Technologies Transforming Academics:

Academic identity and online teaching

Submitted by

Kim McShane
BA (DipEd), BEd (TESOL), MA

A thesis submitted in total fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Education
The University of Technology, Sydney
PO Box 123, Broadway
Sydney NSW 2007

July 2006

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

____

Kim McShane

____

July 2006

// Acknowledgements

and thank you…

to my supervisors, Lyn Yates and David Boud, first and foremost: Lyn, thank you for your responsiveness, your patience with my rush to naïve certainties, your "wait-and-see" ways, your understanding in dark times, and above all, your intellectual guidance and wise mentoring. Dave, thank you for your gentle background presence to this project. Your thoughtful advice, and good coffees now and again, made a difference.

to the participants in the study: Ron, Seb, Zhang, Hilary, Paul; and Frank, Jane, Rose & Cora, Evan, Rahime and Aurea… this is your story as much as mine; thank you for your generosity and your responsiveness.

to my colleagues and co-workers: A huge thank you to each of my colleagues in the Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) at the University of Sydney for their generous, collegial support, especially in the final months of this work. I must acknowledge, too, the early interest and intellectual encouragement of my colleagues in the Faculty of Education and in the Academic Development Unit (ADU) at La Trobe University. Much gratitude goes to my current ITL Acting Director, Michael Jackson, for your encouraging words, and to past ITL Director, fellow Tasmanian and mentor, Mike Prosser, for your patience and generosity as this project slowly came along. And thank you hugely to Angela Brew for many a thoughtful "peer debriefing" session. Long live the CAD Collective! Special thanks to Heather and Susan for your en-couraging ways and email friendship.

to my family: Unspoken thanks always already to Mum and Nep, Dad and Audrey, and Wendy, Joan, Toni and Kevin – and all your loved ones. Mum, you have urged me silently on with every lift of the bench press, every pull-up, push-down, and I thank you for setting the example for all of us! Dad, this thesis is about what I was trying to explain to you one frosty morning in 1969 next to the cream-can at the gate of "Kinvarra" when we went to get the mail. Correspondence school – no way!

to my friends and lovers, in no particular order: I love(d) you all. Tai, thank you for asking the questions that you do, and challenging my mind. You seemed to know what this thesis was about before I did. There is no one else in this world with whom I would rather read Derrida at the pub, than you! And Rach - for your presence and wise words - graçias. Smiles and hugs to Garth, Kerri, Kat and Pete, Barton, Sly, Mindhi, Dionne - and Dick, thank you for the Colo Vale nights and days, with Sylvia watching on. Terry, your ideas and presence are in this thesis more than you know, or remember. Mère and the Montmorency mob, thank you for your love, your fun, and your belief in me. Bill, you are one of my proudest achievements, and this teacher's pet. James, dear Bala, one day soon…

to my readers: Tai, Janne Malfroy, Heather Middleton, Peter Donnan and Anne-Mare Dreyer. Thank you. You all had your own PhDs, yet you took time out to read and respond to my work with insights and suggestions that urged me on.

to my guides along the ancient way: Subhana, with you I have really just started to look into the heart-mind, and your insights and care have sustained me through this project in ways unimagined seven years ago. Thank you to all my sangha companions - too many to name - who support me in zazen and along the path to emptiness. Kshanti and extended family: () for your metta and smiles.

to my students, and my teachers: Here I salute the hundreds and hundreds of students who have taught me over the past 25 years. And there are traces in this thesis of memorable teachers that I have known: Ian Hill, animated classroom performer and jazz musician who changed my life by inspiring me to French, to languages and language teaching, and who was later my "modern language" methods tutor at university; Gerald Barker, rest in peace, never to be forgotten for teaching us beer drinking songs in Grade 10 German, and Oliver Wilson, who introduced me to metaphor, Oscar Wilde and "poetry appreciation" (delicious semiotics in disguise) in Grade 9 English. All very risky, in deed.

Finally, special mention to two people: I am indebted to the Hon. E. G. (Gough) Whitlam AC, QC, for his vision and courage in making Higher Education in Australia free for those, like me, who otherwise lacked the means and the opportunities. I made the most of it, Gough, and thank you. And finally to dear Mabel Jessie Story (Hudson), my grand-mother… When I was at primary school, you made me feel really icky by calling me a "scholar". Well, I think it's all right now. This thesis is dedicated to you, Nan. It is what you would have done, if …

…but then…

Table of Contents *Page No.*

Introduction *1*
The Structure of this Thesis 7
The Contexts of Blended and Online Teaching 9

Chapter 1: Change in Universities *11*
Introduction 11
Change, Uncertainty, and Risk 12
Change in Higher Education: The Enterprise University 14
The Changing Landscapes of Australian University Teaching and Learning Policy 16
Review: Australian Higher Education Learning and Teaching Policy 23
Universities and Change: The Student Focus 24
The Regulation of Academic Freedom 25
The Customer Focus 28
Higher Education Research and the Student Learning Focus 30
Flexible Learning 32
Review: The Student Focus 36
Chapter Review: The Enterprise University and the Enterprising Academic 37

Chapter 2: Academic Identity, and Online Teaching *40*
Introduction 40
Identity, and Academic Identities 41
Academic Identities 44
Codifying Academic Identity 45
Identity, Infinity and the Face of the Other 46
The Excellent, Enterprising Academic 48
The Price of Excellence 49
The Inevitability of ICT 51
The Lecturer Who Makes the Move Online 53
The Traditional Lecturer 54
Academics' Attitudes to the "Technological Imperative" 57
The Metaphors of Online Teaching 60
A Facilitator Facilitates Using Facilities. 61
Of Guides, Learners, Content Experts, Resources and (Middle) Managers 65
Becoming a guide and mentor – and standing aside. 66
Becoming a learner – and losing control. 68
Becoming a content expert and resource – with an exhausting workload. 71
Becoming a (middle) manager – responsible to students, accountable to management. 74
Chapter Review: Academic Identity, Blended Learning, and Teaching 76

Chapter 3: Methodology *79*
Introduction: Theoretical Framework 79
Values and Epistemology 80
Research Design 82
The Contexts of the Study 82
The Process: Data Collection Stage 84
Selection and involvement of participants. 84
Data collection: methods and conduct. 86
The Analysis and Interpretation Phase 89
Formatting the transcripts and extracts. 89
A method of interpretative analysis. 90
Metaphor and Identity 92
Why Metaphor? 92
Metaphor in this Study 95
Why performing, caring, and directing? 96
The relevance and function of metaphor in this study. 97
Quality and Rigour in this Study 98
Accuracy, Dependability and Authenticity 99
Trustworthiness and Reciprocity 100
Reflexivity 102
Methodological Dilemmas 103
Other Methodological Possibilities 105
Limitations of the Study 108
Chapter Summary: Methodology 109

Chapter 4: The University Contexts and the Participants *112*
Introduction 112
Southern Rural University (SRU) 112
The Five "Technology Enthusiasts" at SRU 113
Ron, Zhang, Seb, Hilary, Paul. 114-117
Northern Metropolitan University (NMU) 118
The Seven Participants at NMU 119
Jane, Aurea, Frank, Rose, Cora, Rahime, Evan. 121-124
The Winds of Change 125
Chapter Summary: The 12 Participants and their Contexts 127

Chapter 5: Performing *128*
Introduction 128
The Performer 130
The Metaphors of Performing in this Study 130
"Ah, Showtime!" - The Charismatic Professor Performs 133
"Born to teach" 133
An Ageing Male Professor 134
Age and Seniority 137
Preparation and Improvisation 139

The Student: Spectator, Disciple, Acolyte, and Heckler 141
Performance Fears 144
Performer-lecturers Making the Move Online 147
Scrutiny: "You can get away with things in a live situation" (Ron) 147
The Facilitators' Workload: "I seem to be a lot busier" (Paul) 150
The Tempo of Facilitation 154
The Body of the Facilitator 157
Risky Performing Bodies 160
Chapter Review: The Performer Cannot Perform Online 162

Chapter 6: Caring *165*
Introduction 165
The Carer 166
The Metaphors of Caring in this Study 168
Caring: Family Connections. 170
Caring: Across the Generation Gap. 172
Caring: Relationships, Reciprocity and Risk. 177
The Attributes of the Carer-Lecturer: A Review 180
Carer-Lecturers Making the Move Online 181
Caring and Class Sizes 181
Trust and Risk Online 184
Care with Words and Emotions 190
Reciprocity and Responsiveness 196
Chapter Review: The Carer Finds it Difficult to Care Online 202

Chapter 7: Directing *205*
Introduction 205
The Director 205
The Metaphors of Directing in this Study 206
The Responsibilities of Directing 207
Self-improvement: Preparing oneself to direct others. 208
Directing: "Setting the scene" for learning. 210
Directing a creative process. 211
Directing and Autonomy 214
Leadership and vision will inspire the team. 214
Autonomy and reflecting on performance. 218
The Attributes of the Director-lecturer: A Review 222
Director-lecturers Making the Move Online 223
Facilitating Online: Responsibilities, Autonomy and Loss of Control 225
Online facilitation and creativity. 225
Directors learning to facilitate: From autonomy to collaboration. 228
Facilitators reflecting responsibly: researching student learning. 229
Facilitating Online: Reflexivity and Anxiety 231
Critical reflection online? 232
From being organised to agonised:

"Oh God, I haven't done that!" (Rose). 234
Relations with the Academy 237
Chapter Review: The Director Finds it Difficult to Direct Online 243

Chapter 8: Facilitating Blended Learning *245*
Introduction – Reviewing the Key Questions 245
Teacher-Student Relationships Through the Metaphors 246
Reflecting on the Metaphors 246
Performing, Caring and Directing 247
The Teacher's Pledge: to Respond, to be Responsive, and Responsible 249
The Facilitator and Responsibility to the Student/s 251
Performing, Caring and Directing, the Teachers' Pledge, and The Move to Online Facilitation 251
The performer online. 252
The carer online. 253
The director online. 253
The Online Performer, Carer, Director: Broken Promises 254
The Facilitator and Accountability to Management 257
Responsible and Accountable for Oneself to University Management 258
The Move Online as Risk Management 259
Flexible Delivery of Student-centred Higher Education 262
The Facilitator Delivers 263
Academic Identities in the Enterprise University 266
Employees of the Enterprise University 267
Frank the Facilitator 268
Blended Learning, and Blended Teachers 271
Face-to-face teaching: Resistance and probity. 272
Blended learning – Who/what is supplementing who/what? 273
Blended learning - A new moral order? 276
Archiving the Facilitator 279
Significance of the Study 281

Chapter 9: Responding to Change *285*
An Entrusted Responsibility 285
Grief and Mourning 286
Moving On 288
Critical Agency 289
Moving Sideways, Betwixt and Between 291
Collegial Activities 292
Academic Dispositions 294

Appendices *299*
A. Expression of Interest Form (NMU) 299

B. Participant Information Sheet (SRU) 301
C. Participant Information Record (NMU) 305
D. Topic Information sheet (SRU) 308
E. Topic Information Sheet Conversation 1 (NMU) 309
F. Topic Information Sheet Conversation 2 (NMU) 310
G. Topic Information Sheet Conversation 3 (NMU) 311
H. Log of Research Conversations 312
I. Teaching Metaphors of the Participants 314
J. NMU policy: "Guidelines for Good Practice in Teaching & Learning" 315
K. Final email message to the twelve research participants 316

Glossary *317*

Technical Terms and Abbreviations 317
Definitions 317
Online Teaching and Learning and e-Learning 317
Teachers and Lecturers, Students and Learners 318
How Teaching and Learning were Organised 318
How the Universities were Organised 319
The Academic Developer 319

Bibliography *320*

List of Tables

Page No.

Table 1: SRU participants' subject structures (face-to-face and online components) and online teaching samples. 114

Table 2: NMU participants' subject structures (face-to-face and online components) and online teaching samples. 120

Table 3: Teaching is like Performing. 132

Table 4: Teaching is like Caring. 169

Table 5: Teaching is like Directing. 206

Abstract

As the discourses of the "technological imperative" and student-centred learning have gained momentum in university teaching and learning, one way for the lecturer to signal excellence has been to adopt the flexible, student-centred practices of online teaching. This thesis investigates academics' insights and experiences about their changing teacher identities in the context of being, or becoming, a facilitator of online student learning. This was an empirical research project, a collective case study that explored the teaching experiences of twelve university lecturers in two Australian universities who taught online, or were making the move online. Primary research data were drawn from semi-structured conversations with the lecturers, online teaching artefacts and email communications. The interpretative analysis was organised according to three overlapping lecturer identities: the teaching metaphors of performance, care and creative direction. From the perspective of each metaphor position, the move to becoming a facilitator of blended learning was uneasy. The performer/carer/director lecturer struggled to entertain, care and intervene in familiar ways in asynchronous, computer-mediated communication. Online, the performing/caring/directing lecturer was ignored by students, and became instead a helpless and highly reflexive bystander to students' learning. The findings suggest that the teaching values and practices of the performing/caring/directing lecturer, in particular lecturer-student responsiveness and reciprocity, do not adapt to online pedagogies. Indeed, blended learning establishes the conditions for a new moral order in university education, with the move to online facilitation best understood as a move to management-centred regulation of teaching and student learning. And so, overlooked in higher education policy and research, and ignored by her students online, the performing/caring/directing lecturer is under erasure, at the same time as the work of the facilitator is being archived.

Introduction

> The human ideal has, for centuries, been associated with the capacity to dominate, to tame, to produce and encourage production with one's instruments and methods, to cultivate - nature, the other, others - for oneself. Yet if the human species is to have a future, the ideal should assert itself as a willingness to respect nature, the other, others.
>
> (Irigaray, 2000, pp. 7-8)

I made the move to academic development in 1998, after eleven years teaching languages in secondary schools and six years as a teacher educator and project manager in an education faculty. I became an academic (faculty) developer – a "Lecturer in Flexible Learning" - in an academic development unit at a multi-campus university in Melbourne. My new academic role entailed "developing" and supporting colleagues from the diverse campuses and faculties of the University with flexible and online curriculum design, teaching and assessment. Earnestly and naïvely, I settled into the busy work of developing (myself), and this thesis has played a significant part in my personal, professional development as an academic developer. Improperly, I find it helpful to remind myself sometimes that the term "develop" comes from the Latin *de-volup(tas)* or, in other words, to "de-pleasure" and take the fun out (of university teachers and learning)! Make no mistake, academic development is serious, theoretical work.

Indeed, regardless of their theoretical/practical orientations and institutional positioning, academic development units work with and for change in university teaching and learning (Gosling & D'Andrea, 2002; Land, 2001). For their roles to be meaningful, academic developers are faced with the challenges of promoting, realising and managing change in university teaching and learning. Ray Land writes that, in this work, "a process of change must be negotiated in some fashion, entered into and supported if the developer's role is not to be superfluous. Academic developers… have no vested interest in maintaining the status quo" (Land, 2001, p. 10). In the early days, listening to colleagues and reading the texts of

flexible learning that were left for me by my predecessor on my office bookshelves, I would wonder how much development for change I might actually be able to achieve. What did Land mean by the *status quo*, I wondered? Could I really make a difference to academic work? Surely my efforts to promote flexible learning would not - could not - be viewed by academics as superfluous? The idealist in me became less certain. Back then, I also remember being anxious about my knowledge of computers, information and communication technologies (ICT) and online learning, and I was unsure about how best to communicate with colleagues in the faculties of the university who, I knew from my previous position in an education faculty, were feeling significant pressure for change. I had some vague, well-meaning intentions of supporting colleagues faced with change. I had to be confident, clear, positive and certain, I decided. I shall reveal how wrong I was soon enough. Of course the academics with whom I work, teach and develop me.

Over the past 20 years, academics who teach in our universities have been being repositioned ever so subtly and discursively, whether through rewards and recognition (awards, promotion), coercion (projects, survey-based funding), personal curiosity and enthusiasm for change, or performative compliance (being a "proper" teacher by, for example, teaching online). Coaldrake and Stedman (1998, 1999) are highly critical of "indifferent teaching" (1999, p. 3), a view that committed academic teachers would find outrageous and, indeed, it is the first of a number of provocations for this study. Coaldrake and Stedman (1999, p. 7) write of the inevitability of academic teachers becoming managers and facilitators of student learning, and their views are shared in much of the higher education policy and management literature, which typically exhorts a changed role for teachers who made the move online. In spite of the extent of distance education (DE) practices, and ICT-based projects in universities over the past 30 years, the assumption remains that all academic staff are "chalk-and-talk" boffins, whose teaching is limited to four walls, a lectern, and an overhead transparency projector. The subliminal message in many quarters – management and academic development - is that academics need to change their ways. And one "good" way to appear to do that is to make the move online.

Criticism about academics who teach has been emanating not only from higher education management policy documents and departments. In my own field of academic development, I continue to encounter prejudice and judgementalism about teaching and teachers that frankly surprises me. I have heard lots of blaming, labelling and "othering" – lots of "us" versus "them". A colleague from a Humanities faculty joked with me several years ago: "So the academic develop unit reckons *they're* gonna come over and tell *us* how to teach online?' "Us-and-them" is heard frequently in the corridors of academic development units.

- Kim, make sure *they* get the idea that what *they* need to do is…
- Have you heard what *they're* about to start doing with exams in Engineering (or: Arts, Health Sciences, Physics)?
- Hey guys - no prizes for guessing which faculty was missing yet again from today's meeting!
- Have you seen how many students are turning up to *his* lecture these days? Have you noticed how *he* fills the board with notes every week? or:
- All those PowerPoint slides *he*'s putting up! No wonder they're staying away in droves!

I'll admit that I have been party to jokes with my colleagues about sending out a teaching-learning "Rapid Response Team" to correct bad practice in the classroom! (Pity those who find themselves teaching in classrooms near the academic development unit). One experienced colleague and respected higher education researcher with whom I worked went to great pains to emphasise the fact that lecturers "out there in the faculties" should be discouraged from putting all their lecture notes and readings on the web. "Shovelware" was to be discouraged, he said; it was an unsuitable practice that was not conducive to improved student learning. And yet. And yet, I was encountering lots of teaching colleagues who happily uploaded such "shovelware" as a support for face-to-face lecturing. Back in 1999 there was one older, male colleague in particular who used to like to pop over to my office late in the day and chat with me about his online teaching. I enjoyed our

conversations about his teaching. He was a rather forthright, yet anxious, obsessive-compulsive character, who was gradually moving more and more of his teaching materials and activities online at both postgraduate and undergraduate levels. Contrary to the advice I have been given, and much as I cared for him, I had this sneaking feeling that his students might actually prefer to take his subjects online, rather than be with him face-to-face. This sort of private judgement (still) leaves me uncomfortable - but here was one obvious case where the teacher and students might actually teach/learn more effectively and happily by moving to online modes. He and other colleagues I spoke with insisted that their students asked for and appreciated the notes and readings being made available online. It crossed my mind that lecturers who put notes and readings online, might no longer be able to conduct their lectures in the same manner – "because the students have all the notes". I started to wonder whether this practice might result then in colleagues thinking about changing their lectures – particularly so, given the common fear that students might stop coming to lectures! Perhaps such shifts in practice could actually produce the space for transformative pedagogy and lecturer identity work. Indeed the very thought made me ponder, too, the role that practice might play in stimulating critical reflection on theoretical perspectives.

My research interests were nurtured also through conversations with developer and lecturer colleagues, and incidental reflections on the workshops I was creating and running for university lecturers. It took me quite some time to appreciate how my colleagues out in the faculties were responding to the discourse/s of "flexible learning". I was aware of curiosity and enthusiasm; there was also fear and suspicion towards management imperatives. I remember one particular incident that represented a further step towards the adoption of a more critical perspective on my developer work and on my PhD research. It happened one afternoon in August 2000, while I was introducing aspects of online teaching and WebCT to a small group of academics from a Humanities department. At one stage I flashed up a series of PowerPoint slides, including one that read:

FLEXIBLE LEARNING

- What is central is the intention to increase students' access to, and control over, particular teaching and learning environments…
- …giving students choice about
  - where
  - when and/or
  - how they learn.

Suddenly twelve or so weary, angry academics went on the attack, challenging my definitions of "flexible learning". "This is just another under-hand strategy of this university's management to increase our productivity", exclaimed one colleague who held the floor, and who appeared to have the support of her nodding colleagues who were sitting around her. (She was an articulate Professor, with an intimidating research record and high media profile). "Flexible learning - rubbish!", chimed in another. "Student control of learning environments…! What about us? Our workloads? How are we supposed to learn all this WebCT and html and stuff? I can't see them giving us the time release we need to do all this! As it is, we are losing three tutors at the end of this year - and they're not being replaced", she continued bitterly. I bit my tongue and acknowledged their concerns, all the while churning up inside. I felt deeply their anguish.

Later, as I walked across campus to my office in the development unit, I reflected on how I projected a "wet-behind-the-ears" enthusiasm for the benefits of online teaching to my university colleagues. Until this particular critical incident, I didn't quite get "it/IT" - and my critical role in it at all. Or perhaps I was avoiding dealing with something else…

…for only a few years previously, as the Project Manager of a well-funded, national, distance education project, I had been implicated in enacting real pressure and pain – in the name of change management - on a team of academic staff (who were curriculum writers and distance education, or DE, teachers) from several Australian universities. How I came

to resent my apparently corporate, enterprise role, and the human dilemmas I faced! I had been a middle manager, between academic staff and an organization that held and released the project funds - positioned in an uncomfortable zone, at the intersection of academic and corporate cultures. Decision-making on the basis of available funds, budget figures and dates had mostly burdened the project staff in unreasonable and unethical ways. Indeed, within the same day, I might have had to negotiate revised scheduling and funding requests from an organization that held the real project power (the funds), and then I would have to turn around and justify new, stressful directions to the writers and teachers, a Janus-faced role that tore at my soul. Why hadn't I taken a stand with/for those hard-pressed academics in this DE project?

