provide feedback and endorse a proposed pedagogic focus. As an affect, this can be considered a failure to achieve an idealised being of supporting teachers, but as an effect it does provide a form of strategic utility in that an educational developer can deflect future criticism by using a quantitative measure of the number of teachers involved in the authorship of intended outcomes. The educational developer can continue working toward grasping an idealised freedom where s/he is supporting teachers to achieve outcomes that they self-identify as theirs.

**Pedagogy as a multiplicity of products**

To this point in the chapter I have used Foucault’s (Foucault, 1997c) four
elements of ethical relations to explore how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is an agentic endeavour. By agentic endeavour, I am referring to an educational development subject’s ongoing re-conceptualisation of their ethical self. This continual re-conceptualisation of self is performed in relation to an aspirational being or ‘Telos’ (Foucault, 1997c), and situated determinations of how ‘self’ is constituted differently across multiple discursive fields (Davies, 2000). Through use of Britzman’s (1991) conception of pedagogy as a ‘moment’ and Ellsworth’s (2005) conception of pedagogy as a ‘space’, I have thus far explored pedagogy as an agentic endeavour via axes or discursive fields of ‘location’ and ‘outcomes’. I will now conclude this chapter by working with a third axis of pedagogy as a ‘product’.

A product is commonly referred to as an idea, service or physical entity which is exchanged in pursuit of an individual and/or organisational objective (American Marketing Association, 2018). It may appear problematic to consider pedagogy as an entity for exchange, as this notion of exchange is reliant upon the consumer having some conception of the entity that s/he is consuming. For example, when pedagogy is expressed as a ‘space’ the educational development subject gravitates to one to one interactions as a means of enacting a telos (Foucault, 1997c) of supporting teachers. Meanwhile, in moments when pedagogy is expressed as an ‘affect’ the educational development subject is attempting to cultivate opportunities for teaching subjects to ideate their challenges and required professional learning. Across both axes, there are only affordances or properties which can be evaluated by a teaching subject and/or management subject prior to engagement with the educational development subject. However, there are limited opportunities for an educational development subject to visualise their pedagogic acts or processing (which are an attempt at enacting a telos of supporting teaching subjects) in a manner where they have potential to function as products.

A manager asked me to develop a template for the ELFs to use to document what they are intending to do for KPI 3 – design of a remote delivery unit. I’ve tried to put something together which is a
little bit of a compromise between the data type/reporting approach that is wanted and what I feel may be useful for the ELFs. The idea is that they are questions which could spark further discussion and planning.

In the journal excerpt above, the educational development subject is being asked to produce a survey type instrument which enables a management subject to evaluate the efficacy of a teaching subject’s plan to achieve a key performance indicator. This particular mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997c) solicits the educational development subject to consider the role that the pedagogic product will play in constraining the capacity of teaching subjects to enact objectives they have ideated as a means of achieving the key performance indicator. As a means of navigating this tension, the educational development subject categorises the product using ‘interests’ as a point of differentiation (Foucault, 1982). By interests, I am referring to the educational development subject’s juxtaposition of ‘reporting’ as being a management concern, and ‘utility’ as being teaching subject centred. An educational development subject’s use of this differentiation is a means of self-rationalising the design intention of the pedagogic product as being conducive with a telos (Foucault, 1997c) of ‘supporting teachers’. Consequently, the pedagogic product needs to engender or simulate some form of collaboration with teaching subjects to aid their achievement of objectives they conceive as their own.

KPI 3: Design of Remote Delivery Unit

Please answer the following questions to help you design the remote delivery of a unit of study and/or short course.

What is the name of the unit/short course?

What is the proposed timeline (start and finish dates) for the unit of study/short course?

Who will deliver/manage the unit/short course?

Are the students already enrolled?
If yes, which course are the majority of students currently enrolled in? If no, how does your department envisage promoting and recruiting the participants?

How many students do you have enrolled and or envisage enrolling?

What potential benefits are there for students, teaching staff and/or the department in this unit/course being conducted online?

8. What resources do you intend on using?
   a) External (e.g. LORN repository\textsuperscript{76}, toolboxes, manuals etc;)
   b) Self-Produced (e.g. presentations, worksheets, how to videos etc);
   c) Student Generated (student participation materials from wikis\textsuperscript{77}, blogs\textsuperscript{78}, bookmarks\textsuperscript{79} etc)

9. What real time (synchronous) communication technologies will be used?

Examples include: Video Conference, Elluminate\textsuperscript{80}, Skype\textsuperscript{81}, Instant Messaging etc

10. What non real time (asynchronous) collaboration technologies will be used?

\textsuperscript{76} LORN - The Learning Object Repository Network (now called the Toolbox object repository) is used by VET sector employees to access customizable re-usable online learning objects commonly referred to as Toolboxes.
\textsuperscript{77} Wikis are websites which can be edited within the web browser by the end-users.
\textsuperscript{78} Blogs (weblogs) are websites which display individual entries in a reverse chronological sequence.
\textsuperscript{79} Social Bookmarking refers to web services for storing and sharing web bookmarks/favourites.
\textsuperscript{80} Elluminate (now Blackboard Collaborate) is an online virtual classroom application.
\textsuperscript{81} Skype is a video and audio communication application for couples and/or small groups.
Examples include: Wikis, Blogs, Social Bookmarking, Micro-Blogging\textsuperscript{82} etc