With hindsight, the critical, ideological stand of the tired Humanities academics, confronted by the *diktat* of "flexible learning", was admirable and defensible, and I have attempted to acknowledge their perspective on change in university teaching in this doctoral work. Across seven years, my passion for the thesis has not dimmed. I have been spurred on by my own personal responses to these two situations, prompted by unconscious feelings of resentment towards the covert cultural change that was inherent in that national DE project. And yes, there is guilt and shame. This thesis is my retribution to the team of academics with whom I worked, and a considered response to indifferent corporate management. Motivated by the guilt of the survivor, I feel an entrusted responsibility (with Lévinas, 1991, p. 91) to bring to light in this thesis the difficult circumstances that university lecturers face. I will not romanticise academic work, nor represent my colleagues as victims. However, it is time for more thoughtful and compassionate accounts of the move online. There is a need to re-evaluate the care-lessness and indifference towards academics that exists in much of the literature on new technologies in university learning and teaching.

After three years on the national project, I left my Faculty for academic development, thinking that things across the university and within the disciplines would be different. In fact I discovered similar signs of the same cultural change and, as an academic developer, I

was implicated as a change agent. This thesis has helped me understand my discomfort with these matters as well as my guilt in making the move. It has also enabled me to reflect on what it is to be perceived by academics as a harbinger of change, and how to speak of change with academics in the contemporary university, in an era when it is all too easy to blame performance-based and profit-obsessed regimes of management.

In this study, "the move online" is both the foil, and a timely opportunity, for investigating academics and change. To do this, I have involved twelve academics, who were keen to have their chance to speak about the move online. And I have listened and reflected.

The Structure of this Thesis

This thesis is about lecturer identity at a time when the discourse of student-centred learning holds currency in university learning (and teaching). My core question all along has been: How does the move online challenge and change academic teacher identity? In this thesis I have used metaphor to explore lecturers' identities and values, with a focus on how lecturers talk about their relationships with their students, face-to-face and online – for a teacher by definition has students. The work has allowed me to consider lecturers' changing identities at a time when they are being torn between their responsibilities towards their students, and their growing accountability to a regime of management that monitors academic work, and that seeks to measure university teaching and learning.

In the chapter 1 of this thesis, I discuss the relevant literature on change in higher education, beginning with some reflections on key framing notions of uncertainty and risk, as these apply presently to universities and academic work. My review of this literature culminates with the observation that the academic who teaches has been erased from much of the higher education and institutional management policy on university learning and teaching. The review of the literature shifts in chapter 2 to a thematic survey of academic identity, including "the excellent, enterprising lecturer" who, by taking up online teaching, is signalling a proper gesture towards student learning. My analysis considers how the

academic is represented in the literature on flexible learning and on ICT in university teaching and learning. I reflect on the implied critique of the "untechnologised" teacher, and review the many metaphors that are ascribed to the transformed online facilitator. Integrated into this discussion is a consideration of the reported "challenges" and fears of academics in making the move online. At the end of this chapter I set out my intention in this thesis, which is to investigate academic identity through the lens of metaphor and the move to student-centred online learning and teaching.

In my methodology chapter (3), I introduce the theoretical framework of this study, by linking, first of all, my interest in the topic, my values and the epistemological orientation of the study. I address rigour, (research relationships, my researcher subjectivity, and validity and reliability), before going on to define and explain how I have used metaphor as a method to support the elicitation and analysis of the data. The research design is outlined in detail. The chapter closes with a consideration of methodological dilemmas, limitations, and the significance of the study.

The twelve participants and their university contexts are introduced in chapter 4. The two universities in the study were located in south-eastern Australia. The first five "technology enthusiast" participants researched and taught at what I have called Southern Rural University (SRU), a "gumtree" university (Marginson & Considine, 2000) based in a major city and comprising metropolitan and regional campuses. The other seven participants were at Northern Metropolitan University, a large, inner-city, research-intensive, "sandstone" university (Marginson & Considine, 2000).

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 present the three metaphor themes that structure the interpretative analysis of the data gathered in this study: performing, caring and directing. Using conversational tapes and transcripts, as well as online teaching extracts, I build a description of each teaching metaphor and then, through the lens of each metaphor, I follow the participants in the move online, in order to see how the values, practices and identities

of each perspective are challenged. The Lévinasian notions of responsiveness and responsibility for the other are brought to bear in the analysis of each metaphor. Chapter 8 presents a discussion of the findings, and I reflect on the implications of the "de-responsibilisation" of the online facilitator, who has become a bystander and supplement to flexible, student learning, responsible only to herself and accountable to management, and whose teaching and identity work is being documented and archived, continually, for an uncertain future. In Chapter 9 I return to the fate of the participants in the study, and I reflect on how I and other academic developers might respond to changing academic identities – us and them - in the enterprise university.

The Contexts of Blended and Online Teaching

When I write about online teaching and learning, and when my research participants[1] speak of online teaching, we are usually referring to any of a spectrum of online practices that are *components in a blended curriculum*.

"The move online" and "online" teaching/learning mean different things to different stakeholders in higher education. Online teaching, for example, can be understood very ambiguously, and technically, as encompassing both practices of information sharing and transfer (one-way, "delivery"-based) and computer-mediated communication (CMC, ie. text-based two-way, interactive communication). There are degrees of "online-ness" where, for example, online components are assumed to be provided so as to support and supplement face-to-face teaching, or they are integrated into a program of learning in the form of mandatory, assessed components in a "blended", integrated or hybrid curriculum. Specifically, blended learning and teaching is understood to comprise varying combinations of face-to-face and online environments and activities (the commonly held view), or particular sequences of synchronous and asynchronous events (my publicly espoused view). When online materials and activities are taken up in replacement of existing options, then they are usually discussed as distance education (DE). Abbreviations,

[1] With the exception of Frank, who taught wholly online, distance education courses.

technological jargon and matters of terminology and definition in the language of university teaching and learning have been addressed in the Glossary of this thesis.

Now, to return to the thesis proper: Who is teacher in the contemporary university? What does higher education policy and teaching and learning theory have to say about academics who teach?? What is all this talk of change in universities? These are matters for chapter 1.

Chapter 1
Change in Universities

> Nostalgic for a very ancient past. … And again and yet again, the whole disintegrates and fragments. The ring is broken. The rapture gone. Disenchantment reappears.
>
> (Irigaray, 1991, p. 64)

> Essentially what is being asked of academic staff is that they change their ways of working and that they learn new ways of working. (Martin, 1999, p. 24)

Introduction

Central to this research, and my professional practice, is my interest in academic identity and online teaching in a time of change in universities. As a developer who works with individuals and groups of academics who teach, I am interested in the subjective experiences of lecturers and tutors who teach online and face-to-face. Over the past eight years, and in the face of change, I have moved from more certain frames of mind to a position of less certainty with more criticality around my professional and intellectual work. I wonder too, how are my academic colleagues responding to change? In this chapter I will explore the impacts of change on universities and on the people who work in them, and examine current controlling discourses in university teaching and learning in terms of how they position academics who teach.

I will begin by contemplating change itself, and in particular what I understand to be the hallmarks of change: impermanence, uncertainty, ambivalence, and risk. As a significant ideological, contextual frame for my study, I will review the rise of the enterprise university, governed as it is everywhere by an expanding class of university managers to whom research and teaching academics have become subordinate. Learning for an "uncertain future" is a common theme in current Australian higher education policy and

research, and my subsequent review of relevant policy will focus on how the academic who teaches is acknowledged, portrayed, and/or silenced. This will foreshadow my observation and argument that three critical student-centred discourses have emerged and converged to shape and constrain university teaching and learning (and academic development) in particular ways. Taken together, these discourses undermine and alienate teachers and teaching in Australian universities, all this during a period of "supercomplexity" (Barnett, 2000a).

Change, Uncertainty, and Risk

For most people change and impermanence produce a sense of uncertainty, even some anxiety. Rogers notes that "in all of us there is some fear of process, of change.… Change is painful and uncertain. Who wants it? The answer is, *few"* (Rogers, 1980, p. 354; author's italics). Will it go this way or that? What will happen? What will he/she do? Will things turn out in the way I fear, or in a way I can't predict? When will those terrorists strike? Insurance and (re)assurance are needed urgently.

> To classify… is to give the world a structure: to manipulate its probabilities; to make some events more likely than others; to behave as if events were not random, or to limit or eliminate randomness of events.... Ambivalence, the possibility of assigning an object or an event to more than one category, is a language-specific disorder: a failure of the naming (segregating) function that language is meant to perform. The main symptom of the disorder is the acute discomfort we feel when we are unable to read the situation properly and to choose between alternative actions. (Bauman, 1991, p.1)

One perspective on change in university contexts comes via Ronald Barnett's notion of "supercomplexity" - a "fragility brought on not merely by social change and technological change; it is a fragility in the way we understand the world, in the way in which we understand ourselves and in the ways in which we feel secure about acting in the world" (2000a, p. 257). Supercomplexity comprises four shifting conditions that affect our being

in the world: contestability, challengeability, uncertainty, and unpredictability. These influence the identity work of university academics, and affect how academics perceive and cope with workload issues, changing patterns of resourcing, and thus the changing circumstances and contexts of (flexible) university teaching and learning, including, for example, larger classes, ICT and online teaching "solutions", less time, increased administrative requirements, more student-driven activity and quality assurance processes. In these times of supercomplexity, academics, and developers, are not only grappling with knowledge proliferation and commodification, increasing numbers of students, depleting resources and competing time demands, but they are also wrestling philosophically with an array of metaphysical and ethical responses about what it means to be a teacher. Impermanence and uncertainty lurk out there, somewhere. One response is to attempt to create certainty. Higher education teaching and learning policy, research and, to some extent, academic development practice, are characterised by the tendency to certainty in objectivist perspectives, scientificism, and the will to present a neat and tidy appearance. Regulation and codification offer a veneer of certainty against risky events (that may never happen). "Risk is the modern approach to foresee and control the future consequences of human action, the various unintended consequences of radicalized modernization. It is an (institutionalised) attempt, a cognitive map, to colonise the future" (Beck, 1999, p. 3). Calculating and managing risk – risk management – is a necessary part of government, and in the operation of institutions. Indeed, the effects of risk management are implicated in the identity work of individuals, including academics. Universities are engaged in predicting, classifying, measuring in order to minimise risk. According to McWilliam (2004), they have become "risk-conscious organizations" in that they must focus on guarding themselves against the possibility of failure. "For the university this means guarding against the danger of waste (of resources), of failure (of students), of declining standards (intellectual, ethical and moral)" (McWilliam, 2004, p. 152).

Change in Higher Education: The Enterprise University

Change, uncertainty and risk are destabilising conditions in the post-modern university. Commentators in Australia and internationally over the past two decades have identified and discussed a "crisis" of the contemporary university. In my view, there are two over-arching factors, anchored in change, uncertainty and risk that have contributed to this so-called crisis, and that have had an impact on academic identity.

Firstly, the purposes of university education at the end of the twentieth century are multiple and disputed. Internal and external stake-holders have divergent views about university graduates, their attributes and the value/s of university education and there is no mainstream consensus about the purpose/s of higher education or the restructuring of it (Preston, 2001; Walker, 2002). As Bill Readings observes "It is no longer clear what the place of the university is within society nor what the exact nature of that society is" (Readings, 1996, p. 2). The dissolution of the Modernist, grand narrative (Lyotard, 1984) - the absolute and unitary truth - has led to uncertainty and dissent within and without universities regarding the status and truth claims of knowledge. "The contemporary university is a university of profound crisis in that it wishes to arbitrate in a world that denies such authority to all" (Preston, 2001, p. 3). The impact on curriculum is significant, for example. "Some institutions and some knowledge fields will be able to resist changing to some extent, but it is unlikely that any pool of purity will remain. *Every curriculum will exhibit some form or even forms of hybridity*" (Barnett, 2000a, p. 260; author's italics).

Secondly, what comes to be researched, studied and taught in universities has changed. There has been a cultural shift in universities away from what Readings calls national cultures and ideologies - the European university committed to the Enlightenment ideals of critique, independent thinking and free speech - to the (ironically) universalising culture of "Americanization", or "globalisation". Intellectual idea(l)s and the intellectual development of minds no longer matter. "The centrality of the traditional humanistic disciplines to the life of the university is no longer assured" (Readings, 1996, p. 3). Money,

profits, and markets are what matter now. The discourses of local and national cultures and the "perhaps mythical ideal of a community of scholars" (Duke, 2004, p. 298) have been replaced with the discourses of "excellence" and "entrepreneurialism" Indeed, universities have become profit-making corporations, whose customer service employees (academics) serve clients (students). Knowledge has become a passive commodity for sale and purchase - as if in (electronic?) packets – and opportunities for debate and discussion in the public sphere are rare, as Furedi (2003) has pointed out.

This ideological shift, from the (élite) humanist university to the (mass-market) "enterprise university" has occurred under an ideological régime that is called variously "academic capitalism" (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), "the new capitalism" (Gee, 2001), "new managerialism" (Deem & Brehony, 2005) or "neo-liberalism" (Davies, 2005a, 2005b; Davies & Petersen, 2005). It is recognised politically, economically and socially as "liberal democratic" rule (Rose, 1996). Markets and market-oriented discourses now shape the research, teaching and learning agendas of the enterprise university (Deem & Brehony, 2005; Marginson & Considine, 2000; Mautner, 2005; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Stillwell, 2003). As government funding for higher education in the United Kingdom and Australian has declined, universities have had to identify and draw on other sources of funding to maintain their operations. Sources include teaching and research partnerships with industry, alumni programs, the development and sale of flexible, distance education programs of study, and student fees. There is competition for customers (students), who are being wooed with prizes and bags of goodies at international fairs and at on-campus "Open Days" or virtual "Information Days". Customer perceptions of the service are sought, and valued, or so it seems. In many universities, funding is allocated to faculties and departments on the basis of improving student evaluation ratings. The student knows better (ie. the university needs her money) so evaluation of teaching is a serious, responsive process of quality enhancement. In the drive to increase "market share" in the contemporary university, Stilwell (2003) points out that there are conflicting interests, too, over distributional matters, such as, for example, the relative rewards and the relative

powers of university managers and academics. "Ordinary" academic staff are now subordinate to a rising (surrogate capitalist) managerial stratum, and "conflict centres on the locus of control over the decision-making processes that shape the functioning of the institution" (Stilwell, 2003, p. 59). Stilwell goes on to argue that academic "professionals" themselves are being "commodified" as labour.

My purpose in this thesis is to investigate changing teacher identities in these uncertain, neo-liberal times. If there is no consensus on the purpose of universities education, and if in fact neo-liberal market forces now determine the management, research and teaching of universities, and if knowledge and academic labour are becoming commodified - what are the implications for academics who teach in the enterprise university?

In the coming section I will review relevant Australian government policies and discussion papers on higher education to expose and consider the factors that education leaders and commentators claim are, or should be, driving change in teaching and learning in universities. The metaphors for teaching in higher education policy frameworks will come under particular scrutiny, for my attention will turn to how the university lecturer is represented and acknowledged in Australian national policies about university teaching and learning.

The Changing Landscapes of Australian University Teaching and Learning Policy

Themes of change, uncertainty and risk infiltrate the rhetoric of higher education teaching and learning policy too. The realities of globalisation, corporatisation, and new forms of managerialism are reshaping the missions and work of universities, and the consequences are not going unnoticed by the academics who sustain the teaching, research and service functions of the institution. In this discussion, I shall draw attention to the relevant language and images as part of my overview of government policy, academic work and change.

In their occasional paper entitled "Academic Work in the Twenty-first Century" and commissioned by the Australian national Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA), Coaldrake and Stedman (1999) examine "the changing higher education landscape" and, drawing on their earlier publication (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998), they restate five reasons for ongoing change in universities. The key areas that they argue have had an impact on the work of staff within universities are:

- Growth in higher education participation;
- Changes in higher education financing and accountability;
- Increasing knowledge and the demand for synthesis;
- Industrialisation and industrial relations policy;
- Information technology and the transformation of teaching and learning.

(Coaldrake & Stedman, 1999, pp. 3-6)

The authors acknowledge that universities are struggling to reconcile their culture, values and aspirations with the modes of operation necessary to meet external expectations. That is, that they have become less self-contained and inwardly-focussed, and more selective and strategic in their operations. The authors point to "the inertia of the existing system" (1999, p. 32) and their final section on "possible institutional policy responses" is notable for its landscape(d) rhetoric. (The italicised words to follow in this section appear on page 32 of their paper). In their view, academic work in the future will be characterised by new *pathways;* there will be a gradual shift towards more *nomadic* and independent employment patterns, and staff will need to work more in teams and move across internal and external *boundaries*. Apparently "the signs point in a common direction" and "we need to *broaden our views* of what constitutes scholarship and how university work relates to *the external world*". Their paper concludes with an exhortation for "us" [who?] "to *harness* the full potential of the knowledge and expertise available to as well as within our universities".

Evidently there is a journey to make and there are horses to saddle - or we need to control and strap ourselves into something as this collaborative knowledge production and management scenario develops. Their final statement too suggests that knowledge might well be generated and controlled from inside and outside universities. It is not the first time that Coaldrake and Stedman have stood and surveyed the metaphoric landscape of higher education. The title of their previous book, *On the brink: Australia's universities confronting their future* (1998), suggests they had been standing on a more elevated and dangerous spot. As I shall show, too, the landscape metaphor persists in many sections of commonwealth government policy on higher education.

However, what emerges from Coaldrake and Stedman's analysis is an awareness of conflict between "established academic traditions" and what the authors present as inevitable forces of change. They identify five themes of change in academic work.

> - increasing pressures on time, workload and morale;
> - a growing emphasis on performance, professional standards and external accountability;
> - a shift from local control and individual autonomy to a more collective and institutional focus;
> - the increasing specialisation and complexity of university work;
> - a diffusion and blurring of roles and categories of staff.
>
> (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1999, pp. 9-14)

As in their earlier book (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998), the authors continue their thinly-veiled criticism of "indifferent teaching" and the implication is clear.

> Many academics will have to confront the reality that the task of the academic teacher, traditionally encapsulated in the designation of lecturer, is shifting from the transmission of

> information towards the management and facilitation of student learning. (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1999, p. 7)

Coaldrake and Stedman assert that academic work is changing, and the use of ICT is implicated. One way to appreciate the emergence of these attitudes towards academics is via a lens of neo-liberal evaluation. As Davies points out, "Laziness is easy to attribute to someone whose work does not have measurable or economic products. Neoliberal systems of evaluation are understood, in the face of this implicit subject, as keeping them honest and hard-working." Coaldrake and Stedman's (1999) paper and book (1998) have been cited in government policies since their publication. Indeed subsequent Australian government policy documents reiterate this focus on change factors in higher education; the criticism of university teaching continues and ICT is touted as a response to improving university teaching and learning.

The most recent review of higher education was initiated by the Commonwealth Department of Science Education and Training (DEST) with the Minister's discussion paper *Higher Education at the crossroads: An overview paper* (Nelson, 2002). The landscape metaphor continues. This paper was the first in a series "intended to stimulate discussion and debate about the challenges facing Australian universities and the policy choices before us" (Nelson, 2002, preface). The opportunities and challenges that are reshaping universities are defined in this paper as:

- global competition;
- technological developments;
- social and environmental issues;
- demography and labour markets;
- fiscal capacity.

(Nelson, 2002, pp. 11-15)

The paper also articulates certain pressures and tensions in higher education, although these are not accorded the same space and textual prominence in the document. These "pressures and tensions" are used to frame the consultation process. They relate in part to further deregulation, and shifts in funding sources (away from the Commonwealth Government to students and state governments). Notably, university management is a pressure or a tension too, apparently, for the fact that "governance and management structures of universities also tend to restrict their ability to make the hard decisions required to achieve necessary change". According to the Minister and Department of Education, Science and Training, change is not happening quickly enough in our universities.

In terms of academic work, particularly teaching, the policy notes that there are few incentives to encourage collaboration between universities, particularly in terms of course development, teaching, student services and administration. A difficulty in attracting and retaining quality staff is acknowledged in connection with less comparable rises in salary indexation when measured against other professional occupations.

The second paper to be published in the "Higher Education at the Crossroads" series was *Striving for Quality: Learning, teaching and scholarship* (Nelson, 2002; Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002). Like Coaldrake and Stedman (1999), the authors of this discussion paper are negative in their characterisation of university teaching practices. As the student-centred discourse takes over, university teachers are being rapped over the knuckles. "The most effective teaching is that which facilitates students to be actively engaged in learning, but it would appear that this is not consistently demonstrated in teaching practice" (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002).

Such criticisms of university teaching practices in Australian higher education policies appear to be based on limited and particular experiences of university teaching and learning. Perhaps the assumptions that are made are based on policy writers' own undergraduate experiences of several decades ago, when universities were vastly different,

in terms of funding, structure and governance. Teaching appears to be being narrowly defined as pedagogic acts by the lecturer in the lecture theatre, thereby overlook the *ex-camera* planning and feedback that many lecturers undertake to create a challenging, meaningful learning experience for their students.

The focus in this DEST paper narrows to university teaching and learning, and four factors that have contributed to "a changing context for teaching and learning" are identified.

- evolution to a mass higher education system;
- a global, knowledge-based economy;
- impact of information and communication technologies;
- the internationalisation of Australian higher education.

(Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002)

Of particular significance here is the singling out of ICT, and as was the case in Coaldrake and Stedman's occasional paper (1999), the implication is that ICT will correct bad teaching and enhance student learning, so as to serve better the economic objectives of the nation.

> The new century is generating a need for "emerging" skills and knowledge that have not previously been a focus of higher education. These include initiative and enterprise skills; information literacy and management skills; the capacity for life-long learning; the ability to be adaptable and "learn-to-learn" in jobs and roles yet to be envisaged; and skills to work in multidisciplinary contexts. (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002, p. ix)

Student dissatisfaction is cited as evidence that university teaching (and learning) is failing to meet the needs of students, employers and the community in universities. "Standards need to be clearly and publicly articulated and approaches to student assessment made more consistent. It is important to validate and monitor standards" (Department of Education,

Science and Training, 2002, p. ix). It is not surprise then that mandatory training and accreditation, as well as flexible learning practices, are "options to be considered" as solutions for improving teaching that, by implication, is not up to scratch. I will address this point further in the next section of this chapter, where I discuss the student-as-customer focus that is ever-present in much higher education policy.