11. Do you intend on providing formative (as you go) feedback to students and if so how?
Examples include: Blackboard\textsuperscript{83}, Google Documents\textsuperscript{84}, Wikis (with RSS\textsuperscript{85}), Blogs (with RSS) etc

12. What technologies will students use to submit assessment tasks?
Examples include: Blackboard, Google Documents, Wikis etc

13. Do you think the approach described above can be used with any existing units/short courses?
Yes / Possibly / No

14. If you think your approach could be reused, which units/short courses would be worthy of further investigation?

As a self-forming activity (Foucault, 1997c), the educational development subject has attempted to develop a set of reflective questions for teaching subjects to consider or formulate their actions. This set of questions relies upon a strategy of segmentation, as the online unit of study as key performance indicator is dissected into components. In regards to a problem of compliance being the ethical substance (Foucault, 1997c) for an educational development subject to establish an ethical relationship with self, the overarching reflexive concern is determining whether (or to what degree) the pedagogic product serves a function of engendering or enabling teaching subject’s adhesion with pedagogic

\textsuperscript{82} Microblogging is a combination of blogging and instant messaging that allows users to create short messages to be posted and shared with an audience online.

\textsuperscript{83} Blackboard is a proprietary learning management system used in the provision of online learning programs across the tertiary sector.

\textsuperscript{84} Google Docs is an online office suite encompassing word processing, data sheets and presentation applications.

\textsuperscript{85} RSS - Really Simple Syndication enables users to automatically receive updates to multiple websites via a standard reader without re-visiting the original websites.
requirements determined by a management subject. I will speculate that this reflexive concern is another mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997c) for an educational development subject to be performed at the time prior to distribution, or at a moment when the educational development subject is able to conceptualise a view on how the management subject has reacted to the teaching subjects responses to the questions. In the pedagogic product above, the provision of questions is a mechanism for teaching subjects to declare their design decisions, however the questions and their associated questions offer little capacity to function as a pedagogic process. With an exclusive focus on outputs, this pedagogic product requires a teaching subject to perform a form of critique or diagnosis on their intended outputs, to ensure that each component or segment has been addressed. A teaching subject’s completion of the template would still provide the management subject with capacity to act as the ‘approver’ by performing an early diagnostic review of the teaching subject’s pedagogic decisions.

To design a plan for the online delivery of GCSSUS01A I BSBSUS201A ‘Participate in environmentally sustainable work practices’.

Overview:

1. We first of all (as a group) created a list of things that we think are part of an ideal learning environment.

2. We then constructed a list of practical considerations that will inform the design of any delivery (e.g. locations, participant incentives etc).

3. In order to situate the task, Steve presented the scenario that the unit would be delivered to a group of workers from the one

---

86 BSBSUS201 - Participate in environmentally sustainable work practices is an active (as of November 2018) unit of competency first released with the Business Services Training Package Version 1.0. It is presently operable within 94 nationally recognised Australian vocational qualifications.
organisation at the request of the employer. The specific requirements are listed below in response to the questions generated by the group (see 'What are some practical participant related considerations prior to designing the unit delivery?')

4. The next step involved looking at the competency and identifying the main subject specific components required in the delivery and assessment of the unit. (see In Response to GCSSUS01A I BSBSUS201A 'Participate in environmentally sustainable work practices')

5. We concluded the first session by matching elements and activity types generated at the start with the unit specific deliver and assessment requirements we had previously identified.

Moving Forward: We now have a rough outline of how we plan to deliver the unit (with limited mention of e-learning). We can now use the list of technologies and their common educational applications (provided on a separate handout) to inform a matching of technologies with those tasks and methods of assessment.

This second pedagogic product is a ‘recount’ of a series of stages for designing an online unit of study, as modelled by the educational development subject in a workshop session with a group of teaching subjects. I will speculate that the ideation of this sequence of design stages is informed by insights developed at the aforementioned mode of subjection (Foucault, 1997c) where an educational development subject considers the role that a pedagogic product played in constraining the capacity of teaching subjects to enact objectives they have ideated. As an agentic endeavour, use of this pedagogic process is an attempt an enacting a telos (Foucault, 1997c) of supporting teaching subjects. For example, this pedagogic process is reliant upon teaching subjects conceptualising attributes of an idealistic learning environment and identifying those constraints or challenges they envisage as needing to navigate. The remainder of the process is reliant upon the educational development subject guiding the collective of teaching subjects through a process of enacting these ideals.
cognisant of the challenges and constraints they have ideated. At each stage, the educational development subject is asking the teaching subjects to formulate pedagogic decisions in response to various associations or relationships between curriculum and e-learning related components.

The pedagogic recount was sent by the educational development subject to a group of teaching subjects and a management subject soon after the workshop had concluded, accompanied by a series of pre-authored static handouts and a copy of the notes written on the whiteboard throughout the session. As a self-forming activity (Foucault, 1997c), the production and distribution of this pedagogic recount is an attempt to cultivate opportunities for a wider group of teaching subjects to consider and potentially utilise an educational development subject’s pedagogy. As a product for transaction, it is a replicable process of pedagogic decision making were the teaching subject is prompted to formulate design decisions conducive with their initial conceptualisation of idealised conditions for learning. Design decisions are conceptualised by the teaching subject being prompted to examine the relationships between multiple or disparate elements and formulate responses conducive with their idealised conception of learning.

Production and distribution of replicable pedagogic products provide various levels of tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978) for an educational development subject. In terms of pedagogy as an affect, replicable pedagogic products provide a visible snapshot of an educational development subject’s pedagogic capacity in a form not dependent upon a teaching subject’s action (e.g. production of an online unit of study). In terms of pedagogy as an effect, the provision of replicable pedagogic products reduce capacity for an educational development subject to be positioned within a problem of compliance. There is an absence of specified outcomes or exemplars which may incite a teaching subject’s reference as an idealised performance benchmark.

Pedagogy expressed as a product is an assemblage of moments where an educational developer has packaged pedagogic processes conducive with an
aspirational being of supporting teachers. Pedagogic products are often produced as an attempt at re-directing a reporting requirement into a formative moment, and/or as an attempt at cultivating future opportunities to collaborate with teachers. Despite these intentions, there is risk that an educational developer’s production of pedagogic resources will have an effect of strengthening the capacity for teacher compliance with a management-initiated directive. For example, the educational developer may employ a simplistic ‘interests’ switch of teaching vs management to inform their re-packaging of a reporting moment as a formative opportunity. Use of this role centred switch may result in the educational developer simply dissecting the reporting requirement into a series of pedagogic components or outputs that the teacher is compelled to use as a performance checklist.

For a pedagogic product to be positioned as conducive with an aspirational being of supporting teachers to ideate pedagogic acts and rationalisations, various components can be incorporated into its design. These include soliciting teachers to ideate idealistic conditions for learning; and presenting inter-relationships as a trigger to prompt teacher self-reflection and ideation of pedagogic consideration and acts. The development of pedagogic products inevitably provides an educational developer with greater capacity to report achievement of outcomes not contingent upon the action or outputs of teachers. Such reporting via the use of pedagogic products inevitably relies upon a co-contention or assumption that the process is replicable. In short, educational development pedagogy as a product can be expressed as ‘templates’.

In closing – re-imaging pedagogy as an ethical relation with self

In this chapter I have used Foucault’s (1997c) four elements of ethical relations to explore how educational development subject’s pedagogy is an assemblage of strategies and tactics conceptualised, enacted and rationalised as an agentic endeavour. Drawing upon Britzman’s (1991) description of pedagogy as a
‘moment’ and Ellsworth’s (2005) concept of pedagogy as a ‘space’, I have attempted to show how an educational development subject’s pedagogy is much more than a set of observable techniques or actions. It is a pedagogy of continually negotiating a relationship with a bricolage of subjectivities, constituted as affect and effect of an educational development subject’s attempt at living a telos (Foucault, 1997c) of supporting teaching subjects.

The telos is an idealised conception of freedom where an educational development subject collaborates with teaching subjects to ideate and enact pedagogy in response to intended outcomes or directives that a teaching subject recognises as their responsibility to enact. This idealised conception of freedom is an absolution of moral responsibility in relation to an ethical substance (Foucault, 1997c) of ‘a problem of compliance’, where an educational development subject’s pedagogy engenders or aids the enforcement of teaching subject’s compliance with directives rationalised as a management concern.

Axes of pedagogy as a ‘space’, ‘affect’, and ‘product’, served as vantage points to visualise various moments or modes of subjection (Foucault, 1997c) where an educational development subject is continually solicited to consider their ethical responsibility in relation to a problem of compliance. These included moments such as receiving a directive from a management subject, being presented with a workshop schedule, receiving pedagogical critique from a teaching subject, acknowledging a teaching subject’s ideation of barriers to their use of e-learning, reporting the completion of a management directive, being requested to report on teaching subject’s progress toward completing e-learning associated key performance outcomes, and reviewing self-authored educational resources.

Pedagogic rationalisations, tactics and strategies are self-forming activities (Foucault, 1997c) as an educational development subject’s navigation of each of the aforementioned modes of subjection. An example rationalisation is the educational development subject positing just in-time interactions as an idealised pedagogic space by juxtaposing these against scheduled workshops in relation a telos of supporting teachers. Meanwhile, a tactic of ‘participatory pedagogy’ is an educational development subject attempting to cultivate
pedagogic spaces and moments where teachers ideate challenges and associated learning requirements associated with intended outcomes they acknowledge as theirs. Finally, a strategy of ‘replicable pedagogic products’ is the design and dissemination of educational resources which solicit teachers to independently conceptualise pedagogic acts. The teaching subject is prompted to conceptualise their use of e-learning in response to the presentation of various inter-relationships and their own ideation of an idealistic conditions for learning.
Chapter 11 - A pedagogy of multiplicity

This thesis has been a deconstructive autoethnographic (Gannon, 2006; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008) examination of the ways in which a neophyte educational developer’s pedagogic rationalisations and tactics have been governed or shaped by conceptions of agency. The research has explored how this interplay between agency and pedagogy has been emergent from the educational development subject’s navigation of e-learning-centred relationships, whilst working at a Technical and Further Education (TAFE) division situated in a regional dual sector university in Victoria Australia.