More recent higher education policies of the Australian federal government are focussed on reform. The Department of Education Science and Training (DEST) and the Australian Universities' Teaching Committee (AUTC) have combined their efforts to review and reform higher education policy and funding in universities. The rationale and proposals for change are set out in the policy paper *Our Universities: Backing Australia's Future* (Nelson, 2003). In his foreword, the minister argues:

> Though Australian higher education enjoys a domestic and international reputation for excellence, we must take steps now to ensure its future is built on solid foundations.… Globalisation, massification of higher education, a revolution in communications and the need for lifelong learning leave Australian universities nowhere to hide from the winds of change. (Nelson, 2003, Foreword)

The proposed reforms to Australian universities centre on funding, student fees and scholarships, "promoting excellence in learning and teaching", strengthening research capacity, equity, flexible and responsive workplaces, structural reform and quality. "Promoting excellence in learning and teaching" encompasses new national awards for university teaching, and the establishment of a learning and teaching performance fund as well as international centres of excellence. These and other activities (grants, projects, fellowships, resource networks) are now being coordinated by the Carrick National Institute for Learning and Teaching which was established in 2004, and whose overall mission is "to promote and advance learning and teaching in Australian higher education". The first of the Institute's six objectives establishes a familiar mantra, for the Institute will

“promote and support strategic change in higher education institutions for the enhancement of learning and teaching…” (http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/).

Review: Australian Higher Education Learning and Teaching Policy

Backgrounding the promise and activity that emerge from Australian higher education policy on university teaching and learning are metaphors that speak of change, uncertainty and risk. The higher education scene is portrayed as a harsh landscape, crisscrossed by old and new pathways. Buffered by the “winds of change” we must harness knowledge and potential, and for the important decisions to be made at the crossroads. There are boundaries, further afield, beyond which there is an unknown, uncertain external world. The most recent federal government policy initiative *Our universities: Backing Australia’s future* (Nelson, 2003) suggests undeniably that this is a risky gamble, with money at stake. Of course, risk, uncertainty, unpredictability are not what the stake-holders of higher education - governments, university management, the corporations and business, and students and parents want to acknowledge, yet they are unavoidable.

The reorganisation of Australian higher education over the past 16 years (post-Dawkins) has challenged the professional roles, identities, well-being and productivity of those who teach in universities. As government policy pushes universities further into massification, globalisation, and corporate-style practices, attention is shifting from the work of those who teach, to those who learn, in Australian universities. Clearly the work of university teachers is vaguely defined, much less understood and, for the large part, implicitly criticised in recent Australian higher education policy. The work of those who teach in universities is not acknowledged and it is as if the academic who teaches is being erased from significant discussions about university teaching and learning.

In the following section I want to shift from the federal policy arena to the implications of policy and change on those who teach in universities. In particular I will review change to academic work in terms of the impact of “the student focus” discourse.

Universities and Change: The Student Focus

As I noted in the previous section, university teachers and teaching have been criticised implicitly and, for the most part, ignored in recent Australian government higher education policy. The rhetoric of key documents suggests that academics will need to rethink themselves, reshape themselves - if not remove themselves entirely - from the sites of pedagogical control.

> Mass higher education means a different sort of higher education system, with different parameters and expectations for students, academics and the community. It requires rethinking the design of learning experiences and courses, teacher-student contact, and the role of the academic. It necessitates re-examining the way courses are delivered, the implications of institutional policies and practices and recognising that systems of support for learning are as important as the delivery of subjects and courses. (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002, p. 5)

In change rhetoric such as this, there is an apparent movement and repositioning of players. That is, there is a foregrounding and privileging of the student and learning, and an uncertain "rethinking" of the role of the academic. At this point, I want to consider the implications of this shift of attention from the academic to the student within higher education. The discussion will begin with some reflections on "how things used to be" (real or imagined?) in academic life. Following some brief observations about the impacts of managerialism and the regulation of academic work, I will turn my attention to three all-important discourses that, together with higher education teaching and learning policy, have contributed to the erasure of the academic from university teaching and learning. These student-centred themes recreate the student as customer, as flexible learner, and as an abstract individual student in much higher education learning (and teaching) research.

The Regulation of Academic Freedom

> The university sector seems mired in perpetual crisis. The working week has lengthened; the piles of paper have risen. Academics now administer first, teach second, and research tenth. Ah, for the good old days, when scholars were well-paid, respected and of course left alone to do what they wanted. That was the Golden Age. Or was it? (“Commentaries: The Golden Age”, 2001, p. 2)

This editorial comment in an issue of the National Tertiary Education Union’s (NTEU) *Australian Universities’ Review* (AUR), devoted to “The Golden Age”, presents one perspective on academic work now and “then”. Many older colleagues will nod and smile knowingly for a moment. The changes to working conditions are recognisable and the rhetoric is barely overstated if you are in an academic appointment. Many academics today would nominate “then” - the Golden Age of academia in Australian universities - as being the pre-Dawkins (1988) period in Australia higher education policy. Certainly the 1960s and 1970s were halcyon years, if we are to believe the stories of older academics now who look back (Ballantyne, Bain & Packer, 1997; Martin, 1999; Rowland, 2000).

There is an extant body of literature that reports on the changing nature of academics' work, particularly in terms of work role/s and their relationship with their institution (Halsey, 1992; Martin, 1999; McInnis, 1996; Taylor, 1999; Tight, 1988; Trowler, 1998). Social expectations, university management practices and, in some disciplines, pressures from professional bodies, maintain and constrain academic work in particular ways. These demands appear to be at odds with the scholarly values of more senior academics in particular, and the disciplinary traditions they have sought to honour and cultivate through their teaching, research and service roles. Martin's research (1999), for example, revealed a largely disheartened group of 160 Australian and British academics who felt undervalued, overworked, and overwhelmed by the enormity of the issues and challenges that they perceived faced them. Martin described the “contextual backdrop” for these perceptions of change and loss in terms of reflections from the 1950s and 1960s (nostalgia), more

universities and more students, different students, different courses with different purposes, increased cost, increased answerability, teaching more flexibly, and internationalisation. The advent of the corporate, enterprise university has brought with it new management practices that regulate the work and workers in the university, and there has been a shift from local control and individual autonomy to a more collective and institutional locus of control, invested in new managerial strata (Stilwell, 2003). By way of example, one implication of this for teaching and learning is that in most universities, course and subject outlines must be tendered for scrutiny and approval by faculty committees and individuals. Academics in this study report a request from faculty management for the implementation, by all faculty staff, of standardised subject outline templates. It is a common requirement now in universities that all subject outlines (once approved) be posted on the web for perusal by prospective and current students. It is practices such as these, too, that have increased workload demands on academic staff.

After entering the academy in the early 1990s, I often heard my university colleagues refer to academic freedom and "the good old days". What was free about what they did previously was not quite clear. As Kaplan and Schrecker note:

> …there is little consensus regarding the meaning of academic freedom although there is agreement that it is something worth protecting. The concept has been invoked in support of many contrary causes and positions. It, for example, was used to justify student activism and to repress it, to defend radical faculty and to defend their suppression, to support inquiry into admissions or promotion or tenure decisions and to deny such inquiry. It is, at best, a slippery notion, but clearly a notion worthy of analysis. (Kaplan & Schrecker, 1983, as cited in Tight, 1988, p. 114).

Academic work is critical intellectual work, entailing the creating, sharing and exchange of ideas. By engaging in critical intellectual work, the academic is not simply developing herself, but also the critical abilities of one's colleagues and students in the process, through the activities of research and teaching. Creative, intellectual work supports a vital,

creative society. I have always wanted to believe that academic freedom had something to do with *having the time* to achieve these ideals – through thinking, speaking and writing critically, and by communicating and discussing one's ideas with peers and students. However, this is anachronistic thinking, warns Davies (2005b) who, along with a number of other higher education commentators, rue the loss of this function from academic life. (See for example: Barnett, 2003; Blackmore, 2001; Davies, 2005b; Furedi, 2003; Hayes, 2003, and Walker, 2002).

Marginson (1997) points out that conventional academic freedom has always been regulated by tenure and other conditions of academic work, and is in fact an instrument of university government that controls the individual employee/academic. "For the most part, academics pursue a kind of regulated freedom within institutions in a state of regulated autonomy" (Marginson, 1997, p. 360). Commentators (such as Davies & Petersen, 2005; McWilliam et al., 1999) argue that the university lecturer is being managed and re-shaped by the regulating Foucauldian "technologies" of the enterprise university (defined and discussed in chapter 2) to serve not merely institutional but also national economic values and objectives. "Each person no longer trusts the other to work properly, and each becomes one of the multiple eyes spying on each other" (Davies, 2005a, no page ref.). Indeed, new management practices (eg. study leave applications, university travel insurance forms, and assorted leave forms) require the academic to organise time strategically, purposefully and transparently, and with the approval of line management. Malcolm Tight (1988) presents a different perspective on academic freedom.

> One seldom gets something for nothing in real life. Thus while academic freedom may be given to or assumed by academics, as a privilege or as a necessary part of their job, this carries with it an inevitable *quid pro quo* in terms of expectations, responsibility and accountability. (Tight, 1988, p. 130).

Tight goes on to distinguish academic responsibilities that are internal and external to the academy, and he highlights the increasing focus exerted by university management on the accountability of academics. It is difficult to judge the reasonableness of this increased accountability, he notes. “A system which embodies greater accountability may, though at times both irritating and time-consuming, turn out to be fairer and better able to prevent many abuses of academic freedom” (Tight, 1988, p. 131).

On these matters, Barnett (2004) points out an ironic turn. While he acknowledges the success of the University education “project” in teaching others to think freely and critically from multiple perspectives, he also notes how this very achievement has been so successful that the reflexive critical focus has itself been turned back upon universities, so that academic activities and interests now fall under the critical scrutiny of governments, media and community. Universities are subject to the “public interest” and taxpayers expect transparent standards, performance measures, and accountability in quantifiable terms we can all understand. Lecturers are also subject to the scrutiny of their students, who as customers of the university in a competitive market, are learning to express choice, articulate their expectations and, once enrolled, now have increasing influence in terms of the evaluation feedback they give on their experience of university study. In the coming sections I want to explore more closely the reification of the student as customer, flexible learner and as the focus of much higher education research. Clearly, the impact of this attention on the student must have consequences for academic identity in the enterprise university, and it is my intention in this thesis to explore the effects of this shift, from the perspectives of academics themselves.

The Customer Focus

As I revealed earlier in this chapter, in higher education policy documents it is evident that university lecturers are being criticised for outmoded teaching practices (the “teacher-centred transmission approach” (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002). In so doing, the minister and his policy writers reveal interesting assumptions about university

teaching. Such discussions tend to position the student as the paying customer who must be served and satisfied, someone who is the centre of pedagogical and administrative attention, and the University and its (academic) staff are positioned as "serving" students. Of course, ICT - by offering *materials* - provides the strategy and the opportunity that will enable this to happen.

> With their long tradition of providing high quality distance education courses, Australian universities are well placed to take advantage of the new technologies and opportunities *to better serve students* by offering more accessible teaching and learning materials.… Not only does ICT affect how students might acquire knowledge, it fundamentally changes what students learn. (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002); my italics)

In statements such as this, the impact on academic work of such pressures for change are mostly implicit. It is clear that the autonomous academic can look forward to increasing collegial collaboration, in that familiar teaching functions will be "unbundled" or "disaggregated", and teaching responsibilities are likely to be shared. "Previously integrated activities undertaken by an individual academic - such as course design, materials preparation, lecturing and tutoring, assignment marking and assessment - are being 'unbundled'" (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002).

In such models and discussions it is not hard to imagine that the teacher, who is a component part of the disaggregation, might also be being disconnected from the learner and the content. One important idea that I intend exploring in this research is the notion that whereas a "teacher" is defined by her relationship and connection with learners, to be a "learner" one does not need a relationship with a teacher. A customer does not need to strike up a close relationship with a shop or sales assistant in order to purchase materials. Reflections such as this have led me to want to investigate further how the (shop assistant) teacher might be being positioned differently in these new metaphoric contexts. The

student-focussed higher education research literature has contributed significantly to the reification of the student in universities.

Higher Education Research and the Student Learning Focus

> The aim of teaching is simple: it is to make student learning possible. (Ramsden, 2003, p. 7)

Over the past 30 years, the field of higher education teaching and learning research has been shaped significantly by groups and individuals, many working in academic development, committed to exploring and promoting the student focus in university learning. The diverse research is united by a commitment to "improving student learning", and there is a nested assumption in this commitment that the teaching (and the teacher) will improve through the adoption of the student perspective at all stages of the teaching-learning process: planning, teaching and assessing. Indeed, Biggs' (2003) theory of "constructive alignment" is widely promoted and discussed in university development programs, and most readily adopted by teaching staff as a way of integrating and "aligning" student learning outcomes, teaching and learning strategies and assessment in a subject or program of study. Biggs and Collis' (1982) "SOLO Taxonomy" elaborates on "surface" and "deep" learning, by setting out a gradation of learning competences - from rote learning to complex mental operations such as synthesising. What is important is that the teacher adopt and acknowledge students' "conceptions" of what they are doing as they learn. Academics find the notions of "surface", "deep" (and "achievement-oriented") conceptions and approaches to learning particularly appealing and accessible for reflecting on and planning the sequencing of learning within the curriculum.

The field of research that has produced the student learning perspective is phenomenography, and its explicit agenda is to move "from a focus on teaching to a focus on learning outcomes" (Rust, 1999). Summing up the collected views of the field, Rust states that:

> Learners who have more control over their learning are more likely to:
>
> be motivated
>
> see the relevance of what they are learning
>
> take a deeper approach to their learning. (Rust, 1999, p. vi)

The theoretical underpinnings of the field grew out of phenomenology as well as cognitive psychology and perspectives such as Bloom's taxonomy and the models of Piaget. The work of Bowden and Walsh (2000); Marton & Booth (1997); Prosser (1993; Prosser & Trigwell (1999), are exemplary and offer an introduction to the field. The concepts of phenomenography are well-theorised and debated, and they are discussed as common sense. The ethical posture of adopting the learner's perspectives has been highly effective in opening up academics to new relationships with their students individually and collectively. This is what "good teachers" do. By implication they stop looking inwards (at themselves and their ideas?), and turn outward to attend to the needs of the student Other. The moral project of improvement through self-sacrifice is subtle and powerful. The message about "good teaching" is everywhere. "Good teachers are continually engaged in reflecting on their students' learning and changing their teaching in order to improve learning" (McKenzie, 1999, p. 357). The student focus has had considerable influence, not just on teaching in universities, but also on efforts to enhance teaching and learning "quality". Most universities in Australia, and many in the UK, evaluate teaching and (in many cases allocate funding) according to the results of student course evaluation questionnaires, that seek students' perceptions of the teaching and their learning, and have been developed out of the phenomenographic research base.

When I made the move to academic development in 1998, I discovered a lot of enthusiasm for the student learning focus and I was expected to promote the adoption of a student focus in all aspects of teaching very actively to teaching academics. This was clear-cut, scientific research that could be communicated across all disciplines (though not without dissent and accusations of "wishy-washiness", such as I continue to hear). Thus, phenomenographic

research has been the mainstay that has secured the discourse of improving student learning in universities in the UK, Scandinavia, Hong Kong and Australia for the past 25 years. Its influence in higher education research has been hegemonic and critiques have been rare. Webb (1996) represents a daring example. Concerns centre on the "observational and interpretative neutrality of the researcher" (Webb, 1996, p.1), and the apparently positivist, scientific qualities of what, it is claimed, is "qualitative" research. Webb's paper also deconstructs the surface/deep binary and the raises the question of power, in terms of how the findings are interpreted in institutions and in academic development.

In all this focus on the student in phenomenography, where did the lecturer go? Of course, as I shall go on to show in the next chapter, teacher conceptions have been studied by phenomenographers as well. Yet it seems that the certain, proper focus on the student, her perceptions, conceptions and approaches to learning, alienates the lecturer from this pedagogy even at the level of language. Teachers have been getting in the way of learning. It is interesting that the teacher is being shifted sideways in this pedagogy, and indeed this is not the only discourse that destabilises teacher and teaching. Running alongside the customer focus, and the student focus is the appealing discourse and gainful strategy that is "flexible learning". In the next section I will expose the assumptions of flexible learning (and teaching), ponder the reification of the learner and the implications for academics who teach.

Flexible Learning

> The term "flexible" is used to refer to practices which utilise the capacities of learner-learner and teacher–learner interaction, made possible through recent developments in communication and information technology to provide increased "openness" in both on- and off-campus delivery of educational programs. What is also clear is that this convergence offers the possibility to significantly increase opportunities for access to courses.… We use the expression "flexible modes of delivery" to capture this combination of philosophy and technology, and quite explicitly recognise that this combination frees the

> provision of educational programs from both geographical and time constraints. (Taylor, Lopez & Quadrelli, 1996, p. 6)

Flexibility as a metaphor suggests movement and change - and it requires adaptability. In Australian higher education contexts, the term “flexibility” has come into currency during a time of increasing academic workloads and class sizes and decreasing resourcing for infrastructure and staffing. Picking up on themes at the heart of this chapter, others take a student focus, observing that flexibility of time and location is “crucial to maintain quality in teaching and learning in HE [higher education], whilst responding to the needs of increasingly diverse, mobile and growing student population” (Steeples et al., 1996, p. 77). Although flexibility can refer broadly to student-centred administrative and teaching practices, it is frequently appropriated, as Taylor and colleagues (1996) point out above, to describe the integration of ICT into teaching and learning, in particular, web-based (online) learning. (See for example, Martin, 1999; Taylor, 1999.)

At Southern Regional University, one of the sites for this study, the promotional discourse around flexibility in higher education was focussed on the notion of expanding student choice, and giving students more responsibility for their learning.

> Flexible learning encompasses teaching/learning activities which are responsive to students' learning interests, needs and circumstances. What is central is the intention to increase students' access to, and control over, particular teaching and learning environments. Flexible Learning aims to give students choice about where, when and how they learn. (SRU brochure on *Flexible Learning*, late 1990s)

Conversely the freedom for academics to choose what, when, where and how they teach has become problematic. In my early days in academic development I was struck by tensions and competing assumptions around notions of flexible learning. Perhaps it is not surprising given the fact that, as Taylor and his colleagues pointed out, “the term has no

fixed meaning" (Taylor et al., 1996, p. 6). From the perspective of an educational developer, I can see that, depending on your role in the university, different stake-holders attach different definitions and agendas to flexible learning.

University management, for example, usually assumes the delivery metaphor for teaching and learning (ie. the "packaging" of "shovelware" - commodification). For students, flexibility can mean more administrative and educational choice, through the provision of, for example, non-traditional timetabling options (such as summer schools), different methods of enrolment, and off-campus and distance study. Particular courses of study and single subjects may be designed so as to offer the student a range of less teacher-centred learning and assessment modes (including print, CD-ROM, web-based materials and activities, group-based learning).

Mentioning flexible learning or flexible programs makes for good copy in glossy brochures advertising courses for the postgraduate market - the term "flexible" suggesting that the university its staff and courses are somehow easy-going, and informal, with little standing on ceremony. Yet, academics are suspicious of the term "flexible learning", and students respond variously. In researching stakeholder attitudes to the introduction of flexible learning practices in one UK university, Willmott and MacLean (1994) observed that, "The thread that runs through teachers' discussions about flexible learning is suspicion that it is being promoted for non-educational reasons. Several teachers feel that flexible learning is an educational justification for an economic measure" (Willmot & McLean, 1994, pp. 102-103). In a recent government report on the implementation of flexible (online) learning at the University of Southern Queensland (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2003), both teaching staff and students expressed similar concern that pedagogical imperatives might be taking second place to the university's commercial interests.

Online learning is often introduced by eager deans as a technology-driven solution for coping with staffing and funding cuts, and curriculum rationalisation. The support of teams

of graphic and instructional designers might be welcomed at first by teaching staff, but there can be longer-term consequences. It was reported that the teaching staff at the University of Southern Queensland in particular expressed concern over losing control of what they perceived to be their roles and even their rights. (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2003, p. xvi). Taylor and colleagues (1996) reported a similar anxiety on the part of staff in their study.

> A number of respondents indicated high levels of anxiety when considering the use of "high" technology. One spoke of feeling disempowered – profoundly unskilled in terms of her capacity to consider and/or use that technology – while at the same time feeling deskilled with respect to her original face-to-face practices. (Taylor et al., 1996, p. 58)

The detail of academics' experiences, attitudes and responses towards online learning will be explored in the next chapter. The point to be made here is that academics are suspicious of a technological innovation that is introduced usually for reasons other than pedagogical benefits, and that by all accounts increases their workload and reduces their control over planning, teaching and assessment. Academics feel that management does not appreciate the time required for adequate planning and teaching, and the need to build in opportunities for communication, feedback, encouragement for and between lecturer, tutors and students. From the point of view of the academic, flexible learning is just another student-focussed discursive tactic of the managerialist, enterprise university that ultimately regulates the time and work of the academic.

The adoption of "flexible" learning practices is one obvious theme in the new enterprise university that has lead to a heightened workload intensity and changed tempo. For example, "contact hours" in a subject description are no longer a relevant or proper measure of student learning; the focus is now on the achievement of learning outcomes. Sue Clegg (2003) reflects on how the tempo and intensity of academic work are changing.

> The times and rhythms of academic life are deeply embedded in the passing of the academic calendar, and in the temporalities of student from neophyte to graduate. The academic year passes through terms from admissions to examinations, but superimposed on these rhythms are the new timings of semesterisation, modularisation and different patterns of assessment. As well as disrupting the traditional patterns of the year, external requirements, such as the research selectivity exercise, have created new forms of temporality through which academic careers are lived. (Clegg, 2003, p. 807)

Managing time is about managing the self. Enterprising academics will self-organise, set goals and perform themselves according to their annual, personal set of "performance indicators" to become the desirable employee of the corporate university. As Davies and Petersen (2005) point out, the Foucauldian "technologies" of neo-liberal management are

> designed to produce in individuals higher levels of flexibility, productivity, and co-operation with national economic objectives for the economic benefit for the nation. They provide mechanisms to facilitate the necessary change in individuals. They are a superficial set of governing practices… [intended]… to improve some of their working practices and to make them more useful and relevant. (Davies & Petersen, 2005, p. 33)

With so much attention focussed in the enterprise university on the needs and money of the students, it is not difficult to appreciate how academics are struggling to re-form themselves so as to remain useful and relevant. This is particularly so when (according to institutional performance indicators) their worth and relevance are no longer embedded primarily in their disciplines, but in the extent to which they serve the interests of students and the priorities of management.