The focus of the research

The research question that guided the production of this thesis was ‘How can discourses of agency shape the pedagogy of educational development subjects in TAFE e-learning relationships?’ This question emanated from a problem I identified in my early years working as a neophyte educational developer. At this point in 2008 and 2009, I realised that I was unable to disassociate pedagogy from political concerns and/or implications. In particular, it was those interactions related to the use of e-learning where the sphere of political concerns and implications loomed largest. In other words, I had identified that educational development was not simply a task of providing teaching subjects with instruction on how to perform a particular task or use a particular educational technology. Pedagogy bore more resemblance to Di Napoli’s (2014, p. 7) description of educational development as ‘game playing’, where educational development subjects "at all times reposition themselves on the continuum between the two extremes (of compliance and resistance)." Little and Green (2012, p. 206) succinctly described this navigation as ‘clout’ in acknowledgement of the difficulty for educational development subjects to determine ‘who’ possessed the power to dominate in a given socio-historical
instance. I was able to speculate that educational development pedagogy is a concern with navigating multiple agentic continuums, and I consequently used this thesis as a means to explore how educational development pedagogy is an effect of navigating day to day agentic tensions.

The research as a multiplicity of problems

Five problems of agency emerged from the development of a historical background (Chapter 3 - Navigating the discursive terrain of TAFE) and literature review (Chapter 4 - Academic development as a substitute) read in parallel with the autoethnographic journal serving as the primary source of data for the research.

1. Contestation – an educational development subject navigating a problem of defining their role as ‘educational developer’.

2. Marginalisation - an educational development subject navigating a problem of being excluded or outside of pedagogic decision making which guides the selection and use of e-learning.

3. E-learning as a product - an educational development subject navigating a problem of determining the focus and objective of educational development in e-learning relationships.

4. Compliance - an educational development subject navigating a problem of engendering and being marked by a status of compliance.

5. Pedagogy as generic - an educational development subject navigating a problem of pedagogy conceptualised as a set of generalised techniques.

The thesis research question 'How can discourses of agency shape the pedagogy of educational development subjects in TAFE e-learning relationships?' was examined via these five agentic tensions to reveal a pedagogy of multiplicity. I am using this term ‘multiplicity’ to clearly situate the insights gained via exploration of each agentic tension as not being components of a unified
narrative. In terms of commencing the communication of the original contribution of the thesis, I am positioning it as a theoretical and practical response to Lee and McWilliam’s (2008) call to researchers in the field of academic/educational development to produce ‘ironic texts’. Drawing upon the work of Rorty (1989) via Foucault (1992), Lee and McWilliam (2008, p. 74) posit ‘ironic texts’ as ‘refusing to settle finally on the account, the formula, the set of principles for good moral, political, economic or pedagogical order’. Ironic texts are concerned with examining (not resolving) the ways in which knowledge is used by individuals to constitute themselves as subject to normative categories of identity or category. In the remainder of this chapter I will outline how this thesis is an original contribution to the field of academic/educational development as an ironic text, devoid of conclusions specifying a model or template of best practice.

**Value and limitations of the research**

The major value of the deconstructive autoethnographic approach (Gannon, 2006; Jackson & Mazzei, 2008) employed in this thesis is that it enabled me to chart how an educational development subject’s pedagogical acts and rationalisations were governed by momentary conceptions of agency without relying on the production of a unifying authoritative narrative. This was achieved through performing sense-making of the auto-ethnographic journal using five differing problems of pedagogical agency emergent from the literature review. It serves as a working example of thinking inductively with Foucault’s triple historical ontology of knowledge-power-self (Deleuze, 2006; Foucault, 1982, 1984a) in response to an auto-ethnographic journal initially written under the fiction of a unified ‘I’. While I thought with theoretical aspects of Foucault’s archaeological (Foucault, 1972) and genealogical (Foucault, 1978) methods, neither was used as a blueprint for sense-making. A selection of theoretical concepts from each of these methodological approaches were iteratively
selected on the basis of their perceived efficacy for engaging in an auto-ethnographic sense-making process.

The major limitation associated with the research design is that it relies upon the use of an individual educational development subject’s reflective journal from 2009, positioning the work as being bound to a decade old snapshot of an Australian Vocational Education context. While this retrospective snapshot was utilised on the basis that it represented the fragmented experiences of a neophyte educational development subject, it is envisaged that future enquiry examining educational development pedagogy in a contemporary tertiary education context will contest and extend those insights garnered from the production of this thesis. For example, while I thought with a tacit or broad poststructural conceptual framework when constructing the historical background (chapter three) and undertaking the literature review (chapter four), concerted application of Foucault’s (1979) guiding principles for genealogical research would have garnered the development of more refined conceptions of pedagogical problems of agency. Moreover, use of Foucault’s approach for governmentality analysis in the historical background would have enabled potential for the seemingly irreconcilable agentic contradictions emergent throughout the autoethnographic chapters to be re-considered as tensions between law, discipline and security.

Future research examining the pedagogy of educational development subjects could be significantly extended by thinking with an assortment of other poststructural theorists such as Deleuze and Derrida, and/or through utilising collaborative methods of poststructural enquiry such as collective biography (Davies & Gannon, 2006) where groups of educational development subjects would collaboratively examine how they are constituted as subjects through

---

87 Governmentality is a conceptual term Foucault (2007) used to examine the emergence and application of a mode of governing behaviour, rationalised through measuring the impact on a population and managed via various apparatuses of security.

88 I am thankful for Professor Kaspar Villadsen’s suggestion to use governmentality analysis as a future area of enquiry as outlined above.
analysing a collective array of evocative memory texts written by each member of the group.

Through approaching the research question using five different problems of pedagogical agency, the thesis contains an assortment of original theoretical conceptualisations of educational development pedagogy. These have utility as a toolkit of sorts for educational development colleagues to reflexively examine how their momentary conceptions of agency govern their pedagogical rationalisations and acts. Through positioning the research within poststructural critiques of universalism, foundationalism and essentialism (Parkes et al., 2010), this original contribution doesn’t exceed a dissemination of theoretical concepts and tools for educational development practitioners to think beyond structural-hierarchical conceptions of agency when devising pedagogical strategies and tactics. The remainder of this chapter focuses on outlining the theoretical and practitioner-oriented efficacy for the major theoretical contributions by situating each in their emergent problem of pedagogical agency. These pedagogical problems are contestation, marginalisation, e-learning as a product, compliance and pedagogy as generic.

**A pedagogy of navigating contestation**

Chapter 6 ‘Educational development as a contestable identity’ served as an exploration of the ways in which an educational development subject’s pedagogic rationalisations and acts are emergent from conceptions of agency in relation to a problem of defining a role as ‘educational developer’. The contestability of educational development can function as a macro-level explanation or grand narrative soliciting a multitude of pedagogic rationalisations and acts. Most notably, a pedagogic tactic of vanguard is emergent from an educational development subject’s continual attempts at forging relationships which enable the subject to achieve a subjectivity of ‘expert’. A subjectivity of ‘expert’ is reliant upon ‘collaboration with teachers as students’ functioning as a point of initial differentiation (Foucault, 1972) for the
educational development subject. This criterion for governing pedagogic decision making reflects a historical account of educational development which posits the primary roles of it subjects as supporting teachers via the provision of professional development (Golding, 2014). In a TAFE environment where educational development subjects are positioned as supporting teachers use of e-learning, there are few actions that educational development subjects can use as a pedagogic template for acknowledging political considerations or consequences. The notion of vanguard as a pedagogic tactic of achieving a subjectivity of expert is an accessible means for educational development subjects to commence a reflexive examination of the political efficacy guiding their pedagogic acts. It is a simplistic means for educational development subjects to acknowledge the non-neutrality (Stensaker, 2017) of their pedagogy and imagine new ways of working.

As a vanguard pedagogy is emergent from the dis-juncture between official documents as the ‘rules of right’ (Foucault, 1980e) that officially define the role of educational development, and the everyday actions performed by educational development subjects; there is an imperative for educational development management subjects to refrain from outlining generalist objectives such as ‘provide pedagogical advice to teachers in the use of e-learning’ as a key responsibility in position descriptions. An implication of this finding is that there is an opportunity for future educational development position descriptions to encompass reference to the capacity to ideate tactics in response to localised objectives, whereby soliciting educational development subjects to undertake a journey to develop an expert status as a pedagogic tactician. Achieving expert status as a pedagogic tactician is in part reliant upon Hallett’s (2012) thesis which posits the ‘subject matter’ of educational development as a ‘working knowledge’ of what academics (teachers) need to know in order to do their work. However, the aforementioned conceptualisation of vanguard pedagogy as a means of cultivating a subjectivity of expert, solicits a caution or reflexive examination of the ways in which an educational development subject uses their ideations of
such local knowledge to inform and rationalise their pedagogic acts.

A pedagogy of navigating marginalisation

Chapter 7 ‘Educational development as marginal’ served as a means to explore how an educational development subject’s pedagogic tactics and rationalisations are governed by navigating a problem of being excluded or outside an idealised centre of pedagogic decision making. Through adopting a Spivakian conception of marginality (Spivak, 1990, 1993) as a space between the margins and a centre, used in parallel with the relational conception of knowledge/power (Foucault, 1978), I was able to visualise how an educational development subject’s emergent and multiple conceptions of marginality function as both strategic effect and affect.

Educational development marginality is beyond a consequence or effect of structural-hierarchical rules of right. It is a non-static conception of freedom which governs an educational development subject’s pedagogic acts as acts of resistance. A practice-based implication of reconceptualising marginality in this manner, is that it provides educational development subjects with a prompt for reflexive pause before using generalised statements about the field to define their agency.

"The legitimacy of professional development is increased if there is clear institutional support for it, and if high ranking staff make use of centrally organised professional development" (Moses, 1985, p. 81).

The above quote succinctly articulates an idealised state of play, reliant upon a conception that the legitimacy of the educational development endeavour is based upon management subjects’ assessment of its relevance or utility. Thinking with a reconceptualization of an educational development subject’s emergent and multiple conceptions of marginality being a strategic effect and affect; the educational development is solicited to identify such differentiations (Foucault, 1982) guiding their determinations of agency. This component of the
thesis contends that multiple spaces of marginality cannot be rationalised as a sole consequence of structure, for example via an idealised fault line between a central learning and teaching unit and the faculties, schools and departments. While there are numerous references in academic development literature identifying and/or exploring how the agency of an educational development subject is seemingly constrained by their organisational position (Stensaker, 2017), the re-conceptualisation of these organisational locations as ‘idealised fault-lines’ provides educational development subjects with an argument for moving beyond a conception that organisational (structural) locations of employment as an agentic determinant. Moreover, it serves as a prompt for educational development subjects to examine how they use a generalised conception of agency based on a structural location to navigate pedagogical relationships with teaching and management subjects.