Review: The Student Focus

To summarise this discussion of the student focus, my analysis of higher education policy and research on university teaching and learning found little reference to university lecturers and university teaching. In fact, it appeared that the academic had been erased

from explicit discussion of university teaching and learning and, at the very least, has been de-centred by three student-focussed themes in the enterprise university:

- the student as customer - a product of the corporatisation of university management; addressing student needs becomes a key university activity;
- the flexible learner - flexible learning has produced a re-regulation of academic time and workload;
- the student-focus – the institutional commitment to "improving student learning" that is supported by higher education research that seeks to identify and espouse "quality" learning and "good teaching".

My analysis of Australian higher education policy, and these three student-centred themes, suggests that the university lecturer is being sidelined or overlooked. The discourse of student learning signals changing roles and identities for university teachers, and academics' subjective experiences of this ideological, discursive shift is the central concern of this thesis. However, before examining academic identity in more detail in the chapter to come, I shall review the key contextual concerns raised in this framing chapter.

Chapter Review: The Enterprise University and the Enterprising Academic

In this chapter, I have identified and discussed ideological shifts and themes in the discursive contexts of academic life. The discerning student, who has become a customer and flexible learner of the enterprise university, and whose perspective lies the heart of higher education research, has captured the attention of university management. The permeation of neo-liberal values and surveillance practices within the enterprise university has led to the increasing manipulation and regulation of academic work and identity.

Of course, if we are to believe the glamorous images and messages in university websites, newspaper and magazine advertisements and glossy brochures, our universities are exciting places to be and learn. Claims for excellence are built on such notions as international reputation, the humane, social contribution of cutting-edge science research, and the promise of a lively, stimulating campus lifestyle. In less than half a century the purposes of higher education and the missions of universities have changed radically. The name of the game in the mass university is knowledge production, and the corporate, service-oriented university now strives to be more outward-looking, yet inwardly-regulated - transparently accountable to those who would fund it and work *with* it, including the professions, government and media. In the enterprise university, everything – including teaching and learning – is being recorded, measured, judged and archived (Derrida, 1998; Lyotard, 1984; Morris, 2004).

For academics, the impacts of this focus on the student are likely to be profound. McWilliam et al (1999) note that academics are being "made over" by the Foucauldian technologies of the enterprise university, that seeks to (re)-develop them into (risk-conscious, self-auditing), enterprising individuals. In many universities now, academic codes of conduct dictate proper, ethical academic behaviour. Workloads have increased, and performance and academic freedom are monitored and documented. Indeed "one sort of romance about being an academic is no longer speakable, thinkable, do-able in universities at the turn of the millennium", and a new discursive tradition in universities "is giving birth to a new romance in which the enterprising academic is a central figure" (McWilliam et al., 1999, p. 69).

The enterprising academic is just now (this evening) stepping out confidently down the hallway to co-teach a split lecture delivered simultaneously to a second campus via video-conferencing. Her every move is being watched and documented, and in a very public way. Every click of the mouse, and every tap and slip of her digits will be recorded in the online discussion list postings she makes early the next morning. Her teaching evaluation scores -

and the extra funding those scores attract to her department - depend on such moves and gestures. Her apparent enterprise and innovation will advance her performance management and development assessment. There are (imagined) eyes on her work everywhere. Interaction with ICT is essential for the maintenance of this impression of competence and probity, and for promotion and advancement within academia.

The key government policy papers cited in this chapter were written in different historic-political contexts, and for different purposes, yet it is notable that they have all specified the transformative impact of ICT on teaching and learning. There is also the suggestion in these policies that ICT can solve perceived inefficiencies, and correct or supplement out-moded, "indifferent" teaching. While there are references to changing academic teacher roles as a consequence of the adoption and integration of ICT, what those changed roles are, or might be, are not discussed. In the next chapter, I will explore relevant themes in the literature on academics and ICT with a particular interest in the effects of new technologies (in all senses) on academic work and identity.

Chapter 2
Academic Identity, and Online Teaching

> The growing power of networked computing and the convergence of information and communication technology hold the promise of enhancing communication and personal interaction, aspects which are central to education (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1999, p. 6).

> How do I protect the memory of you, of us, despite so many changes in distance, in co-ordination between sound and image, despite so many scissions between the time to see you and listen to you, you see you, to listen to you and to place my hand upon you?
> Where are you? Where are we? And what have we become? (Irigaray, 2001, p. 96)

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I outlined the policy and institutional context, which now regulates the work and teaching of lecturers. In this chapter, I now turn to consider notions of identity, academic identity and, in particular, the discursive construction of the excellent, enterprising academic who takes up flexible and online learning. This chapter will enable me to discuss the impact and implications for academics of “making the move” (Taylor et al, 1996, p. 48) online, and I will identify several commonly reported effects of change in the literature on higher education teaching and learning and ICT that have implications for academic identity. In my reading of this literature on ICT and university teaching and learning, I have been intrigued by commentaries and depictions of the academic who teaches, and this chapter will integrate a discussion of the teaching metaphors for the (changed) online academic that appear in the literature, as a prelude to my own analysis of academics’ teaching metaphors.

Identity, and Academic Identities

> When what was once attributed to a unified psychological domain is now dispersed among culturally diverse linguistic practices, beliefs, and conventions: the unified self is revealed as a construction. Once again the self is challenged and fragmented: heterogeneity is not a temporary condition but the inescapable outcome of the discursive processes through which "the self" is "socially constructed". (Rose, 1996, p. 9)

This thesis is a study of academics' insights into their lecturer-teacher identities, on the threshold of the 21st century in two different university contexts in south-eastern Australia. Sarup (1998) has pointed out that identity has become a preoccupation in post-modernist thinking, with interest and theorising focussed on the individual and the society within which one interacts. This establishes three elements in my thinking about identity: the social context, the individual, and the interaction between the two: language.

Identity is a discursive process of becoming - and we produce ourselves discursively through language. According to Althusser (2000), individuals are "always-already" discursive subjects. In taking up or signalling a particular identity ("I'm a Tasmanian"; or "I'm an academic developer") I hail or interpellate myself to a very conscious, ideologically-located identity - from a previous non-conscious ideological standpoint. I am signalling particular ideological positionings, in terms of who I am, and who I am not. As an academic developer, for example, I am contracted into a particular kind of ideological relationship with people and practices that distinguish the institution where I work - a university. The self that I know and write about here (in this thesis), there (in emails to colleagues) and everywhere (in personal letters to friends overseas) is not unitary, and never fixed, stable, nor constant. Identities are fluid, contextual, changing. As identities, our selves are "always already" works-in-progress. Perhaps I am a Tasmanian when I feel the need to be a Tasmanian; perhaps I say I am an academic developer to signal I am not affiliated with a certain faculty. I might also be signalling a certain relationship with university management, depending on circumstances and context. And besides, I am many

other identities, depending on context. In sum, as Hall (2002, p. 19) writes, “Identities are thus points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us.”

According to Foucault as well, the self is subject to ideological influences – “a whole hierarchy of relations…that reside in discourse itself” (Foucault, 2002, pp. 81, 82). These relations exert values and influences on me, and indeed and all who are engaged or implicated in the “practices”, “enunciations” and “strategies” (Foucault, 2002, p. 82) of the discourse. In chapter 1, I discussed three student-focussed themes in university teaching and learning that together appear to be drawing attention away from the academic who teaches. The three themes represent and embody discursive practices, enunciations and strategies that together produce the discourse of student learning, a discourse in universities that appears to be destabilising, perhaps erasing the lecturer. Discursive “truths” (eg. “good teaching is about improving student learning”) are always transforming or “becoming” (eg. “the excellent teacher uses critical reflection to improve student learning”). The power that circulates discursively has both negative and productive outcomes. There is inclusion and exclusion, and acceptance and resistance are built-in effects. The individual academic may well grapple with being both a union member and a head of school. Some of the participants in this thesis worked intensely at their online teaching, in spite of their awareness of their colleagues’ suspicions and concerns about flexible, online learning and teaching.

In his particular theorising of identity, Nikolas Rose (1996), launches from Foucault’s writings about ethics and “the care of the self” (Foucault, 1986), to develop his thesis of the enterprising individual. Rose firstly expands on Foucault’s notion of “technologies of the self” where such “technologies” are techniques by means of which one governs the project of the self, and

> which permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality (Foucault, 1988, as cited in Rose, 1996, p. 153).

The discourse of the enterprise culture that operates currently in universities is one such "technology" in that, by means of particular management practices, university management attends to the shaping and controlling of the enterprising academic. This government of individuals is about the "conduct of conduct". This process of manipulation is enacted through the establishment of particular managerial technologies (such as over-arching promotions and awards criteria, indices and indicators), such that management is able to govern "*through* the freedom and aspirations of subjects rather than in spite of them…" (Rose, 1996, p. 155). Academic staff seek promotion, rewards, awards and acknowledgement that they are doing a good job and, in universities, these controlling mechanisms are closely tied to those processes. Rose continues.

> The vocabulary of enterprise links political rhetoric and regulatory programs to the "self-steering" capacities of subjects themselves. Along this… dimension of political rule, enterprise forges a link between the ways we are governed by others and the ways we should govern ourselves. Enterprise here designates an array of rules for the conduct of one's everyday existence: energy, initiative, ambition, calculation, and personal responsibility. The enterprising self will make an enterprise of its life, seek to maximise its own human capital, project itself a future, and seek to shape itself in order to become that which it wishes to be. The enterprising self is thus both an active self and a calculating self, a self that calculates *about* itself and that acts *upon* itself in order to better itself. Enterprise, that is to say, designates a form of rule that is intrinsically "ethical": good government is to be grounded in the ways in which persons govern themselves. (Rose, 1996, p. 154; author's italics)

Rose (again after Foucault) maintains that these "technologies of the self" are in fact "ethical techniques". "Ethics are thus understood as means by which individuals come to construe, decipher, act upon themselves in relation to the true and the false, the permitted and the forbidden, the desirable and the undesirable" (Rose, 1996, p. 153). The notion of "ethical techniques" or "technologies of the self" is key to understanding the desires and acts of the self-improving, autonomous academic employee of the enterprising university, who was introduced in chapter 1. In the next section, I will examine and exemplify in more detail the implications of Rose's theorising in terms of academic identity, in combination with the identity typology of another key writer in education.

Academic Identities

Rose's theory of identity formation arises out of a broader discussion of the functioning of societies and individuals under "liberal democratic" government – what is also recognised as "academic capitalism" (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), "the new capitalism" (Gee, 2001), "new managerialism" (Deem & Brehony, 2005) or "neo-liberalism" (Davies & Petersen, 2005), the latter being my preferred term in this thesis. Rose's theory of identity formation of the subject who is subject to managerial regimes of power and discourse is helpful for understanding the current situation of university academics. The enterprising individual and indeed the enterprising lecturer must strive for "fulfilment, excellence, and achievement" (Rose, 1996, p. 154), and they are summoned to adopt that teaching identity by technologies that operate through, for example, policy documents such as the government discussion paper entitled "Striving for Quality: Learning, teaching and scholarship" (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002). From the perspective of both university management and the individual lecturer, the ethically proper teacher is someone who speaks the proper discourse/s of university "learning and teaching". The desired conduct is written up of course in the codes of conduct for academic staff.

Codifying Academic Identity

A brief glance at the Code of Conduct that appertained to academic staff at Northern Metropolitan University (approved in 2000; downloaded in 2001) at the time of my most intense communication with NMU participants is confirmatory. The code aims "to promote the highest ethical and moral standards and to foster an understanding of the conduct expected of staff". An initial statement of principles sets out a commitment to certain values that underpin the role of the university – that is, "to create, preserve, transmit and apply knowledge and understanding through teaching, research, creative works and other forms of scholarship". The last of these values (that include "university autonomy" and "intellectual freedom and social responsibility") is identified as "constantly improving the quality and delivery of its services." The commitment to "quality" is made and the "delivery" metaphor, common in discussions of learning and teaching stands out boldly, resonant with notions such as "delivery modes", and the electronic packaging of material for flexible, off-campus students.

Additionally, and echoing the language of Foucault (1977) and Rose (1996), staff are warned that any breaches of aspects of the code "may fall within the scope of improper conduct and could therefore result in disciplinary action being taken". The risk management intention of the code of conduct is reflected in sections devoted to probity in terms of personal and professional behaviour, conflicts of interest, outside employment, acceptance of gifts and benefits, public comment, union membership, security of official information, use of facilities and equipment, corrupt conduct, maladministration and waste, equity of access and occupational health and safety. Aspects of the NMU Code of Conduct are referenced and repeated *verbatim* in the NMU Academic and Teaching Staff Agreement (2003–2006).

Once upon a time such codes of conduct did not exist in universities. Some academics today would find the very notion, the text and its intention risible. This evidence of a need to regulate academic conduct contrasts with the implied independence of academic life in

pre-managerialist days. “A story is sometimes wistfully repeated within academic circles of an Oxford don who, when referred to as an employee of the university, replied indignantly. ‘Sir we are not *employees* of the university. We *are* the university.’” (Anderson, 2004, p. 185). The posturing is amusing; the effects of change bitterly realised and felt. Academics’ ambitions and desires for improvement, promotion, recognition and reward have been co-opted, and control of them has assumed legitimacy in the name of the rights and responsibilities of academics who these days cannot be trusted to self-manage. Thus we see how the alignment of institutional goals (to control, monitor and measure) with individual aspirations, efforts and desires for autonomy of the self becomes a discursive object of enterprise culture in universities.

Of course, codes of conduct are a rigid replacement and assurance when mutual trust is considered no longer adequate or reliable. An ethics founded on respect and responsibility for the other is perhaps a more traditional way to conduct academic behaviour.

Identity, Infinity and the Face of the Other

However, the discursive teacher identity work that we come to understand from this formulation of “ethical technologies” of the self is only partial and, in my view, it does not take account adequately of the work and relationships that are the stuff of university teaching. While Rose (and Foucault) explain the discursive formation of the individual in social contexts, they do not address the shaping, the recognition and the effects of the other, or close others, nor the Lacanian realisation of oneself as other - to others. For, by definition, a “teacher” has students, and in classrooms and hallways everywhere, teacher and student continue to recognise each other. For James Paul Gee (2001), identity is about “being recognized as a certain kind of person, in a given context” and this notion of “recognition” is referenced to Foucault’ writings on power and discourse. The university lecturer is recognised and positioned – and she positions herself - in relation to significant others in the institutional context: her students, her colleagues, the management and administration of the university, and indeed by many in the wider context of society (eg.

students' parents, industry partners) and government (eg. higher education policy). To shift consciously to the first-person, as a lecturer, I have particular relationships with significant "others" in the institutional context who are necessary to my self-work and identity claims as a lecturer. The presence of the other commands my attention and demands an ethical response. As a teacher of others, my identity is inextricably bound up in my ethical responsibility towards the student.

Here I turn to the profound writings of Emmanuel Lévinas (1906-1995), a Lithuanian who lived for most of his life in France. Lévinas studied under Heidegger and Husserl in 1920s Germany, and his at times obscure phenomenology and philosophical thought was profoundly influenced by the horrors of the Second World War and, in particular, the Holocaust. For Lévinas, ethical subjectivity is grounded in the encounter with the absolute other, who remains "infinitely transcendent, infinitely foreign" (Lévinas, 2002a, p. 515). The other "does not simply mean a sociological "Other" who is marginalised or maligned, nor does it simply signify another person who, as a subject, resembles myself. Simply put, for Lévinas, "the other is what I myself am not" (Todd, 2003, p. 29). The face of the other is an epiphany; it surprises me; it invokes my response and my responsibility. The face maintains a relation with me by discourse.

Learning is change, and learning as pedagogy or formation demands alteration. Following Lévinas, the source and conditions of "alterity" is always to be found in the face of the other, precisely because the other is not what I am, and the other always "brings me more than I contain", or "Infinity".

> The relation with the other who puts into question the brutal spontaneity of one's immanent destiny – introduces into me what was not in me…. A being receiving the idea of Infinity, receiving since it cannot derive it from itself… a being whose very existing consists in this incessant reception of teaching, in this incessant overflowing of self (which is time). (Lévinas, 2002a, p. 522)

Time for the other, "being-for-the-Other", responsibility for the other – such are the ideas of the ethics of responsibility that Lévinas advances. Because he often refers to the ethical relation as a teaching relation, Lévinas' ideas also resonate with educational theorists, although they are still largely untested in terms of online education, with perhaps the notable exception of Zembylas and Vrasidas (2005).

The Excellent, Enterprising Academic

> Despite the rather discouraging picture that surrounds them, many university teachers are teaching excellently and many teachers are learning to teach excellently…. It is up to us as teachers to take control of improving university teaching, especially by listening respectfully to our students about how we can help them to learn…. There can be no excellent teaching and learning unless teachers and learners delight in what they are doing. (Ramsden, 2003, p. 253)

From the site of academic development I have observed an interesting linguistic, discursive shift in terms of how university teaching and teachers are valued. As I mentioned in chapter 1, the hegemonic literature on higher education – phenomenography - has for several decades promulgated the notion of the "good teacher" who is intent on improving student learning. The teleology is commonsense, the moral appeal to enhance learning difficult to resist, and there is even a trace of transcendental virtue in the mortification of the teacherly self in aid of the student who must learn properly, more, better. Of late the language and the moral emphasis have intensified. One is no longer just expected to be a "good teacher"; now the lecturer is being exhorted to become "excellent". Readings (1996) has written about *the idea* of excellence in universities, and his comments offer another perspective on the quote by Ramsden that introduced this section.

> The need for excellence is what we all agree on. And we all agree upon it because it is not an ideology, in the sense that it has no external referent or internal content. Today all

> departments of the University can be urged to subscribe to excellence, since the general applicability of the notion is in direct relation to its emptiness. (Readings, 1996, pp. 23)

> Its very lack of reference allows excellence to function as a principle of translatability between radically different idioms: parking services and research grants can each be excellent, and their excellence is not dependent on any specific qualities or effects that they share. (Readings, 1996, pp. 24)

Excellence seems to be a certain, perfect state, yet it is essentially unachievable due to its emptiness in these uncertain times. In academic contexts, the excellent, enterprising academic manages her teacher identity according to particular practices focussed on self-improvement and professional development such as developing and meeting (indeed exceeding) performance indicators, promotion criteria, learning and teaching awards criteria, indices of scholarship in research and teaching. The two processes at NMU which make the greatest demands on academic staff performatively are the guidelines for Academic Promotions (2003) and the performance indicators that were used to guide the performance management process for academic staff in 2002-2003.

The first of the three principles that guided academic promotions at NMU in 2003 states that "the University is committed to recognising and rewarding sustained excellence in it staff by providing opportunities for promotion". While there is no express reference to flexible and online learning and teaching, amongst the Criteria for Progression (at levels A and B) listed under "Teaching Experience" we find reference to teaching/supervision "in different styles and settings". Similarly under "Good Practice in Teaching", it is noted that staff will have "implemented improvements/innovations in teaching".

The Price of Excellence

So, to meet the demands of the changing, corporate university, academics need to become "excellent" teachers, which means, amongst other things, being visibly enterprising, risk-

conscious, self-auditing individuals (McWilliam, 2004; McWilliam et al., 1999). Commentators such as Land (2005b) and McWilliam (2004) have also noted how one's enterprising work is, and needs to be, rendered visible to all. The individual academic has to be seen to be doing her research and teaching properly. She will report on her work and self-rate her performance in annual personal performance reviews. Curriculum and assessment practices must be documented and archived. She might be required to participate in collective, Faculty-wide reviews. This academic must also create and write convincing depictions of her achievements. Effectively, she must "perform" herself, taking care to align her claimed excellence and reported activities with job descriptions, and performance and tenure criteria. The excellent, enterprising academic is the Institutional-identity (or I-identity; Gee, 2001) that is preferred and sanctioned in universities currently, the desired academic identity that is supported by a host of "technologies" that are designed to measure and display the abilities of the enterprising individual.

In submitting to such mechanisms and technologies the academic is being "made over", but not without some cost. According to Ball (2003), "impression management" (and, with Blackmore and Sachs (1997), I would argue "emotional management") are critical tasks of "making oneself over" so as to be seen to present the proper Institutional-identity (Gee, 2001). As a technology, the fabrication of academic identity in such ways becomes a set of practices to be sustained, and lived up to. Even as one reshapes one's image (and puts on a suit and stockings), utters the proper, (empty) words, completes a report ahead of time (to impress) and reviews one's performance goals for an annual performance review (picking one's words very carefully), there are personal and psychological costs. Ball (2003) suggests that in the process, neo-liberal, managerialist cultures are replacing values with value. One way for an academic to "value-add" in the interests of excellence and enterprise is to engage with innovations in learning (and teaching). Making the move online is an evidently advantageous, enterprising practice.

The Inevitability of ICT

As discussed in the previous chapter, Australian higher education policy on learning and teaching pays no mind to the work of lecturers. Curiously, while managerialist practices in universities render the textualised work (planning, teaching notes, assessment, evaluation) of teaching more visible and ready for measurement and judgement, the work of teaching is not acknowledged in policy. The themes of "the student focus" discourse - the student as client, as flexible learner, and as the central subject of phenomenographic research - appear to be working in unison to decentre the teaching academic. Indeed, in recent Australian federal learning (and teaching) documents, the university teacher has been all but erased, as a result of a discursive reversal that has brought learners and learning to the fore of higher education pedagogy, policy and development activities.