This component of the thesis adopted the Spivakian concept of ‘catachresis’ (Spivak, 1993) to explore how generalised role based conceptualisations of ‘award unit teacher’ and ‘IT officer’ function as efficient, but problematic idealised proximate points of differentiation (Foucault, 1982) for an educational development subject’s conception of their marginality. The thesis contends that ‘catachrestic conceptions’ serve as leverage points of resistance against effects of marginality (Spivak, 1990), conceptualised in relation to an idealised centre of ‘pedagogic decision making in award units of study’. Catachrestic conceptions have future utility as a practice based theoretical tool for educational development subjects working within a humanist stance to imagine or ideate key points of differentiation (Foucault, 1982), through examining those normative role-based functions they are resisting association with. A broader implication of the methodological work undertaken in this component of the thesis is that it can be used to guide future research exploring how catachrestic conceptualisations (proximate idealised roles) are used as a strategic device or point of resistance in interactions with other members of an institutional community. It serves as a practical example of enquiry which draws on an intersection of Foucauldian and Spivakian thought.
This component of the thesis contends that effects of marginality can be analysed by educational development subjects using a centre-value-strategy triad. ‘Centre’ refers to an idealised position of pedagogic decision making in award units, while ‘Value’ refers to an educational development subject’s conception of worth based on teaching subject’s use of e-learning at this idealised centre. Finally, ‘Strategy’ refers to the assortment of in-between marginal spaces which an educational development subject can occupy, as a means of engendering a future occupation of the centre (pedagogic decision making in award units of study). As an original contribution to the field of academic/educational development this reflexive framework provides educational development subjects with a means to explore the ‘interrelationalities’ (Ellsworth, 2005) or intersections of multiple discourse where effects of marginality are emergent. The centre-value-strategy triad is a reflexive framework for educational development subjects to continually re-examine agentic rationalisations of being marginalised along seemingly fixed binary fault lines and ideate pedagogic tactics using a conception of marginality as in-between space (Spivak, 1990, 1993). It has future utility as a theoretical tool for enacting a form of poststructural agency reliant upon the educational development subject locating their multiple discursive positionings (Davies, 2000). In closing, it serves as a pragmatic response to Manathunga’s (2006) call for considering educational development as a ‘liminal space’ where subjects actively seek hybrid understandings of the concepts they engage with.

**A pedagogy of navigating e-learning as a product**

Chapter 3 ‘Navigating the discursive terrain of TAFE’ presented a historical timeline commencing in 1974 at the point of establishing TAFE (Kangan & Australian Committee on Technical and Further Education, 1974b), that educational technologies (e-learning) have been consistently advocated on the basis that their use will serve as an enabler for garnering operational staffing
efficiencies, widening access to vocational study, and more recently as a source of income in a partially deregulated funding system (Victorian State Government, 2012). This notion of e-learning being positioned as a financial enabler solicits a re-description of e-learning as a product. An implication of this reconceptualisation is that there is little capacity for an educational development subject to conceptualise their personal worth or success through referencing a teaching subject’s use of e-learning post-engagement in a professional development activity (i.e. workshop).

Chapter 8 ‘e-learning as umbrella’ served as a means to explore how an educational development subject’s pedagogic acts and rationalisations are governed by conceptions of agency in response to a problem of e-learning as a product. This thesis contends that conceptions of e-learning as a product posit acts of facilitating and refining conceptions of products in conjunction with teaching and management subjects, as a necessary component of educational development pedagogy. As a practice-based implication, it would signal a significant re-positioning of responsibility for educational development subjects nominally expected to provide a level of technical competency to assist teachers implement e-learning. This point is particularly salient in an Australian Higher education sector where it is commonplace for directors of institutional learning and teaching centres to enter the field of academic/educational development as a director (Fraser & Ryan, 2012). These management subjects are unlikely to have been exposed to the agentic dilemma of ideating objectives or justifications for engendering a teaching subject’s use of e-learning. In parallel, higher education based educational development subjects have regularly created a binary opposition of student learning vs teacher centeredness as a means of articulating a rationale for e-learning which is not institutional or product oriented (Cochrane et al., 2013; Green, 2013; Hardy, 2010; Hicks et al., 2001; Kanuka et al., 2008; Owens, 2015; Torrisi & Davis, 2000; Trigwell, 2001). I will speculate that the reiteration of such binaries is a rhetorical pedagogic strategy to engender teaching subjects to commit to using e-learning, and this may serve as a future area for enquiry in educational development pedagogy.
This component of the thesis also presented a visualisation of how an educational development subject’s pedagogic rationalisations and acts can be viewed as responses to a product-based conception of e-learning via three axes of differentiation: the pedagogic, technologic and rule of right (Foucault, 1980e) status. Many of the eventual pedagogic actions leverage and/or are justified using a series of economic rationalities (Foucault, 1979), whereby an educational development subject inadvertently reinforces a discourse of e-learning as a product. The ‘pedagogic’ refers to the technical competencies and pedagogy which an educational development subject is expected to treat as the ‘subject matter’ in professional development interactions with teaching subjects. However, the efficacy of such subject matter is governed or shaped by a discourse of e-learning as a product where the end game is a solution of flexibility for a problem to be determined by a management subject. As replicable product-based descriptions of e-learning are difficult to succinctly enunciate, e-learning is often positioned as ‘technological’, via a learning management system (LMS) vendor name serving as a master word. Competing the triad, a ‘rule of right’ (Foucault, 1980e) status associated with a pedagogy or technology is also used as a point of differentiation (Foucault, 1982) by the educational development subject in their ideation of pedagogic tactics. For example, this component of the thesis contends that the mandated primary status (rule of right) of the LMS solicits a problem of agency for an educational development subject as it diminishes the need for teaching subjects to solicit advice on selecting and configuring educational technologies guided by a teaching intention.

A reconceptualization of e-learning as being shaped by an educational development subject’s use of the pedagogic-technological-rule of right axes serves as an original contribution to the field of educational development as it positions agentic subjectivities as a force governing the focus or ‘subject matter’ of educational development. The three axes of differentiation have future utility as a theoretical tool for educational development subjects to critically evaluate how their pedagogic acts are reliant upon rationalisations which may encompass
an economic logic used by management subjects to engender use of e-learning. In parallel, the development and use of visual representations articulating an interface between curriculum outcomes, pedagogical decisions and use of educational technologies is a complimentary area of future practice and enquiry. The development of learning designs serving a role similar to that of musical notation (Dalziel et al., 2016), may provide educational development subjects with a means of leveraging reflexive insights they have constructed via use of the three axes and apply these in interactions with teaching and management subjects. The production of learning designs is a key skill that educational development subjects could be supported and/or expected to develop, as visual representations have the capacity to compliment the facilitation of productive conversations between management and teaching subjects. Moreover, learning design can provide the educational development subject with a visual workstation to continually refer to as a means of examining how their recommendations on the use of e-learning in units of study are a response to a multiplicity of pedagogic, technological and rule of right considerations.

**A pedagogy of navigating problems of compliance**

Chapter 9 ‘Problems of Compliance’ served as an opportunity to explore how an educational development subject’s pedagogic rationalisation and acts are governed by conceptions of self as engendering, enforcing or being marked by a measure of compliance. This component of the thesis explored how a triad of idealised subjectivities of ‘deficiency’, ‘an instrument of compliance’ and ‘non-compliance’ are emergent for an educational development subject from socio-historical instances where a teaching subject is solicited to use e-learning.

I was able to chart how a subjectivity of ‘deficiency’ is emergent from an educational development subject attempting to locate or determine a normalised standard or e-learning practice through benchmarking observed localised use of e-learning in relation to ideations contained within disseminated case study-based research. The thesis contends that a pedagogic tactic of
benchmarking is enacted as a means to engender or coerce teacher use of e-learning by defining a standard of performance that is not currently being achieved. A commonly espoused pedagogic strategy such as role-modelling effective practice (Smyth, MacNeill, & Hartley, 2016) is inevitably reliant upon the ideation of localised definitions of normality found in case-study based publications. The articulation of a subjectivity of deficiency as presented in this component of the thesis, serves as a call to educational development subjects to examine the perceived tactical affordance or necessity to locate and reference case-study based research in response to socio-historical instances where a teaching subject is questioning the rationale of using e-learning. I am presently speculating that the aforementioned pedagogic tactic of benchmarking is performed in response to a problem of teacher compliance serving as a normative concept or effect of veridiction (Foucault, 1979a) in a discourse of educational development. A neophyte educational development subject is likely to be first exposed to this normative concept as an abstraction, as the impact of e-learning is cited as a major challenge for educational development subjects in Australia (Ling & Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, 2009) and in North American universities (Gillespie et al., 2010). Locating and examining how effects of veridiction may govern educational development subject’s pedagogy is an area of future enquiry which has emerged via the aforementioned examination of a subjectivity of ‘deficiency’ and a pedagogic tactic of ‘benchmarking’.

A subjectivity as an ‘instrument of compliance’ is emergent from instances where an educational development subject utilises a juridical conception of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e) to posit teaching subjects as structurally subordinate/oppressed, as they have been directed to use e-learning by a management subject. This component of the thesis contends that rationalisations of teaching subjects being oppressed through leveraging a juridical conception of power (Foucault, 1980a, 1980d, 1980e), provide the educational development subject with a form of tactical productivity (Foucault, 1978) to resist a subjectivity of being an ‘instrument of compliance’. An initial
visualisation on how a juridical conception power has been utilised as a means of declaring that teaching subjects are structurally oppressed, and how this structural view of oppression has served as a succinct rhetorical tool for an educational development subject to deflect responsibility for their pedagogic actions, places emphasis on the necessity for future research further examining how a juridical conception of power is used an agentic enabler by educational development subjects. Future enquiry following such a trajectory has capacity to extend and challenge thinking on ‘how’ an assortment of common educational development activities can serve a disciplinary function. This is particularly salient given the near ineluctability of an educational development subject's production of learning resources serving a self-regulatory function (Land, 2003; Manathunga, 2006) and facilitation of workshops on topics having been ideated by non-attending management subjects (Bradley, 2010).

A subjectivity of non-compliance is emergent in socio-historical instances where a management subject has capacity to utilise their rule of right status (Foucault, 1980e) as a means to evaluate the efficacy of pedagogic acts performed by an educational development subject. An educational development subject may rationalise such agentic tension as an effect of a discourse of managerialism which engenders activities of accountability soliciting a demonstration of value via immediate quantitative measures (Bamber & Stefani, 2016). This agentic tension could also be rationally explained as an educational development subject feeling compelled to utilise generic actions, concepts and strategies (MacKenzie et al., 2007; Rowland, 2007), as an effect of management subjects privileging readily accessible quantitative evidence (Reid, 2009, p. 590). This component of the thesis certainly visualised a range of day to day instances where an educational development subject was unable to rationalise and defend pedagogic tactics emergent from ‘reflective and subjective interpretation’ (Bamber & Anderson, 2012, p. 7). However, the point of original significance is that it shows how an educational development constituted ‘self’ as non-compliant in response to an agonistic power relation of possible "action(s) upon action(s)" (Foucault, 1982, p. 789, p.789). This thesis contends that a status of
non-compliance becomes a subjectivity via various modes of subjection (Foucault, 1997) where an educational development subject is ongoingly solicited to consider their moral responsibilities in response to such markings of compliance. While Stefani (2013) has aptly suggested that a mission for educational development subjects is to place greater emphasis on defining measures of performance, such an act is inevitably shaped by an educational development subject’s ongoing constitution of self in relation to problem of compliance. In other words, if educational development subjects seek to contribute to the definition of performance measures, this component of the thesis contends that they would benefit from locating examining those socio-historical moments where they are prompted to determine ‘how’ they are compliant.