From the perspective of government and institutional policy, ICT is viewed as a solution to implied bad teaching practice. Online learning in particular is an "innovation" and way to open up access to more "customers", a way to improve student learning, a way to offer them more flexible means of study. McWilliam (2002) makes the point that the new imperative to adopt practices of "flexible delivery" is predicated on "the assumption that academics are deficient as teachers" (McWilliam, 2002, p. 295), and it is ICT that will remediate that deficiency. Clegg, Hudson and Steel (2003) have noted how the irresistible power of globalisation and the determining effects of technology have resulted in presenting the acceptance of e-learning throughout the education system as inevitable. "The space left for practitioners in Higher Education is to either embrace the new media enthusiastically or to stand aside and watch its inevitable unfolding…. One of the attendant dangers of globalisation myths is that they present the future as inevitable and ride rough-shod over counter-tendencies or evidence of continuities (Clegg et al., 2003, pp. 39-40)." The "technological imperative" (Thompson & Holt, 1996) – the integration of ICT in all aspects of university work and study - is represented as unquestionably cool and inexorable. Students expect it - campus myth holds that students are more technologically-oriented, computer literate and connected to ICT than older academic staff. ICT intensifies

work, with university managers imagining that ICT will allow more to be done with less. The majority of the academics "making the move" in Taylor and colleagues' (1996, p. 49) study "perceived flexible learning as being advocated from an economic rationalist perspective – 'a government/management push to increase student numbers with reduced economic outlay'". Similar suspicions are reported in a number of other studies (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2003; Fox & Herrmann, 2000; Taylor et al., 1996; Willmot & McLean, 1994). Brabazon articulates the bitter sentiment of many academics. "The skills being developed in our age include how to teach larger classes and be more entrepreneurial…. Technology is framed as a cheaper, more efficient replacement of university teachers" (Brabazon, 2001, p. 3).

Of course some writers (such as Coaldrake and Stedman, 1998, 1999) in the field have advocated online learning as a solution to bad teaching, an argument which has not gone unnoticed by some university deans and managers. Over the past decade increasing numbers of universities and departments have required teaching staff to develop an online presence for all or part of their subjects (Ham & Davey, 2005). This was the case for the Humanities faculty participants at NMU in the present study, where some academics reported requests from students for more online instruction, often because their colleagues were using ICT, and students wanted it to be expanded within the program. Sometimes it is simply "strategic" to make the move online, especially if the course itself is about flexible, online and/or distance education (Campbell-Gibson, 2000). In my study, Hilary, felt it was good practice to give her students the experience of online communication in her Business Communications subjects. From the academics' perspective, it helps if ICT might be an interest. If one also enjoys tinkering with technology and learning new IT skills then the alignment of personal desires and managerial imperatives is strengthened. Thompson and Holt (1996) identify both pleasures and frustrations in online practice on the part of "technology enthusiast" academic staff.

Given these contextual factors, it is not surprising that academics feel the pressure of expectations from a number of quarters to make the move online. Academics may not be being coerced directly, but the pressure to be excellent, innovative, and to be seen to be engaging with proper teaching practices is there. Going online is a proper, student-centred practice, an inevitable move, particularly if the academic seeks advancement and recognition.

What do we know about academics' perceptions and experiences of the move online? In the coming sections, I will critically analyse the emerging literature that reports on changed role and identity for teaching staff who "make the move" online in post-secondary higher education.

The Lecturer Who Makes the Move Online

Much of the literature that discusses academics' experiences of the move online assumes the inevitability of online education and, in the process, is negligent of the moral impact on lecturers and students. Oliver's (2002) enthusiasm is typical of much uncritical acceptance of ICT in university learning and teaching.

> There have been a number of factors impeding the wholesale uptake of ICT in education across all sectors. These have included such factors as a lack of funding to support the purchase of the technology, a lack of training among established teaching practitioners, a lack of motivation and need among teachers to adopt ICT as teaching tools [Starr, 2001]. But in recent times, factors have emerged which have strengthened and encouraged moves to adopt ICTs into classrooms and learning settings. These have included a growing need to explore efficiencies in terms of program delivery, the opportunities for flexible delivery provided by ICTs [eg. Oliver & Short, 1997]; the capacity of technology to provide support for customized educational programs to meet the needs of individual learners [eg. Kennedy & McNaught, 1997]; and the growing use of the Internet and the WWW as tools for information access and communication [eg. Oliver & Towers, 1999]. (Oliver, 2002, pp. 1-2)

Teachers who lack motivation or need for ICT "tools" beware! There are powerful factors (discourses) out there that make the adoption of ICT hard to resist - including some familiar ones raised in the first chapter of this thesis ("efficiencies", "flexible delivery", meeting the needs of learners). While many authors appreciate the affordances, intricacies and potential of new technologies, they do not stop to acknowledge or critique the values that underlie the technology or innovation that they seek to study. At this point in the development of my thesis, I want to draw attention to how teacher identities are discussed and labelled in the literature in ICT and university teaching and learning. As part of this discussion I will discuss the various attitudes that emerge towards university lecturers – attitudes of sympathy, hostility, oversight. The issues for academics in coming to grips with new technologies (learning new skills, new teaching practices, workload, disorientation and fragmentation) will be reviewed, along with some initial reflections about the re-designation of the teacher as an online facilitator.

The Traditional Lecturer

> Students can no longer be assumed to be sufficiently gifted to learn for themselves in the face of indifferent teaching (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1999, p. 3).

In the literature that discusses academics' experiences of making the move online, there are some curious common assumptions about the identities and teaching practices of the "un-technologised" or pre-online lecturer. Some writers view the unreconstructed, face-to-face teacher as a content or subject expert (Berge, 1995; Miers, 1989; Morrison, 1999; Torrisi & Davis, 2000) who dispenses and transmits information or delivers content (Dahlgren, 1998; Mandinach & Cline, 1994; Naidu & Cunningham, 2004). A transmission model of teaching is commonly assumed, in the same manner that it was implied in the recent Australian higher education teaching and learning policy documents. Put plainly, if ICT is good, then by implication, former practices (traditional, face-to-face teaching) were bad. Academics are aware of this assumption and some feel threatened. Taylor and colleagues reported an

anxiety amongst some of the participants in their study that "because a particular practice is called 'flexible', it must be better than what academics are already doing – which may be traditional, but not necessarily less effective" (Taylor et al., 1996).

Studies that are more "technicist" in tone (those more favourably disposed towards ICT and less critical of management agendas) tend to exhibit little sympathy for the academic who must make the move online, and there is little attempt to appreciate and explore academics' concerns and attitudes. The thinly veiled coda is that these old-fashioned teachers need to move on (-line)! Indeed, academics' concerns and fears are usually regarded as a "barrier" in such writing (see for example: Boddy, 1997; BECTA, 2004; Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998). Coaldrake and Stedman (1998) allude to the "problem" of previous bad teaching practice in their (remarkably) titled chapter: "Teaching: From Side Show to Main Event".

> Put bluntly, there is a view that some students studying at universities are not up to the challenge. However, part of the problem undoubtedly lies with teaching methods, and with the difficulty in providing students with education that suits their own particular requirements and abilities. (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998, p. 76)

Coaldrake and Stedman (1998) share that blunt view about students with notable implications for the teacher, as they later reveal. "Some students either from innate ability, motivation, or because they have been well educated, are better able to cope without close interaction from a teacher. Others need more help" (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998, p. 107). The authors go so far as to suggest that in an ICT-based curriculum, teaching might be reduced to remedial support for students who struggle. These quotes also reveal a troubling naïveté about the nature of teaching, learning and pedagogical interaction in higher education. Putting to one side their determinist values about learners, there is the suggestion that interaction is to be seen as a remedial educational strategy. Diana Laurillard (2000) makes a similar case, arguing that the use of new technologies in teaching and learning will resolve some of the "educational tensions" she sees focussed on academics

and universities. She suggests that new technologies could be used to provide a more responsive curriculum, solving implicit tensions to do with "how we teach, as much as what we teach" (Laurillard, 2000, p. 138-9). By implication, university lecturers are not being responsive enough to their students.

While Coaldrake and Stedman (1999) might allege "indifferent teaching", there are other more sophisticated views of the traditional, face-to-face teacher, who is characterised as enabling dialogue through the setting up of authentic tasks (Matuga, 2001) and as "an informal presenter or discussion leader" (James & Beattie, 1995). Other writers in the change-focussed literature on ICT identify the face-to-face lecturer as a performer or actor (McVay-Lynch, 2002; Morrison, 1999), an oracle (Conrad, 2004; Goodyear, 2001), a monk (Kirkup, 2001; McWilliam, 2004 - both with notable irony), and the archetypal "sage on the stage" (Asensio, Whatley & Jones, 2001; Rogers, 2000; Terrell, 2000). As these labels might suggest, the traditional teacher is also recognised in some contexts as a lonely, isolated or secluded character (Anderson, 2004; Bashir, 1998; Churchman, 2006; Cranton & Carusetta, 2002; Goodyear, 2001; McLoughlin, 2000), who works with sacred texts, scripts and/or knowledge. Conrad (2004) points out, too, that the "discussion of the role of ego in university teaching often does not occur or is hidden in more politically-gentle, elevated discussions of professionalism." This observation morphs into a discussion of teacher control over students in the classroom, and the "letting go" that is necessary when one facilitates collaborative learning. Notions of teacher authority and control also emerge in other studies (Goodyear, 2001; Mandinach & Cline, 1994; Miller & Olson, 1994; Reeves, 2001). In a case study of online teaching and learning at the University of Southern Queensland, online lecturers "expressed concern about losing control of what they perceived to be their roles and even their rights (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2003, p. xvi). In discussing the "misgivings and concerns of academic staff in the face of open and flexible learning, Bashir (1998, pp. 43-44) notes that the focus on user choice and learner autonomy "moves the 'centre of gravity' away from the tutor and closer

to the student. Such a shift is seen by many academics as a loss of control and power which can lead to feelings of uncertainty, inadequacy and anxiety".

Turning to Gee's (2001) identity typology again, it is possible to appreciate how these character-full labels are easily recognised and ascribed as Discourse-identities (D-Identities); the discussions in which they appear tend to suggest that they are not institutionally authorised I-identities. This gap between self-ascription and institutional authorisation represents a space of discursive and representational tension in terms of academic identity. Significantly, in the present study, a number of participants spoke of their teaching as metaphoric performance and acting, and indeed in my analysis of academics' experience teaching, I will examine in depth how the metaphorical performer transitions to online teaching.

Having revealed a range of views about the traditional, "un-technologised" teacher that are indifferent to, or that denigrate, her teaching role and identity, I will now turn to examine how academics' attitudes to the "technological imperative", flexible learning and online teaching are described in the literature that reports on the move online.

Academics' Attitudes to the "Technological Imperative"

There have been a number of studies that identify and discuss academics' attitudes and stances on ICT in university teaching and learning. What is interesting about this literature is firstly how it categorises and, in some cases, judges academics and, secondly, how it acknowledges (or not) the affective responses of academics.

The most commonly mentioned attitudinal type in the literature is the "technology enthusiast" (Thompson & Holt, 1997) or "innovator" (Levenburg & Major, 2000; Taylor et al., 1996) who happily tinkers with technology in an unintimidated, experimental manner, and who is optimistic about the potential of technology to improve student learning and higher education more generally. Levenburg and Major (2000) also discuss the "early

adopters" and "late majority adopters". However, Fox and Herrmann (2000) have criticised such categories (they themselves identify the innovators, the early adopters, the early and late majority, and the laggards) as implying a sequence and a chronology that does not represent their experience of how academic staff take up ICT. They propose a set of stances that they argue is more sensitive to context than the labels more commonly used to describe academics' attitudes. Working from case studies of individual academics, Fox and Herrmann (2000) identify instead five "archetypal stances" of academics toward online educational technology. The *Neutralitarian* believes that online approaches make no significant difference to learning or curriculum, but online teaching is a tool that can improve efficiency. The *Booster* is of the view that the new online approaches will improve learning and make education more effective and efficient. On-going developments in online technology are perceived as inherently good and non-problematic, and they offer solutions to many teaching and learning problems. The *Oppositional* is concerned that technology over-simplifies complex teaching and learning processes and practices. The danger is that ultimately, machines will take the place of teachers. For the *Sceptic* there is a significant gap between the rhetoric and reality of online practices. The Sceptic is hesitant to use technology unless the advantages in so doing are obvious. The *Transformationalist* is convinced that online approaches radically change teaching and learning processes and curricula. In their case study of flexible learning in one UK university, Willmot and McLean (1994) observed that academics staff were cautious and suspicious about the introduction of flexible learning practices. Of course Fox and Herrmann acknowledge that, "Any changes in teaching practices can be threatening, even frightening, to staff when it takes them beyond their accustomed practices" (2000, p. 84). Yet, I feel equally cautious – and sceptical - about Fox and Herrman's claim that their framework of stances will assist staff to become "more aware, more critical users of technology" as well as providing academic developers with a framework and a strategy to help teachers to adopt ICT "in pedagogically appropriate ways". The process and logic are not specified.

Stepping back for a moment, I begin to wonder how this self-labelling might be helpful in changing practice. I wonder about the purpose and point of identifying myself, for example, and I feel reluctant to opt for one essential label. In light of my discussion of identity earlier in this chapter, I might want to claim different identities in different contexts, and indeed I might well claim several overlapping identities at once. For example, I'm not sure that realising that I am a "sceptic" or a "neutralitarian" helps me to change my ways if I am a wary, stressed Humanities academic, asked by the faculty dean to put more of my course online because my colleagues have already done so, and because the faculty requires "an enhanced web presence" for its programs. Kirkpatrick (2001) makes the point succinctly.

> I believe that we must be careful not to generalize about "staff" or to view staff simply as categories such as resisters, disciples or gurus and that we not assume academics to be passive in the process. It is essential to make academics' values, attitudes and responses to change visible if real cultural change is to occur. Trowler [1998] highlights the importance of hearing the stories of academics and realising that those involved in change in higher education are both actors and audience. (Kirkpatrick, 2001, p. 175)

McLoughlin (2000) has also commented on this in a similar vein.

> Not surprisingly, teachers do not always take up new technology and pedagogy with alacrity. This should not be considered as resistance to change, but as an expressed need to be consulted and included in decision-making processes, while being trained and inducted into new forms of practice. (McLoughlin, 2000, p. 118)

As I will explain in more detail in my next chapter, which sets out my methodology and methods for this study, I agree with both Kirkpatrick and McLoughlin, in terms of the stress they place upon "hearing the stories of academics", and consulting and including them in decision-making processes respectively. However "consulting and including" seems less

realistic in the present climate of regulation and top-down management practices, and indeed McLouglin's comments about academics being "trained and inducted" illustrates perfectly the critical point that I have been making in these introductory chapters that, by adopting ICT-based teaching practices, academics are being domesticated and regulated into certain kinds of identities by neo-liberal, managerialist cultures. In the next section I want to return to the practices of naming in the literature that discusses academics and the move to flexible and online learning. As I shall show, there are some common themes and interesting metaphorical teacher identities being advanced to describe the new, enterprising (online) academic.

The Metaphors of Online Teaching

In this section I will describe how the role shift from traditional to online teacher is described in the literature on ICT in university teaching (and learning). Metaphors abound, and there are patterns or groupings for these, yet their significance and the implications for academic work are rarely plumbed in any substantial way.

In 1995, Zane Berge published a comprehensive list of labels for the "technologised" or online teacher. This act of collation drew on his own work and acknowledge that of others in the field: *assistant, chairman, consultant, community organiser, coordinator, discriminator, discussion leader, editor, entertainer, (content) expert, explainer, facilitator, filter, fire-fighter, goals setter, helper, host, intermediary, leader, lecturer, manager, marketer, mediator, mentor, observer, pace-setter, participant, promoter, provocateur, tutor*. Clearly online teaching involves diverse roles and demands! In the same paper he summarises these functions into the four key role categories of the online facilitator - Pedagogical, Social, Managerial, Technical (Berge, 1995; Berge & Collins, 1996; Verneil & Berge, 2000). This is a framework that is oft cited (Bunker & Vardi, 2001; Conrad, 2004; Wiesenberg, 2000) and used by some (Asensio et al. 2001; Youngblood et al., 2001) as a frame of analysis. Along the same lines, Gilly Salmon (2000) has identified the *Pedagogical* and *Technical* roles in her five-step guide for online discussion moderators.

Berge's roles define the work of the online moderator in four ways. The *Pedagogical* role is focussed on the intellectual work and tasks to be conducted online. The educational facilitator uses questions and probes for student responses that focus discussions on critical concepts, principles, and skills. The *Social* role requires the teacher to create a friendly environment in which learning is promoted through the establishment and maintenance of relationships, the fostering of group cohesiveness, and helping members to work together in a mutual cause. The *Managerial* role is focussed on organisational, procedural, and administrative tasks. This leadership role involves "setting the agenda" for any conference or communication including the objectives of the discussion, the timetable, the rules, and decision-making norms. With a *Technical* focus, the online facilitator makes participants comfortable with the system and the software, with the ultimate technical goal of making the technology "transparent".

In this and subsequent papers (Berge, 1995, 1997; Berge & Collins, 2000), Berge refers to the online teacher as a "moderator" or "facilitator", and indeed this is the term and the notion that emerges most frequently in the literature to describe the online teacher or lecturer. This appellation is close to ubiquitous (see for example: Asensio et al., 2001; Brabazon 2001; Brown, 1998; Bunker & Vardi, 2001; Conrad, 2004; Galusha, 2001; Gunn, 2001 Harasim et al., 1995; Hiltz, 1997; James & Beattie, 1995; McLoughlin, 2000; McVay-Lynch, 2002; Mandinach & Cline, 1994; Miers, 1989; Miller & Olson, 1994; Morrison, 1999; Naidu & Cunningham, 2004; Reeves, 2001; Steeples et al., 1996; Terrell, 2000; Torrisi & Davis, 2000; Youngblood et al., 2001). In online environments the traditional teacher becomes a "facilitator".

A facilitator facilitates using facilities.

In a climate of technological inevitability, most authors describe the *online* teacher identity - of themselves, or of others - as a facilitator. The use of the term facilitator appears to distinguish what is done online (facilitation) as different from what is/was done face-to-face (teaching). Interestingly, writers in the field of ICT-enhanced learning and teaching

rarely describe the pre-online or face-to-face, traditional teacher role as facilitatory. Rather, the traditional teacher is a "sage on the stage", "performer", or a "subject expert", as previously mentioned. This shift of terms in the literature on ICT in university learning and teaching is curious, given the general focus on the facilitation of student learning in educational research and practice in the final decades of the twentieth century in particular. (See for example: Brookfield, 1986; Heron, 1989; and Rogers, 1961, 1981, 1990). Indeed, in universities throughout the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, scholarly research and practice have advocated facilitation rather than teaching, and this has been tied to an explicit, student-focussed agenda. "The concept of the facilitator of learning now exercises something of a conceptual stranglehold on our notions of correct educational practice, and to talk of the role of the teacher, or of teaching as a function is unfashionable and distasteful to some educators of adults" (Brookfield, 1986, p. 123).

The term facilitator is a very proper descriptor, but it is difficult to acknowledge it functionally as metaphor[2], in the same way as the "performer", the "carer" and the creative "director" will be described later in this thesis. Compared with these relatively rich, multi-faceted metaphors, the facilitator is a less elaborated role concept - socially, historically and rhetorically. Outside of educational environments the term is context-free. The term is an empty cipher – that has no fixed or remembered signified. A facilitator facilitates (something, someone) using facilities. And of course the etymological origin of the signifier cannot go unnoticed. Facilitators presumably make learning easy - indeed uneasily *facile* - for their students.

It was the Californian counsellor and educationalist, Carl Rogers, who first drew a distinction between teaching and facilitation, in his writings on person-centred education in the 1960s and 1970s. Rogers' writings were a significant influence on teacher education (including my own) in English-speaking countries during the 1960s and 1970s. However, as I will show in the coming pages, the term has been co-opted since into adult and higher

[2] The definition, relevance and use of metaphor in this study are set out in chapter 3, Methodology.

education contexts with a somewhat different cast - ideally to suggest a commitment to student-centred learning. Rogers expressed the firm view that teachers, as facilitators, would relate *as persons* to their students.

> Those attitudes that appear effective in promoting learning can be described. First of all is a transparent realness in the facilitator, a willingness to be a person, to be and live the feelings of the moment. When this realness includes a prizing, a caring, a trust and respect for the learner, the climate of learning is enhanced. When it includes a sensitive and accurate empathic listening, then indeed a freeing climate, stimulative of self-initiated learning and growth, exists. The student is trusted to develop. (Rogers, 1990, p. 321)

This quote suggests that Rogers' conception of facilitation was not that far removed from my own analysis of the carer-lecturer (see chapter 6) and, indeed, Rogers' views on education were intimately bound up with his work as a counsellor and therapist. Noddings (2003) reveals a more pragmatic, schools-focussed perspective. Her insights were derived from motherhood and teaching experience, and she drew particular boundaries around teacher responsibilities toward the other, the student. Referring here to the student-centred views of the educators Neill and Rogers, Noddings wrote:

> In their [Neill and Rogers'] views, the teacher must wait for the student to display interest before working with him to establish and attain particular objectives. But I would not hesitate to teach that which I, as teacher, believe the student should know if he is to be credited with mastery of a particular set of topics. Throughout the process, however, I would accept his attitude toward the subject, adjust my requirements in light of his interest and ability, and support his efforts non-judgementally. He must be aware that for me he is more important, more valuable, than the subject. In our discussion of teaching, we shall see that the teacher properly influences and, also, quite properly plays a role in evaluation[3]. (Noddings, 2003, p. 174)

[3] In non-North American educational contexts, the term "evaluation" is understood to mean the "assessment" of student learning.

The final sentence of this quote hints at one of the slippages between the meaning and use of the term facilitator – for the facilitator can never offer a truly open, negotiated curriculum, if she is in the employ of an accrediting or certifying authority, such as a government department of education, or a university. Thus Rogers' definition of the facilitator who abdicates control and power to the learner, appears to be no longer relevant, nor possible, in the contemporary educational institution. Was it ever possible?

> Who has the essential power and control? It is clear that it is the learner, or the learners as a group, including the facilitator-learner…. The facilitator relinquishes control over others, retaining control over only herself…. The learner is the center. (Rogers, 1990, p. 328)

It is more likely the case at the present time that many lecturers, some of whom might prefer to be called (online) facilitators, are employed, authorised and monitored by their enterprising institutions to conduct teaching in very particular and regulated ways. Policies, codes of conduct, and collegial learning and teaching committees (for example), oversee and stipulate what the well-meaning facilitator can and cannot do in terms of designing, teaching and assessing student learning. As Boud (2005) has noted, "even today, it is possible to find bold aspirational language about student-centredness within courses circumscribed by oppressive assessment practices" (Boud, 2005, p. 31). A truly negotiated curriculum, dependent on the inclinations and abilities of the student (much as Rogers' original facilitator would have enacted) seems unlikely. In the end, the university facilitator is accountable for overseeing the return of results that will produce uncertain futures for students. And so, at a time when curriculum, teaching and assessment in universities are being regulated to a greater extent by university management, it would seem that the facilitator role, as conceived by Rogers some decades ago, might be empty and impossible.

Yet "facilitator" is a discursively attractive label for the aspiring lecturer to adopt so as to suggest excellence in teaching in the contemporary university. Berge (1997, p. 38) thinks so. "I also believe that online teachers have chosen to use interactive technologies as an

expression of their own learner-centred orientation to teaching". According to Gee's (2001) conception of educational identities, the facilitator is both a safe and cosy Discourse-identity and a proper Institution-identity and, following the ideas of Rogers, calling oneself a facilitator at least signals student-centredness.

Thus it appears that in ICT-enhanced (online) learning and teaching, the term facilitator has been co-opted to signify the proper, innovative online lecturer who is student-centred. But is the shift from (face-to-face) lecturer or teacher to (online) facilitator just a matter of words, or does this shift carry deeper implications for the signified teacher in higher education contexts? In fact, in the literature on ICT in university learning and teaching a very suggestive set of parallel metaphors and co-terms appear alongside the facilitator, to give some substance to what is effectively an empty cipher. The online facilitator is named by these other identities, and it is these identities that might also suggest the real work of facilitation. In the literature at least, the work of the online academic is described in rich and suggestive metaphors, which I have categorised into four broad categories: *(Middle) Manager, Content Expert and Resource, Guide (mentor, coach, adviser, consultant), and Learner*. In the coming sections, I will review the evidence for the construction of these categories. I will discuss what the literature reveals about the functions, as well as the implications, of these identities for the excellent, enterprising lecturer who, as an online facilitator, becomes more vulnerable to the discursive grooming and attention/s of university management.

Of Guides, Learners, Content Experts, Resources and (Middle) Managers

As I established in the previous section, the facilitator is an excellent, enterprising teacher identity, for it implies a student-centred focus. Indeed the categories (guide, learner, content expert, resource, and middle manager) that I have developed to organise the metaphors for online teaching offer very specific perspectives on how one conducts oneself as an online teacher with a student focus. In this section I will distil from the literature

what is known about the impact of those roles (and their constituent metaphors) in terms of new academic identities.

Becoming a guide and mentor – and standing aside.

> The instructor is performing much more as a one-on-one mentor for the student than in the traditional classroom. (McVay-Lynch, 2002, p. 74)

Role descriptors in the research in this category included: mentor, guide, coach, helper, adviser and counsellor, assistant, consultant, critical adviser (Asensio et al., 2001; Berge, 1995; Berge & Collins, 2000; Choden, 2000; Conrad, 2004; Galusha, 2001; Goodyear, 2001; Gunn, 2001; James & Beattie, 1995; McLoughlin, 2000; McVay-Lynch, 2002; Mandinach & Cline, 1994; Miers, 1989; Reeves, 2001; Rogers, 2000; Terrell, 2000).

As mentioned before, there is frequent reference in the literature that describes the shift the teacher makes from being that of "a sage on the stage" to "a guide on the side". However, the implication in this simplistic shift of metaphors is that that the non-online, "un-technologised" teacher - "the sage on the stage" – is a fixed and absolute role. The possibility for one to act in multiple roles and, for example, to act also as a guide to students, when one descends from the stage, is not given credence. The "guide on the side" suggests a different relationship between teacher and student/s. When the lecturer steps down from the stage and stands at the side, one is on a more equal footing with the students. The academic as "guide on the side" is not located within the audience, but standing aside, she watches the students in the audience as they engage in (unspecified, assume constructivist) learning activities. It is anticipated that students will call over the lecturer-guide for expert advice and counsel. The guide or mentor is more accessible to students (Brabazon, 2001; Young, 2002) and communicates with them frequently. "I give more written (online) feedback to students per assignment than I ever received from most of my teachers in the Masters program I completed two years ago" observes (Lowe, 1999, p. 1). Some writers have asserted that students dislike working in isolation in online and

distance education programs, and they want to be able to access, as immediately as possible, a "virtual" academic (Brabazon, 2001, 2002; Conrad, 2004; Mazzarol & Hosie, 1997; Oliver & Omari, 1999; Young, 2002). On this matter, it is interesting to note that the initiation of access or contact has shifted from the teacher to the student. The suggestion is that, rather than initiating learning activities, the academic must now wait until called.

The "guide on the side" thus experiences a shift in the tempo and timing of teaching and learning. This shift has also been reported in relation to the move to electronic modes of teaching (Clegg et al., 2003). Benfield (2000) has observed that the isolation and "radically different tempo" of online learning are disorienting for many academics. The lecturer has to develop her online voice and persona, learn to use language thoughtfully, and "read" and accept silences online. That is, she has to learn new ways of commenting from the (metaphorical) wings, using text-based communication, which requires "a strong conscious effort, planning, forethought, time" (Benfield, 2000, p 4). As a case in point, the student teachers in Ham and Davey's (2005) study found the task of sending assignments online confronting, and the academic staff and students involved in the program found the rhythm of giving and receiving feedback uncomfortable and unsettling.

As a guide online, the facilitator can find herself communicating with students after hours, on weekends and from home and other sites outside the lecture theatre, seminar room and university office (Young, 2002). This increased accessibility in terms of both time and space can become a workload trap. As one of Young's academic case study participants said, "It's exhausting. You're essentially teaching every day of the semester." Kirkup (2001, p. 77) wrote despairingly, "I felt tired and exploited…. There was no joy in this elision of work and leisure, in the dissolution of the boundary between my private time and my teaching time". To be a mentor and guide to students in their learning is an attractive identity to claim for an academic aspiring to excellence in these times of student-centred flexible learning. However, standing in the wings of student learning, the experienced face-

to-face academic may well feel she is now at the beck and call of students. Feeling displaced and disoriented, she must adapt to a changed timing and pace of teaching and learning.

Becoming a learner – and losing control.

A number of commentators have noted a generalised shift from teaching to learning that is taking place with the integration of ICT in university programs (Brown, 1998; Goodyear, 2001; McVay-Lynch, 2002; Reeves, 2001; Rogers, 2000). This shift to learning is not just expressed as a student-focus. Indeed there is substantial evidence in the literature that the ones who are learning are the newly-ordained facilitators. These learner-facilitators are also recognised by some writers as learning alongside their own students as "learning partners" (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2003), "participants" (Berge, 1995) or "fellow travellers" (Miers, 1989).

To integrate ICT into existing pedagogical practices, an academic has to learn about and become familiar with new software, new "tools", and new technical practices. If the lecturer decides to integrate CMC (email, discussion lists, chat), then she needs time to assess the pedagogical affordances and implications, as well as consider how the interactive online activities will integrate with on-campus, face-to-face learning. The lecturer becomes a learner by attending training workshops focussed on, for example, learning skills in moderating collaborative learning (Hiltz, 1997). In researching the technological options and in developing the technical and pedagogical expertise to implement ICT, the university teacher thus becomes a learner. Collaboration with peers – and students (Brown, 1998) – can play a large part in this shift. The lecturer might work as part of a project team, or rely on others (eg. non-academic technical staff and instructional designers), for support. Hoffman (2001) advised his colleagues, "Be a follower rather than an early adopter of technology so that you will have colleagues to help you learn". The enterprising academic knows that communication skills are all-important in this endeavour. Sound communication skills will be necessary in order to encourage thoughtful, inclusive participation in online

discussions (Goodyear, 2002), and there is a good chance that the online facilitator will learn alongside her students for, according to McVay-Lynch (2002) the lecturer undergoes a transformation to being a learner through managing and engaging in online discussions and communication. Another aspect of academic learning that is mentioned but remains under-explored in the literature on ICT and university teaching is pedagogical learning. There is some reporting of this in isolated case studies and in self-study literature, in which lecturers reflect on, and learn more about, their own teaching (and learning) as a consequence of the making move online (Campbell-Gibson, 2000; Dahlgren, 1998; Ham & Davey 2005; Matuga, 2001; Taylor, 1996; Wiesenberg, 2000).

The nature of the role shift from teacher to learner is articulated most clearly in the research into computer-mediated communication (CMC). In online, two-way, communication-based learning environments, teachers become learners, and learners become teachers. Teachers and students work and communicate as peers, and the sustained and supportive online learning relationships which can develop in CMC contexts have been reported extensively. (See, for example: Berge, 1997; Dexter, Anderson & Becker, 1999; Harasim et al.,1995; Hiltz, 1994; Mowrer, 1996; Smith, 2000; Steeples et al., 1996; Taylor et al., 1996).

Associated with this move from being (face-to-face) lecturer to (online) facilitator and learner, some writers have identified a loss of control over curriculum, teaching, and assessment. Indeed a perceived giving-up of control of the learning process is also often the most frightening aspect of online teaching for many academics (Graham & Scarborough, 1999; Lynch & Collins, 2001; McVay-Lynch, 2002; Taylor, 1996), and according to Blackmore (2001), creates a crisis for academic authority. This shift can produce not a little insecurity in terms of having to learn new technical skills, and in the process being challenged to question accepted traditional, pedagogical approaches (Wallace, 2002, p. 203). Bashir has also commented on this.

> The open learning approach, by focussing on used choice and learner autonomy, moves the "centre of gravity" away from the tutor and closer to the student. Such a shift is seen by many academics as a loss of control and power which can lead to feelings of uncertainty, inadequacy and anxiety…. This is particularly applicable to long-serving teaching staff who, over decades have never needed to discuss, negotiate or compromise on any aspect of teaching and learning with their colleagues, much less with students. (Bashir, 1998, pp. 43-44)

When writers make unspecified comments about how the academic faces significant "challenges" to their work, practice and teacher identity in making the move online, I suspect they are often really referring to this loss of control of curriculum and loss of sense of authority as a disciplinary expert. For Bauman (1997) the decline of academic authority is a consequence of the growth of the Internet.

> The opening of the information superhighway revealed, in retrospect, just how much the claimed, and yet more the genuine, authority of the teachers used to rest on their collective monopoly of the sources of knowledge and the no-appeal-allowed policing of all roads leading to such sources. It also showed to what extent that authority depended on the unshared right of the teachers to decide the "logic of learning" – the time sequence in which various bits and pieces of knowledge can and need be ingested and digested. (Bauman, 1997, pp. 23-24)

It seems that someone else must now share "the right of the teachers to decide the 'logic of learning'", and those implicated might include students, cross-disciplinary collaborators, professional accreditation organizations, and departmental and institutional teaching-learning committees. The self-managing, enterprising facilitator must be seen to be inclusive of all stake-holders' perceptions as she prepares and documents the (blended) curriculum, teaching and assessment of her courses with probity. University management has ways ("practices, enunciations and strategies") of ensuring that its teaching staff are

good middle managers of learning. Indeed good managers of student learning are themselves managed.

The online facilitator learns alongside students following their own paths through programs of learning that allow for flexible study and flexible access to all sorts of information. While the academic might still direct students to preferred sources of knowledge by putting selected content online, she can no longer maintain control over specific sources of knowledge. There are now multiple perspectives to manage, and in the Humanities at least, there is more learning involved for the online facilitator who must come to grips with these perspectives, so as to be able to develop and present guiding, interpretive commentaries. One becomes a learner and content expert of a lot more content.

Becoming a content expert and resource – with an exhausting workload.

The online facilitator is also sometimes co-designated in the literature as a "content expert" or "resource" (Asensio et al., 2001; Berge, 1995; Berge & Collins, 2000; Conrad, 2004; Dahlgren, 1998; Jacobs & Cook, 2004; James & Beattie, 1995; Miers, 1989; Reeves, 2001; Terrell, 2000). The facilitator filters and selects information (readings, links, files) for students that is then provided for online access. The presentation of readings, material and content in this way is common in blended programs, where the lecturer then uses face-to-face lectures and seminars for discuss and interpret the material under scrutiny. At one level, this "expert/resource" metaphor supports a view of learning as the one-way "delivery" of knowledge. Yet other views suggest a more active and stimulating dimension to the role. A participant in Dahlgren's study reported that online the teacher became "a pathfinder of the knowledge that the student would acquire" (Dahlgren, 1998, p. 38). Asensio et al. (2001) noted the difficulty faced by tutors who come in to teach someone else's course, and have to take over "someone else's design". Their case study illustrated the fact that "design encapsulates an individual or individuals' view of knowledge and understanding of the students' learning experience", and in some sense expertise and resources do appear to amalgamate into perceptions of the facilitator as an online resource –

though not necessarily inanimate. Reeves (2001) noted that the online facilitator becomes a "resource" both in the sense that sometimes she is consulted by the student, but at other times becomes a student whom others teach.

For the online facilitator, the shadow side of becoming an online "resource" is the increase in workload (Graham & Scarborough, 1999; Hartman, Dzuiban & Moskal, 2001; Lynch & Collins, 2001; Youngblood et al., 2001). There is a significant increase in workload, not just in locating new material, but also in preparing it in appropriate file formats for online delivery, and in up-dating and maintaining it subsequently. Academics fear that, with the move online, the teaching workload will increase and that it will take time away from their research. Indeed research into academics' uptake of ICT appears to justify these fears. There is much to learn; there are new skills and techniques to master (Hiltz, 1997). While she was happy to describe herself as a "bricoleur" and co-learner with her students, Brown (1998) also mentions the large investment of time and effort that was necessary for her to develop an online learning design. Most academic participants in the study conducted by Taylor et al. (1996) said that they had underestimated the time and energy required to complete their new learning designs. In reflecting on his personal experience of the move online, Hoffman noted that "learning new technologies takes time and comes at the expense of other activities…. Extra time spent there [online teaching] slowed down my research activity" (Hoffman, 2001). Hoffman went on to note significant costs, particularly in terms of time - the time needed to learn new technologies, maintenance time and "down-time" due to equipment and systems breakdowns, and time necessary for the up-dating of websites. He emphasised the fact that online courses require more effort and preparation prior to delivery.

There are new demands on the facilitator once the course with its online components is running. The lecturer has to learn how to manage online discussions (Goodyear 2002). Hesketh, Gosper, Andrews and Sabaz (1996) considered that managing this electronic contact and information literacy development would "pose new challenges" for academics.

While the academic participants in Pachnowsky and Jurczyk's (2003) study anticipated that the amount of preparation time would decrease if they were to re-teach the same courses using the same modes, it was very clear from the quantitative data they collected that the on-going, ICT-based, faculty workload increases. Drawing on data from a United States National Education Association survey, Terrell (2000) elaborates on this finding.

> Faculty who had taught their online course more than seven times spent more preparation and delivery time, yet most don't receive a corresponding reduction in workload or increase in pay. In addition, those enhanced e-mail class discussions require more in-depth faculty responses to a greater number of students. More troubling to faculty, additional time spent on classroom responsibilities means less time spent conducting research and writing - the pathway to tenure. (Terrell, 2000, p. 2)

Reflecting on the experiences of six academics, Young (2002, p. 2) stated that "it takes more time to teach in a virtual classroom than in a regular one". Indeed, it was reported in the findings of one case study (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2003) on the adoption of flexible learning practices at one Australian university that the anticipated and actual workload was a source of "physical exhaustion and nervous tension" for academic staff. Writing about the unexpectedly pervasive fears of online teachers in his survey of 36 online, post-secondary teachers, Berge (1998) noted academics' sense of work overload, more so if no account was taken administratively of online teaching commitments.

Growing class sizes exacerbate the perceptions and realities of an increased workload with online teaching (Mazzarol & Hosie, 1997) and in fact respondents in Larose et al's (1999) study expressed the need for compensation for the increase in size and number of the groups they would be teaching. The issue of increased workload has produced calls for incentives, compensation, remuneration, recognition and/or rewards for academic staff (Galusha, 2001; Hartman, Dzuiban & Moskal, 2001; Hiltz, 1997; Pachnowski & Jurczyk,

2003). McVay-Lynch (2002) singled out strategies related to promotion and tenure, publications, release time or overload pay, and course load review, along with an active program of mentoring for faculty making the move.

Clearly it is one thing to become an online facilitator, "expert" and "resource", but the workload is exceptionally demanding. Wallace sums up the implications for the enterprising academic most concisely. "Online teaching is also more 'labour-intensive' because of increased 'customer'/student access and demand for immediate response. Again there looms the spectre of a continuously contributing 'production worker' identity" (Wallace, 2002, pp. 205-206).

The prospect of the academic becoming a "production worker" brings us full circle to matters of employment and industrial flexibility, and the relationship of the individual academic with university management.

Becoming a (middle) manager – responsible to students, accountable to management.

As already quoted and discussed, Coaldrake and Stedman, (1998, 1999) have exhorted academics to shift their teaching practices to "the management and facilitation of student learning", via the uptake of ICT. It is no coincidence that the online facilitator is often equated with being a manager, mentor and mediator. McLoughlin (2000) presents a most succinct analysis that leads to this equation. The suggestion is that the facilitator is some kind of third party intermediary, who mediates between students, and between students and the content and curriculum. Yet in most studies there was little comment on the implications of this shift for academic teacher identity. In fact, if the discourse of flexible learning casts the academic as serving the customer-student, by implication the academic then becomes a customer service operator or manager, ultimately accountable to a higher stratum of management. The academic in effect becomes a middle manager, on the one hand responsible to students and, on the other, accountable to management for the

outcomes of student learning. Thus in my thesis, the manager might also be understood as the “managed”, and such a (middle) manager is not to be confused with the autonomous, creative director of group-based learning whose lecturer identity is described and discussed in the analysis chapters of this thesis.

One consequence of becoming a pedagogical middle manager is that the online facilitator herself becomes managed by the disciplinary mechanisms, or technologies, that support accountability, performance management, and enterprise culture. McLoughlin (2000, pp. 124-125) offers one example of how a lecturer might take advantage of innovation to improve prospects for promotion, by making the products of one’s efforts more available to senior managers and supervisors. In discussing a framework for change management (“Rogers’ [1983] framework for implementation of innovation”), McLouglin’s underlying assumption is that university lecturers want their efforts to be noticed: “Observability: if I do adopt ICT, will my efforts be noticed?” The developer’s proper response appears to be: “Observability: …[the] *UNE Teaching DataBase* is a database of innovative teaching initiatives that have been successfully implemented and can be used in teachers’ portfolios for promotion” (McLoughlin, 2000, p. 125).   Of course, ICT-based and online teaching can be readily archived and accessed for “observation”, measurement and judgement. Wallace (2002) offers an alternative perspective on a similar case, reporting on academics’ outrage at a plan in an Australian university to give IT staff and senior management access to online subjects while they were running.

> This was regarded by academics as an invasion of privacy, by management as a justifiable monitoring. Academics argued that the same level of scrutiny did not apply to lectures, tutorials or teleconferences. Academics maintained that their professionalism was threatened and that increased surveillance was being imposed on online subjects because the technology could facilitate this. (Wallace, 2002, p. 205)

Indeed, as Clegg and colleagues (2003) have noted, rather than making the campus more virtual, the introduction of technology has had an ironic tendency to make the institution's processes and functioning more visible and concrete. The mere possibility of surveillance and its effects, even when not activated, establishes a form of panoptic technology, as proposed by Foucault (1977) in his theorising of discipline, governance and power.

This is a difficult organisational role. The academic as middle manager and facilitator finds herself metaphorically between Scylla and Carybdis – accountable to management and responsible to the all-important student – where avoiding one means increasing the risk from the other. The implications for academics in a time of "student-centred", flexible learning are likely to be significant, and it is academics' experiences of navigating these dire straits that I intend examining in this thesis, with a focus on academics' commitment to student learning and their relationships with their students.

Chapter Review: Academic Identity, Blended Learning, and Teaching

I began this chapter by discussing identity as a discursive process that shifts according to three factors: the individual, social context, and language so that, as Hall put it, "identities are thus points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us" (2002, p. 19). In considering academic identity, I have elaborated on this further by taking up the ideas of Rose (1996) and Gee (2001) to profile the enterprising academic who makes the move to online teaching and so becomes an online "facilitator". This identity is at once a signifier of student-centred excellence and yet, as a metaphor, it is also culturally and socially unrecognisable, unfixed, and context-free. Facilitators facilitate. This is where the other metaphors of online facilitation that emerge in the literature about academics and ICT become useful in fleshing out the identity of the online facilitator: guide, learner, content expert, resource, and middle manager. With each of these facilitatory roles come particular impacts on academic teacher identity that also signal the rise of neo-liberal culture and its attendant managerialist regulation of academic work: changes to the tempo and timing of academic work, loss of pedagogical control, increased

workload, and invisible electronic surveillance that renders all it monitors highly visible, including the texts and products of teaching (and learning).

I find it disturbing that the literature on ICT in higher education is relatively dismissive of academics' concerns and critical of traditional teaching and learning practices. This negativity and blaming do not reflect or address the complexity of university teaching and teacher identity that I have experienced in working with academics who make the move online, usually by blending it with familiar, face-to-face practices. Such attitudes and oversight in the literature offer little hope and fewer strategies to academics struggling with the ontological consequences of the "technological imperative" – in the name of "flexible learning". The increasing surveillance and manipulation of academic work and teacher identities as a consequence of globalisation and neo-liberal managerialist practices in universities requires academics to be more accountable, and their work to be more visible. For the most part, it seems that academics must fall in line with exhortations for change that are loosely and uncritically linked to the notion that ICT and e-learning are inevitable improvements in higher education teaching and learning. Academics who critique or resist the encroachment of ICT find themselves increasingly subject to measures of discipline and domestication, by means of performance criteria and the textual, discursive hurdles that are necessary for promotion and recognition.

For the most part, the literature on ICT and university teaching does not really adopt a critical perspective regarding the corporate university contexts in which academics work. Yet academics are liable to feel uncertain, vulnerable, and fearful in the face of this combination of factors, and my interest is in uncovering more about their teaching values and moral dilemmas in the face of, and in the name of, the technological imperative. What are the implications of becoming a facilitator in the corporate university, from the perspective of university lecturers? In this thesis, the move to facilitating blended learning offers a particular lens though which I will investigate academics' own views on how their teacher selves are being challenged and changed.