Re-imaging pedagogy as an ethical relation with self

Criticism of educational development pedagogy as a set of generic techniques (Rowland, 2003) may be partially resisted using an argument that it is a ‘principled pragmatism’ (Bostock & Baume, 2016) emergent from a need for educational development subjects to work across traditional disciplines and develop a set of accepted and-reusable concepts and practices. However, little scholarship exists which critically examines how the educational development subject’s day to day pedagogic rationalisations and acts are governed by some form of principles-oriented pragmatism. Throughout this thesis ‘pedagogy’ has been used as a means to articulate the interconnected nature of the philosophical justification and tactical actions utilised by an educational development subject in response to their positioning across multiple discourse. I have explored pedagogy expressed as a ‘moment’ (Britzman, 1991; Lusted, 1986) and as a ‘space’ (Ellsworth, 2005) in recognition of the poststructural conceptual framework that has guided this thesis. Leveraging this conception of pedagogy, Chapter 10 ‘Pedagogy - effect/affect’ served as an opportunity to explore how an educational development subject navigates a problem of pedagogy expressed as
a generalised set of techniques. This component of the thesis used Foucault’s (1997c) four elements of ethical relations to provide a theoretical framework articulating how an ethical relationship with self, governs the pedagogy of an educational development subject, revealing a pedagogy which is much more than a set of observable techniques or actions.

This part of the thesis contends that educational development pedagogy is a continually negotiated relationship with assemblages of subjectivities, constituted as affect and effects of an educational development subject’s attempt at living a telos (Foucault, 1997c) of supporting teaching subjects. The telos is an idealised freedom where an educational development subject is invited to collaborate with teaching subjects to ideate and enact pedagogy for intended outcomes that the teaching subject willingly recognises as their responsibility to achieve. This idealised conception of freedom provides an educational development subject with a near-absolution of moral responsibility in relation to a ‘problem of compliance’ which posits an educational development subject’s pedagogy as engendering the enforcement of teaching subject’s compliance with directives rationalised as a management concern.

Working within Foucault’s (1997c) four modes of ethical relations, the problem of compliance is the ‘ethical substance’ or component of an educational development subjects constitution of self which is morally questionable. The educational development subject is continually solicited to consider their ethical responsibility in relation to the problem of compliance via various ‘modes of subjection’ (Foucault, 1997c), which this thesis contends are an assemblage of pedagogy conceptualised as a location, intended outcome and as a product.

Pedagogic rationalisations, tactics and strategies are posited as self-forming activities (Foucault, 1997c). They are instances where the educational development subject has re-negotiated a relationship with self through considering their pedagogic acts and rationalisations as a location, intended outcome and as a product in relation to a problem of compliance. Through using pedagogic location as one mode of subjection, I was able to chart how a logical juxtaposition between pre-structured workshops and just-in-time interactions is
emergent from an educational development subject seeking to achieve an idealised freedom of supporting teachers in relation to a problem of compliance. Likewise, pedagogic intended outcomes (affects) were able to be re-considered as a strategy of self-governance guided by a telos of supporting teaching subjects, whereby pedagogic effects are the multitude of tactical affordances which enable a continued pursuit of an idealised freedom of supporting teachers. Finally, consideration of pedagogy as a product revealed an assemblage of moments where an educational development subject produced pedagogic resources and/or processes governed by an ethical relation to self, emergent from a problem of compliance.

Based on the aforementioned application of Foucault’s (1997) four modes of ethical relations, this thesis contends that future claims of ‘effective’ pedagogy would benefit from consideration of an educational development subject’s ethical relation with self. This kind of consideration would serve as an effective response to aforementioned critiques of educational development pedagogy as generic (MacKenzie et al., 2007; Rowland, 2007) through providing educational development subjects with a means to enact Gosling’s (2003) call for a philosophical approach. For example, simplistic and static pedagogic products such as learning resources, can be re-thought of as an educational development subject’s multifaceted attempt at: re-directing a reporting requirement into a formative moment, cultivating future opportunities to collaborate with teachers and developing a capacity to achieve an outcome not initially contingent upon a teaching subject’s contribution. Through re-conceptualising educational development pedagogy as being governed by a relationship with an assemblage of subjectivities emergent from a problem of compliance, this component of the thesis provides educational development subjects with a theoretical and methodological lens to explain how their pedagogy is an ethical pragmatism.
In Closing

A decade after initially commencing a journey to try and understand how an educational developer’s pedagogy is shaped by their conceptions of agency, measures of time and size inform me that it is now time to hit the pause button. This thesis doesn’t contain a unified answer to the research question, however it does articulate an original toolkit for educational development subjects to imagine new ways of working governed by a willingness to problematise the everyday.
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