In a climate of enterprise, excellence, and flexible, *student-centred learning* in higher education

- How do lecturers conduct their ethical, pedagogical relations with their students? How are these relations enacted through academics' own metaphors for teaching and learning?
- In the transition to online facilitation, how do lecturers maintain their *responsibility* to their students, in terms of their preferred (or new) teaching metaphors?
- In the conduct of their blended teaching, how do academics remain *accountable* to university management in respect of their teaching and teacher identity?

In the next section I will set out the methodology and the methods for this study.

Chapter 3
Methodology

> A certain amount of method is required in order to remove both me and you, or us, from the passivity of perception. (Irigaray, 2001, p. 46)

Introduction: Theoretical Framework

In the previous two chapters I reviewed the literature and relevant policy that discusses change in higher education teaching and learning and the impacts of change on academic identity associated with the move online for academics. However, as a developer who works with academics facing pedagogical change, I have felt dissatisfied with the lack of discussion about the implications of the move online for academic teacher identity, particularly so in terms of changes in the relationship with the student other. The present chapter will explain how I have designed a collective case study that uses critical, interpretative, metaphor analysis to examine academics' perceptions of their teacher identity in university contexts that were being influenced by the "technological imperative", the discourse of student-centred learning, and neo-liberal management practices.

Kemmis (1980; p. 94) describes case study research as "naturalistic" in that it entails both a search for phenomena in the real world, and an attempt to theorise those social phenomena (in my study: academic identity, online teaching and change). Naturalistic case study work seeks to describe particular contexts in the social world (ie. the contexts of traditional and "flexible" teaching and learning in contemporary universities). The object of case study work is a "given" – a particular issue arising in a particular social situation (ie. how academics perceive their teacher identities in a period of change). As Kemmis and Irigaray (above) note, the design and methods of the study go beyond mere observation.

"Observation also entails such interventions as interviewing, recording and participation… let alone data analysis, interpretation and selection of participants to observe or interview (Kemmis, 1980; p. 96)."

In this chapter, I will make the processes of my study design visible, and establish the grounds for accuracy and trustworthiness in my approach to data gathering and analysis and in the metaphor analysis. To begin, my values about teachers and learners and teaching and learning, face-to-face and using ICT, motivate my interest in the topic, and must be acknowledged, for they frame the very design of this project.

Values and Epistemology

> Research should lead to a growing and deepening understanding of what is of value. As such it must become a process of learning how to live. We cannot do this by leaving ourselves out of the picture, and it is not something which a small handful of academics can do alone…. It is no use expert academics simply developing understanding or arrogantly asserting that all is under their control. It has to be a cooperative endeavour. Academics have to help other people understand, articulate and solve their own problems. Research must thus have both a personal and social dimension. (Brew, 2001, p. 100)

These lines encapsulate some of the guiding principles and values of my methodology.
I am one of many academic developers working with academics coping with change in teaching and learning in Australian universities. This research is presented to my peers – developers and academics who teach - as an exercise in going beyond a description of what academics do - to understand our responses to online teaching. This work aims to be honest, engaging and thought-provoking in terms of its analysis of the literature, in its processual rationale and organization, and in its discussion of findings. The issues of interest were not tightly controlled in my mind's eye from the beginning; there was some openness to possibilities and to fresh insight/s along the way. To some degree, the study was co-operative, although perhaps not in the sense that Brew intended it to mean in her

quote, for the study was not defined as participatory or action research. However, the participants did agree to cooperate in carefully defined ways, and some expressed to me unsolicited appreciation or pleasure at their involvement.

Trowler (1998) also notes that much of the recent research into change and higher education adopts “top-down” managerialist perspectives on institutional change, and he calls for researching and theorising the “underlife” of universities as new management practices take hold and policy innovations (such as online education) are implemented. This challenge is taken up in this thesis which focuses on understanding how academics perceive, and respond to the (changing) structures of the university. Academic development is frequently discussed in higher education policy and research as “change management” and, as an academic developer I have found myself doing, speaking, and even “facilitating” sessions and workshops with change management objectives, for academic staff. In such change-focussed circumstances, it was hard to listen. I need to do more listening. Thus I have designed a study that will allow me to listen to my colleagues, and to interpret and communicate their values and concerns about change in universities, stealing in as it does, under the guise of “student-centred” online learning. The writing of the research text has entailed a mindful intermingling of my researcher's outlook and point of view with those of the twelve participants.

As a study of perceived moral and pedagogical change in educational contexts, this collective case study is by definition subjectivist in its epistemological orientation, ordered by a theoretical framework of post-structuralist interpretation, and deliberately “grounded” and exploratory in the analysis of the empirical data gathered from semi-structured conversations and teaching artefacts with 12 academic participants (Crotty, 1998, p. 5). The study reveals important insights into shifting values, which both the participants and I have found troubling. As the study has progressed, I have had to confront and acknowledge my humanist values, and chapter 9 represents in some sense an early “coming-to-terms” with change both on my own part, and for most of the participants. Since its inception and

in its progress, this study has been conceived of as a mindful, ethical piece of work, involving processes of data gathering, analysis and interpretation that have depended on my researcher and developer relations with others – the academic participants in the study.

Research Design

> The intertwined processes involved in the conceptualisation of a research problem, the investigation, the interpretation of findings and their application in the world beyond the study must be carried out with as much caution, rigour and compassion as the circumstances of each allow. (Kemmis, 1980, p. 101)

This is an empirical research project, a "collective case study" (Stake, 2003, p. 138) that explores the face-to-face and online teaching experiences of twelve university lecturers. As Stake notes, a collective case study entails the joint study of a number of individual cases, alongside the development of a collective case study analysis that draws on the experiences of the participants. In my study, each of the twelve lecturers represents an individual case. Indeed as my study has progressed, I have presented and published elsewhere on some of these individual case participants (in earlier conference papers, and in journal articles - see, for example: McShane, 2006). A collective case study is also defined by an "instrumental" focus or purpose. "A particular case is examined mainly to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalisation. The case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else (Stake, 2003, p. 137)." Constructed out of the contributions of twelve lecturers, my study examines a particular phenomenon (how online teaching might shape or change academic teacher identity). In the following sections I outline the organization, phases and methods of the study.

The Contexts of the Study

The university research sites I chose for this study were two universities in south-eastern Australia. In the beginning, I had planned to limit my study to one university and ten participants, so as to manage the time and logistics, as well as the extensive and responsive

communication with participants that I knew would be required. A single university context would provide a common institutional context in terms of university policy, and ten participants would provide scope for a diversity of disciplinary perspectives, departmental contexts and teaching experience, in terms of traditional and ICT-enabled teaching background, including distance education (DE). As the project began as an exploratory study of academic identity and online teaching, I thought that ten participants might also allow me to conduct some individual case studies, should that prove worthwhile at some point.

The first five participants at Southern Regional University (SRU) were experienced "technology enthusiasts", and in one sense they had acted as a pilot group, allowing me to test my procedures and ideas, and certainly my conversations with them stimulated and advanced my thinking about the study. In 2001, I moved to a new academic position in a new city and state, and I had to review the staging and conduct of the project, and decided to introduce a second university context that offered a useful contrast, and that extended the experiential and disciplinary representation of participants.

Northern Metropolitan University (NMU) was a research-intensive, "sandstone" university that offered recognised, prestigious campus-based programs of study. Online learning was in various stages of development across the faculties, typified for the most part by enterprising, and in some cases eccentric, technology "pioneers". At NMU, I recognised a timely opportunity for integrating into my study important perspectives on change in the Humanities, where funding-based pressures focussed on improving student learning were starting to be implemented, with some uncertainty and resistance. I was aware too of some reluctance in Humanities departments in particular to engage with ICT, online learning, and technology-enhanced offshore and distance education (Mazzarol & Hosie, 1997).

The involvement of two sites and eventually, twelve academic participants, provided scope for exploring differences between experienced and novice online facilitators. Indeed, at

NMU, six (of seven) participants were about to make the move online. The involvement of two sites also encompassed lecturers who were teaching wholly online and/or blended subjects, from a range of disciplines. The two university contexts are described again briefly in chapter 4, along with profiles of each participant, their reason for the move online and some details of their online and face-to-face teaching.

The Process: Data Collection Stage

The selection of participants for this study was a tricky process, in terms of locating lecturers who had integrated online CMC (SRU), or were planning to integrate online CMC (NMU), into their curriculum design and teaching. The final twelve participants in fact represent a diverse collective, in terms of discipline, gender, (online) teaching experience, and university context.

Selection and involvement of participants.

My original selection criteria for the first five or six participants at SRU specified that participants would

- be experienced in online teaching at university level;
- be located on at least two campuses of the university (rural and metropolitan);
- teach in either of the Health Sciences and Management/Business;
- have taught at least one of their part-online subject/s previously in traditional face-to-face mode.

The five academics at SRU (Seb, Ron, Hilary, Zhang and Paul) were all early adopters of web-based teaching within their departments, indeed within their university. With SRU ethics committee approval, I invited them to participate in the first exploratory stage of this study because of their disciplinary diversity, and their experience with ICT in teaching, which put them in a position to reflect on and articulate their experiences in implementing and conducting online teaching – something which they were each eager and ready to do.

Once the SRU participants had expressed verbal interest in the study, I sent them an ethics committee approved consent form, a consent form for their students and a Participant Information Sheet (Appendix B). It was difficult at the time to locate interested colleagues who were not only about to make the move online, but who were also planning to integrate and assess (as opposed to support) their subject/s with online CMC. I faced a similar difficulty in relation to participant selection at NMU. With university ethics committee approval, I sent out an Expression of Interest form (Appendix A) via an NMU campus (online learning) mailing list, and I spoke with interested colleagues by phone. I received six expressions of interest.

Aurea was selected because she was conducting both on-campus teaching as well as designing and preparing a new online DE subject, and she was a novice to online teaching. Jane also approached me as an interested computer user who was about to launch a very comprehensive WebCT site (including live chat and online discussions) to support a large first year group to tutors and students that she coordinated. Frank was keen to be involved, even though he had little to no experience of face-to-face teaching. He taught local and international students in wholly online subjects, he was starting to research his online teaching (including a PhD thesis), and he was very interested in this study. Because Frank thought he might be making the move to face-to-face teaching, it seemed likely that he would have some other interesting insights to share.

At about this time an online learning project was just starting in the Humanities faculties at NMU, and I was able to distribute Expression of Interest forms (Appendix A) to roughly 15 academics. Four Humanities colleagues (Rose, Cora, Evan and Rahime) responded to me by phone or email. We discussed their teaching circumstances and I sent them each a copy of the participants' consent form, a consent form for their students and a Participant Information Record (Appendix C). In the case of these four Humanities participants, to some extent this was deliberately opportunistic sampling and selection. After expressing interest in being involved in the study, Rahime decided not to use WebCT, but was

nevertheless very keen to be involved in my study, so as to discuss her experiences of using email and a rapidly growing website to support the students and staff of a large first year subject she coordinated. Rahime also wanted to engage over issues of change and ICT.

Data collection: methods and conduct.

The Participant Information Sheet or Record (Appendices B and C) that I sent each interested participant gathered factual information to inform the individual case study profiles. It was also designed to reduce the gathering of background information in the first conversations. This sheet asked participants about their teaching experience, their online teaching plans, and their reasons for participating in the study. The sheet also asked participants to supply a pseudonym for this study, which most participants did. Seb picked his dog's name! Three participants demurred, but they were content for me to allocate them a name. The naming of participants in this way was important, as I would like them to be recognised in the study as living, laughing, flesh and blood academics, rather than being known as nondescript "Lecturer A", or "Participant B". Perhaps there is something in this gesture, too, that responds to Seb, who, when reflecting on his face-to-face visits to see his Singapore students, added, "Because now they know Seb, they know who Seb is and Seb is a normal human being. He's not something out there on the Internet – ethereal and non-contactable." To respect the confidentiality of the participants, I have also replaced the names of colleagues, students, and identifying contextual phenomena (such as committees and grant schemes) with pseudonyms.

The primary research data in this study are the 28 face-to-face, semi-structured interviews that I held with individual participants at SRU in late 1999, and with the NMU participants in 2002 and 2003. After I had contacted an individual participant to organise a conversation, I sent them a copy of the Topic Information sheet (SRU: Appendix D; or NMU: Appendix E). At SRU, I travelled to the regional campus and met with Seb, Hilary, Zhang and Paul in an empty office near their own offices. At the metropolitan campus, I met with Ron in a large meeting room in the development unit. The duration of each

conversation varied, (and here I respected participants' work and time commitments), but most conversations ran for between 60 to 90 minutes. A log of all research conversations is provided in Appendix H. The SRU conversations began with a general discussion of participants' teaching (how they learnt to teach, what they (dis)liked about teaching, particular teaching incidents they remembered), the participants' past and present online teaching, and finally turned to a discussion of their perceptions about changing role and practices.

At NMU, the conversations were held in participants' offices – it was easier for them. The first of the conversations (Appendix E) with the NMU participants explored their teaching experiences, how they learnt to teach, their experiences of "good" and "bad" teaching, their relationships with their students, what they had done, or what they planned to do, online and why, and their expectations about online teaching. The second conversation (Appendix F) explored online teaching experiences over the past six months, and asked about teaching metaphors. The third conversation (Appendix G) revisited teaching metaphors, and also elicited other contextual information, views about academic autonomy, colleagues' attitudes. I openly asked my participants, too, to tell me about their metaphors for teaching. Some participants had reflected on this and had an image or metaphor ready to discuss. Some were less certain and so I would mention examples from the literature, usually referring to Fox' (1983) "personal theories" of teaching – content transfer, construction, tour guide and gardener. Frank was familiar with the research of Berge (1997, 1998) and Berge and Collins (1996), and he was keen to discuss the metaphors he had read there. We revisited their metaphors in subsequent conversations (NMU participants) and/or email communication (SRU and NMU participants). The relationships I developed with the participants were conducted respectfully. The conversations with the NMU participants became increasingly semi-structured, and by the time of the third or fourth conversation, the Conversation 3 Topic sheets (Appendix G) had become indicative, but not mandatory, at least in terms of how we followed the agenda they represented. Our meetings were

punctual, confidences were not shared and I complied with participants' requests to delete or not divulge certain matters.

MacLure (1993, p. 382) writes that researchers need to work to retain the complexity in teachers' accounts of themselves, and this was an important principle behind this conversational strategy in my methodology. To develop the case studies and to elicit metaphors, I needed to talk with lecturers, but in more depth than I found was usual in my developer-lecturer interactions. MacLure (1993, p. 381) argues that the analysis of this talk can illuminate the ways in which issues such as morale, commitment and personal values are articulated as matters of concern by and for the person giving the account. Telling stories is a significant way for individuals to give meaning to, and express, their understandings of their experiences (Mischler, 1991, p. 75). Shotter (in MacLure, 1993, p. 377) maintains that our concepts of ourselves are revealed to us in how we talk about ourselves in all the different ways that we do.

After each of the NMU interviews, I went to a quiet place and made several pages of hand-written notes, jotting down my impressions of the conversation. Participants were sent profile summaries and extracts of transcribed conversational data for editing, comment and return, though, as mentioned previously, this was not undertaken by all participants. I emailed each of the twelve participants the transcribed sections where they spoke about their teaching metaphors, seeking further comment from them. Sometimes we scheduled an extra meeting to address matters that hadn't been covered. When the tape recording of a session was barely audible, as occurred in two instances, audible stretches were still transcribed, and the participants (Frank and Rahime) and I revisited the same topics at the beginning of the next research conversation.

I asked the twelve participants to select and share with me some online teaching artefacts (eg. website material, unit outlines, discussion list extracts, e-mail exchanges with students) that in some way showed them in their teaching role. These artefacts are listed in Tables 1

and 2 in chapter 4. I made notes of some phone conversations and filed relevant e-mail messages. Rahime, for example, was keen to email me some of the exchanges she was having with her first year group. I contacted the SRU participants by email annually from 2000, and the NMU participants annually from 2003 to catch up on their news and online teaching circumstances. Participants were under no obligation to reply, but most let me know what was happening, and wanted to know how I was going. In December 2005, I sent a final email (Appendix K) to all participants asking them about their views and experiences of online facilitation, and I also thanked them for their involvement in the project, and I heard back from all but three.

As previously mentioned, for the duration of my doctoral program I have kept a handwritten PhD Journal. In it, I reflect on my questions, progress and decisions, as well as my dilemmas and breakthroughs. My use of the journal as a strategy for organization and reflection also informed a conference paper (Peseta & McShane, 2004). However, its influence on this substantive account of my research is indirect and diffuse. Journal-writing helped me more with the methodological process and decision-making, and it was never intended as a source of data for my analysis. My PhD journal, which provides both a descriptive and reflective record of events, as well as my personal responses to them (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999, p. 136), embodies continuity and validity in my research.

The Analysis and Interpretation Phase

These procedures and texts outlined in the previous section then informed the next phase of the study, the interpretative analysis using teaching metaphors.

Formatting the transcripts and extracts.

The details of the interviews with each participant are provided as Appendix H: Log of Research Conversations. The taped interviews were transcribed and, to identify and trace extracts, I developed a protocol that appears at the end of each participant extract in this thesis. For example, the words "Frank, C1b" in brackets at the end of an extract indicates

that the extract comes from Conversation 1b with Frank; similarly “Jane, C3” means Conversation 3 with Jane, and so on.

In formatting the transcripts and transcript extracts, I decided to use punctuation as a stylistic device to signal as much as possible the spontaneity of participants’ speech. I wanted to render in text the rhythm, hesitations and pauses, of each participant’s verbal language though, as a linguist, I am well aware of the differences between spoken and written language, and the inadequacies of capturing the meanings and subtleties of live language in words on paper. I have left in participants’ “ahms” and “aahs”, their incomplete utterances and their repetitions, their obvious inhalations and exhalations. I thought it important, too, to try to give some sense of, for example, Evan’s rapid fire speech, Aurea’s infectious giggles, Zhang’s ways with words, and Hilary’s thoughtful silences. Indeed, such communicative idiosyncracies are surely indistinct or unheard by their students in online CMC. Such characteristics will only be partially “heard” in this thesis too, for my formatting of the transcript extracts remains inadequate to the task of rendering their spontaneous and generous responses in our conversations.

A method of interpretative analysis.

When it came to making sense of the transcripts and artefacts in light of my research questions, I tried a number of approaches. In the early years of the study I tried arranging the narrative sections of the transcripts in a poetic, narrative manner, in the way of Kohler-Riessman (1993) and Gee (1985), but this wasn’t particularly revelatory in terms of what the data could reveal for my questions, although I did learn a lot about the canonical structures of narrative (see for example Mischler, 1991). I read and coded the conversational transcripts and entered segments of what participants had said into 24 different thematised categories, including coded topics such as: “flexibility”, “keeping it real”, “collegiality”, and “time and workload”. I wrote up five individual participant case studies, and I arranged and rearranged the metaphors into various types and categories: by discipline, by gender, by expert/novice, by metropolitan/rural, by blended/distance

education. Over time, and after a series of experiences that I call "tilting at analysis", I realised that I needed a theoretical structure, which ultimately took the form of critical metaphor analysis. With hindsight, the process of four different attempts at data analysis was not entirely wasted, as I became saturated (metaphorically) in the data.

As a method of analysis, I settled on grouping participants' metaphors into three arch-metaphors or similes: teaching is like performing; teaching is like caring; teaching is like directing. These three arch metaphors offer overlapping and interwoven insights into lecturers' shifting identities in times of change in universities and, in the next sections of this chapter I will set out my rationale for focussing on these three metaphors in particular. However, examining identity via metaphor is not a method in itself, and so the interpretative analysis using metaphor in my study has also been shaped and guided by a critical theoretical framework (drawing on the writings of Gee, 2001; Foucault, 1986, 2002; Rose, 1996) which aims to uncover the effects on academic teacher identities of enterprise discourses in the corporate university. My analysis using metaphor also drew attention to silences and unspoken pedagogical matters, such as the issue of (how much) preparation a performer might put in before performing, and the risk of sexual intimacy when the one-caring and the cared-for were close together in the private space of an office. "Reading for differences and escaped meanings enables different interpretations, distancing them from normativity and, ultimately, warranting understandings that are created within and between different discourses" (Koro-Ljungberg, 2005). Certainly, the use of metaphor in this study did not lead to any glamorising or sentimentalising of the work of teaching, but rather it was an effective methodological strategy for revealing tensions between the discursive pull that the lecturers felt between being responsibly student-centred, as they understood it, and performatively accountable to management.

In each of chapters 5, 6 and 7, the interpretative synthesis that follows the presentation of each arch-metaphor is organised so as to show firstly, the key themes and teaching values of the metaphor in a general sense. A second section in each analysis chapter then

discusses the challenges and relational-ethical shifts that are experienced in (moving to) online teaching, as perceived by participants through the lens of that arch-metaphor. In all my research interactions and analysis dilemmas, my measure of ethical respect has been, "Would I want to be written about in this way?" Would I like to be addressed in this way?" That is, I have attempted to put into practice Lévinas' (2002) notions of relational ethics, of responsiveness and responsibility to the other[4]. My demeanour towards myself and my participants is to a large part influenced by mindful, ethical research methodologies such as that described by Bentz and Shapiro (1998), though I have not formalised mindful practice as part of this study.

Metaphor and Identity

> The use of metaphor, anchored in language, is bound up intimately in the discursive production of our identities. It is an artful, rhetorical strategy of inventive attribution - a substitution of elements that invokes "the pleasure of understanding that follow surprise" (Ricœur, 1978, p. 33).

In this study, a focus on metaphor has served a number of functions that combine to offer some new perspectives on academic identity and ICT. Here I will define and explain my use of metaphor, and I will outline the ways in which I have used it, and to what effect in the study.

Why Metaphor?

The notion of metaphor (from the Greek *meta-pherein*) is about *carrying with/over/beyond* or *transferring*. We all use metaphor discursively as a creative linguistic and conceptual device to describe a way of being, feeling or doing in terms of another image. In the most general sense, metaphor is "any comparison that cannot be taken literally" (Bartel, 1983, as cited in Deshler, 1991, p. 297). The second image (the metaphor) translates and

[4] "Face" and "presence" are not to be taken literally in this statement, nor in Lévinas' writings, as he points out (1991, p. 89)

recontextualises the original being, feeling or doing. Put differently, a metaphor can separate and/or conjoin two objects or identities within the same, or in different domains (Koro-Ljungberg, 2004). The use of a metaphor is an imaginative strategy and, as it crosses signified time and contexts, it carries with it other values, characteristics and nuances that are not always clearly articulated in the experience and description of the actual, factual phenomenon.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980)[5] have had significant influence on how metaphor is recognised and used as an interpretative tool in research. They identified and discussed metaphorical concepts such as ARGUMENT IS WAR and TIME IS MONEY, spatial metaphors like HEALTH AND LIFE ARE UP - SICKNESS AND DEATH ARE DOWN, ontological metaphors, eg. THE MIND IS A MACHINE, and common expressions and idioms such as, for example, THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS, and LOVE IS A JOURNEY. Indeed, METAPHOR is a VEHICLE for articulating and representing experience. However, we need to remember that the metaphor itself is merely a linguistic device (de Saussure's *signifier*), not to be mistaken for the experience itself (the *signified*). Thus we arrive at the position that all language is metaphoric. "The paradox is this: there is no discourse on metaphor that is not stated within a metaphorically engendered conceptual network…. Metaphor is metaphorically stated" (Ricoeur, 1978, p. 287).

Taking a lead from Ricoeur's quote at the beginning of this section, metaphor appears to offer an imaginative lens through which to discuss and understand identity work, and indeed, this is reflected in a number of educational research studies that use metaphor in some way to research teacher identity, particularly in the research on school teachers and in teacher education (Aubusson, 2002; Craig, 2005; Fox, 1983; Munby, 1986; Perry & Cooper, 2001; Sumsion, 2003). Sumsion interprets metaphors in early childhood education as "cultural texts". There have also been fewer studies to investigate university teaching and learning through the lens of metaphors (Dunkin 1991; Koro-Ljungberg, 2001, 2004;

[5] Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) use of capital letters has been replicated here.

Martin, Prosser, Trigwell, Lueckenhausen and Ramsden, 2001). Lee and Green (2004) have investigated current and emerging research degree supervision pedagogies using sets of guiding metaphors. Like many subsequent applications of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) cognitivist theory of metaphor, the studies by Dunkin (1991) and Martin et al (2001) tend to locate and analyse metaphor from transcribed interview data (often gathered for other analytic purposes) and essentialise it to types or individuals. Indeed, Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) traditional, comparative use of metaphors has had the effect of including and excluding, of dualising and "othering".

However, it seems that "othering" is unavoidable in educational research. When it comes to teacher identity, the most obvious determinant of a teacher is the fact that she has (a) student/s. That is, when a teacher looks into Lacan's (2002) mirror, she sees not just her self, but also the student. Peters (2002) has commented on the detrimental, dualising effect of metaphor in education.

> Metaphors, in their application and formalisation, have become the substance of educational practice. Perhaps, the most culturally deeply embedded dualism with which educational theory and practice must come to terms is the mind/body separation. This dualism historically has developed as an instrument of "othering": of separating boys from girls, reason from emotion, minorities from the dominant culture, and classes from each other. It nests within a family of related dualisms and remains one of the most trenchant and resistant problems of education in postmodernity. (Peters, 2002, p. 404)

Some writers in the field have also pointed out how easy it is for metaphor to narrow, unify or essentialise identity, as has been the case for those who have followed Lakoff and Johnson's lead. However, metaphors can have a productive or opening-up function, and they generate multiple, but also partial insights (Chapman, 2002; Koro-Ljungberg, 2001, 2004; Lee & Green, 2004). According to Koro-Ljungberg (2004, p. 358), metaphors "open up the chains of meanings and lines of related thoughts, and they reveal present discourses, positions of power, and relevant value systems".

Metaphor in this Study

> In the process of thematic sense-making, metaphors stood out from the narratives because of their richness of language, practicality, and capability to capture certain moments and feelings. (Koro-Ljungberg, 2001, p. 372).

It is intended that the use of metaphor in this study will offer a creative, interpretative strategy for accessing the complex identities and ambiguous life-worlds of university lecturers. A detailed listing of participants' metaphors has been supplied in tabulated form in Appendix I. The metaphors, and the associations they may prompt, should be recognised as partial, indistinct, and shifting. No one metaphor in itself represents a complete or fixed account of lecturer identity. In conversation, a metaphor was called on for particular effect sometimes; at others times a different metaphor would reflect a changed mood or changing circumstances, shifting contextual demands, and/or new insights into the identity work-in-progress of the individual.

Each arch-metaphor incorporates multiple perspectives on university teaching and learning, and comprises various constituent metaphors that participants spoke about in our conversations. For example, the directing arch-metaphor is constructed from a grouping of metaphors that in some way entail artistic "direction" or giving directions: orchestra conductor, stage manager, coach, team leader, (tour) guide. The (student) "others" are also brought into view within the metaphor. In the case of directing, they might include musicians, actors, stage crew, sports team and players, team members, tourists. This thematic approach using metaphors was the most suitable for bringing to the fore the participants' collective values about their teaching and their relations with their students, and it aims to introduce complexity into this investigation of teacher identity. As well, this form of analysis supports an approach that does not judge, categorise or rank the beliefs and practices of the individual participants, in the manner of a phenomenographic approach, for example.

Why performing, caring, and directing?

As I listened to the conversations again and read over the transcripts, it seemed that some metaphors were more potent or meaningful to some participants. In fact, very early on, my attention was drawn to five metaphor groupings in particular: performing, caring, serving the community, managing and directing, and facilitating. Looking across the individual cases, I noticed that even if one of the "stand-out" images didn't figure so much in an individual case (eg. caring), there were usually references to cognate activities or values (eg. a pastoral care, being an "elder of the tribe"). I puzzled over the notion of the facilitator, because it wasn't technically a metaphor (it had no recognisable, contextually-anchored signified), and I wondered how to account for it until, rereading the literature with an increasingly critical eye, I realised that the facilitator was the canonical identity of the online teacher. I was still left with four metaphors to shape my analysis. Uncertainly, I started to draft my analysis of the participants' experiences of teaching as performing, directing and caring. When it came to the latter metaphor, I could see that it integrated quite naturally into the caring metaphor. In my present analysis (chapter 6), I have acknowledged the "duty of care" focus that is common to these constituent images (social worker, policewoman, tour guide, lamplighter).

As the participants' shifting teaching metaphors suggested, metaphors can be ephemeral, idiosyncratic and transient. Yet, as Lee & Green (2004, p. 8) argue, they can also be category-creating and "create conditions for new thought". Performing, caring, and directing are common, sacred, archetypal metaphors that invoke images of university teaching as entertainment, care, and expertise and leadership. Performing, caring and directing are recognisable, enduring metaphors for university teaching and, as such, they represent metaphor systems that have become "fixed, canonic and binding" (Lee & Green, 2004, p. 8; this expression traced to Nietzsche). Each of the three arch-metaphors represents a collective set of particular values and practices in relation to the teacher-student relationship. These three metaphors also point to particular ethical relationships

between key “players” in each metaphoric context (performer and audience, the one-caring and the cared-for, director and crew), relationships that carry across to the sites of teaching and learning. These arch-metaphors and their implications for the identities and relationships of university teachers (and their students) are explored in my analysis in chapters 5, 6, and 7.

The relevance and function of metaphor in this study.

By using metaphor I was able to structure and enrich the conduct and the interpretive analysis of this study of academic identity a number of ways. Firstly, an awareness of metaphor proved to be useful in reading and reflecting on policy and literature in the field for my literature review, and this influence may be seen in some of the insights and key points I have drawn in chapters 1 and 2.

Secondly, it seemed that the elicitation of metaphors in the research conversations might provide the lecturers with an imaginative means of claiming various teacher identities, values, beliefs and practices – and they did, as the list of metaphors in Appendix I attests. The metaphors could be understood as discursive masks, or “Discourse-identities" (Gee, 2001) – not all of them institutionally-sanctioned identities, but rather what Gee calls “achieved” or “ascribed” identities - that participants could assert at certain points in the study. Metaphors would help the participants in my study to talk deliberately and reflectively about their teaching. (Indeed they did enliven our conversations, particularly if they were remembered, often humorously, in subsequent conversations). As a rhetorical device, the use of metaphor encouraged the participants to articulate humanist, modernist and post-modernist identities, changing identities, and they also bring to light some of the value struggles inherent in describing, for example, both “how things are now” and “how things used to be”.

Thirdly, I also thought that metaphor might support the critical, interpretative work of my analysis, by helping me to read and organise my research data in particular ways, as well as

guiding the exploration and portrayal of the values, emotions and tensions – the identity-(at)-work – of the twelve participants who found themselves in challenging, changing discursive contexts. In fact, each of the three metaphors opened up insights into the teacher-student relationship (performer and audience, the one-caring and the cared for, director and crew), effectively supporting the central interest in this research into academic identity, online teaching, and the defining relationship with the other, the student/s.

Quality and Rigour in this Study

Case study cannot claim its authority; it must demonstrate it. (Kemmis, 1980, p. 109)

My naturalistic study aims to generate subjectivist interpretations of academics' perceptions of their teacher identities in two changing, "technologising" university contexts. Conventional standards of rigour, validity and reliability, as applied in scientific inquiry, are inadequate to judging the quality of a research process and a research product that both depend upon respectful, ethical relationships between the researcher and the researched. In order to make my own research observations and interactions accessible to the reader (and I am the central, critical "instrument" of the study), I have attempted to plan, interact, reflect and write, mindfully and cautiously, with "critical self awareness" (Kemmis, 1980). Ball's observations about rigour in ethnography set a useful standard for my study. "The basis of… rigour is the conscious and deliberate linking of the social process of engagement in the field with the technical processes of data collection, and the decisions that that linking involves. I call that linking reflexivity" (Ball, 1990, p. 159).

In this qualitative research study, reliability is the fit between what is recorded as data, and what actually occurs in the setting under study, rather than the literal consistency across observations. My claims for reliability in this study are better understood in terms of accuracy, dependability and authenticity. As I shall explain, validity in this study is anchored in trustworthiness, and the reciprocity that was essential to the social processes of engagement between myself and the participants. I will make some brief observations about

each of these two key aspects of my study, and my insights into these will be followed by comments on my researcher reflexivity, for, as Ball (1990) points out, it is reflexivity that connects the social interaction and the accuracy and authenticity of the data that is collected, and the meanings that are made from it.

Accuracy, Dependability and Authenticity

In discussing reliability, Bogdan and Biklen (1982, p. 44) point out that in qualitative research, the researcher must attend to the accuracy and comprehensiveness of their data. I have sought to be organised and systematic in my procedures and, to this end, the field texts (transcripts, online artefacts and email records) have had to be accurate, comprehensive, and dependable. My post-conversation field notes were very helpful as a back-up strategy. These were notes I made after each of the 23 conversations with the participants at NMU, and they became a handy record of my reflections. In light of the conversations with participants at SRU, I realised I needed to capture overall impressions, emphases, which went beyond the spoken words of the encounter that were recorded, and that were to be transcribed into text. I collected all relevant email communications and on a couple of occasions made notes of incidental conversations with the participants after phone conversations that were directly related to the research. My academic developer role has meant that I have maintained a familiarity with the university settings generally and specifically, and with research in the field, and I was able to gather other relevant documents, such as Academic Codes of Conduct, University Mission Statements, teaching excellence awards criteria, and teaching performance indicators.

Reliability and dependability in an empirical study are strengthened by the researcher's ability to document systematically the methodologic and analytic "decision trails" created during the course of the study (Hall & Stevens, 1991, p. 19). In my inquiry, these trails can be identified and tracked first and foremost in the many neatly arranged files and folders on my two computers, on the server at work, the two flash drives, and on numerous back-up CD-ROMs. The trail continues through my PhD diary and impressionistic field notes, and

in the neat binders of paperwork and hard copies I have to hand for each participant. All research data has been stored securely in multiple electronic and hard copy format in work and home settings as a risk management strategy that not only addresses the unforeseeable, risky prospect of an "act of God", but also meets the requirements of three university Ethics Committees.

While this work is unique, and the study unrepeatable, I have been reassured of the dependability and authenticity of the data and my analytical work, when I have shared it with colleagues for feedback and discussion. Academic developer colleagues in other Australian higher education institutions read and gave me positive, encouraging feedback on my metaphor analysis chapters 5, 6 and 7, indicating that the metaphors and many of the thematic discussions were familiar to them in their own contexts. Other parts of the text have been shared in conferences, presentations and discussions (online and face-to-face) with colleagues in the UK, Canada and Australia. Along the way, I have also been reassured about the validity and reliability of my research ideas when papers have been peer-reviewed (encouragingly) and published. Such efforts to disseminate and discuss my developing work have pushed me critically to consider other contextual explanations, other perspectives on what I have recorded and interpreted.

Trustworthiness and Reciprocity

I continue to ask myself how adequate and convincing are my findings in answering my questions? Some writers have suggested that such questions of validity in qualitative research might be addressed via criteria that include adequacy, coherence, complexity, and resonance (Harrison, MacGibbon & Morton, 2001; Lincoln & Guba, 1990). Others have proposed that validity in case study research such as this is better argued as honesty or "trustworthiness" (Bassey, 1999; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In fact, Bassey (1999, pp. 73-74) proposes an ethics of respect: respect for democracy, respect for truth and respect for persons and, in his view, trustworthiness is particularly bound up with respect for truth. As I explained in the previous section, my research design and process have been thoroughly

documented, I have maintained particular strategies, and attempted to maintain mindfulness throughout the process, so as to present a trustworthy, truthful and accurate final textual account of the process. Such an account also depended on reciprocity and responsiveness with participants.

Charles Taylor writes that "my own identity crucially depends on my dialogical relations with others" (Taylor, 1994; as cited in Gee, 2001, p. 113). The relationship with the student defines a teacher as a teacher. Indeed, one of the constant themes in this thesis is my contention that the teacher, any teacher, is duty-bound by an unspoken pledge or promise to respond to the student other. Regardless of the educational context, teachers are obliged morally to respond to, and be responsible for, their students. My findings in this thesis regarding the (teacher) response and responsibility towards the other, apply not just to the topic and analytical process of this study, but they also informed the methodological choice, the design of the project, and my reciprocity and relationships with the participants.

The maintenance of open, non-judgmental relationships with the lecturer participants has been essential to the validity of the study at all stages. I have maintained clear and responsive communication with participants throughout the six years of their involvement, and I have been mindful of the need to maintain the participants' anonymity and confidentiality, in all areas of my research scholarship. From the beginning of the study, I expressed my research purposes directly, honestly and consistently to my participants. I was clear about the fact that I did not want to burden them with lots of extra "paperwork", or the need to read and respond to lots of material for my study. The consent forms guaranteed each participant access to their own, complete, conversational transcripts if they desired them, and stated expressly that I was not judging them personally, nor evaluating or measuring their teaching practice and values. No conditions were put on participation in terms of what I would do for participants outside of the research study. Indeed, it was specified on consent forms and in all communication with the participants that there was no obligation to maintain their participation or to respond to requests for further information.

There were several participants who didn't reply to the final email, and I didn't follow up with them. Two were participants who had "made the move sideways" to administration or research. There was one colleague in particular who, over the years, would ignore my nods and greetings whenever our paths crossed. Guilt? Fear? Perhaps he was really distracted, bound up in thought, and didn't see me? I didn't chase him (up), but rather let him be. I waited for participants to respond, and then I would respond in kind.

Reflexivity

The research topic, the research design, and the passion for the research have been mine, and I have been central to the inquiry. Connelly and Clandinin (1999, p. 138) observe that "a [research] text written as if the researcher had no autobiographical presence would constitute a deception about the epistemological status of the research. Such a study lacks validity". Much as I have tried not to influence my participants' perceptions and contributions, I am implicated in the participants' meaning-making – in the conversations that we held, and in the follow-up exchanges by phone and email that we had. Throughout this project I have needed to maintain an awareness of how my presence in the research might influence participants' perceptions and responses. In all of this, I have sought to maintain a careful reflexivity, and to keep uppermost in my mind questions such as "Why is this lecturer saying these things to me?" "What is my part in this exchange?" "How might my presence [eg. as a developer] have shaped this perspective or this assertion?"

My role and influence as researcher has been no less challenged in the construction of the final thesis. In the write-up, I have selected and incorporated the lecturers' meanings, but in the interest of representing complexity and offering alternative readings, I have had to privilege some interpretations over others. In constructing meanings, I have had to make explicit my opinions, decisions and biases, introducing where necessary relevant contextual information to support my interpretations. This reflexive acknowledgement of my values, purposes and assumptions has been essential for the integrity, rigour and outcomes of the research. Material evidence of these claims to rigour rests not only in journal entries and

field notes made after most of the 28 conversations I held with participants, but above all, in the five volumes of my hand-written PhD Journal which has documented meetings, conversations, post-seminar thoughts, weekend ruminations and indeed much of my internal reflective and reflexive dialogue about my topic since 1998.

Ultimately, the categorisation of many metaphors into these three arch-metaphors, based on what the participants shared with me, together with my contextual knowledge and notes, is my interpretation, and my knowledge of the literature in the field and the contexts of their teaching. These descriptions were informed by the conversational data, the online artefacts and other field data, along with my developer knowledge of the teaching and institutional contexts – for I could not "bracket" myself out of the creation of these cases. The validity and resonance of these three thematic analyses rests on the rhetorical effect I have sought to fashion for each, using these criteria. Lincoln and Guba (1990) have proposed a set of seven rhetorical criteria for judging the quality of "craftsmanship" of the case study product - the case study account: power and elegance, creativity, openness and negotiability, movement away from false consciousness, researcher emotional and intellectual commitment, courage, and egalitarian stance. These qualities have guided me knowingly in the crafting of this substantive account of the study, and (tentatively and vulnerably) I invite the reader to apply them to this singular "artefact of social life" (Kemmis, 1980, p. 102).

Methodological Dilemmas

In qualitative case studies such as this, methodological dilemmas can arise in terms of the relationships in the research. I was conscious of this from the commencement of my study. The participants in this study knew I was an academic developer, and I could not pretend otherwise in our encounters. Sometimes, after our conversations, participants asked me for help with WebCT, or for advice on the blended design of a subject they were putting together, and I would help them. I would have helped them regardless of whether they were involved in this study or not. I was invited to take part in research projects, asked to

run a session on WebCT for tutors, and I encountered participants on campus, in the gym, and at university events. While I was clear about my developer and research roles, inevitably there were two occasions when there might have been a mismatch of expectations, and these occurred after the main research activities (the conversations and the passing on of online teaching artefacts) had been completed. I was slow to respond to a request for a reference to support a colleague applying for a Teaching Excellence Award (it was not late, but she was not successful in her application), and on another occasion, I declined when asked by a participant to join a research project collaboration. In the latter case, I could see difficulties arising because of our different epistemological positionings and values about ICT and student learning, and I gently explained this in email. I don't believe that these matters have affected (at least consciously) the trustworthiness of my account. Reciprocity, expressed as "unconditional positive regard" (Rogers, 1961), is an unspoken promise I make to the other in my professional and personal relationships. At all times, in my relations with the participants, I have striven to hold a mindful awareness of my position and power as both developer and researcher, and I have been willing to acknowledge this to myself and the participants. But it has not always been easy.

At first, I found the conduct of the interviews quite challenging. Listening to the tapes, I was annoyed when I heard myself jump in and cut someone off. After my first conversation with Frank I wrote in my field notes: "I am being pushy in subtle ways in these conversations. I might be throwing out leads so as to hear and report what I want to hear!" (Field notes for Frank, C1a). Was I pushing my own agenda, and not listening deeply enough to what participants were really telling me? Of course, as I wrote in my journal back in April 1999, "I <u>am</u> imposing a direction by starting with my beliefs (PhD journal, 02.04.99). Over time I became more mindful and aware of when I was pursuing my research interests and, as that awareness developed, I became more comfortable and settled in the conversations. As I wrote after an exhilarating, first conversation with Aurea:

> I am learning to suspend my faith, my trust, my anxiety. I think: 'I must ask about this, I must ask about that - oh, but I can't switch the interview mid-stream, change the subject so obviously or quickly'. And what happens? We get to that topic further down the track. It emerges anyway. A smoother, more patient transition. (Field notes for Aurea, C1b)

I have been selective and overlooked certain stories, because they might identify participants. For example, I hesitated over whether to include Ron's story of how he faced serious legal action over material deemed unsuitable on his publicly-accessible university website. However, by changing identifying details, I have been able to maintain the spirit of the story, and underline a key thematic point about scrutiny and online teaching material. Originally I recounted in more detail the uneasy, email exchange between Rahime and her awe-struck, admiring first-year student. However, a friend and colleague who read this account found it very unsettling, and also questioned the essential relevance of it being retold in such detail. I was able to elide and reduce the story, while maintaining the thematic purpose.

Other Methodological Possibilities

Having decided on a study of academics' teaching identities, I considered a number of methodological approaches to the empirical work and its interpretation. Methodologies that were considered for organising the conduct of this study included action research, actor network theory and phenomenography. I rejected action research (Carr & Kemmis, 1986) because my thesis was not looking to enact change and improvement in the teaching practices of group of university lecturers. Also I did not want to place extra demands on participants' time in terms of them becoming involved in a process of reflection, discussion and decision-making. I did not want to burden academics with what might appear to be more professional development, and the accompanying expectations of pedagogical change or improvement. That is, I did not want to set up a study that produced change, rather I wanted to investigate academics' perceptions of change as it was happening to them in their

contexts, without imposing a structured research intervention that might make more demands on the participants' time and energy.

Actor Network Theory (see for example, Callon, 1986; Latour, 1993; Law, 1986) was a second possibility, but it would have required an analytical study of academics as symmetrical actants or objects in numerous appearing/disappearing networks or environments. I found it difficult to conceive of discussing the emotions and lifeworld of academics and their teaching metaphors, for example, as linkages in an articulated, symmetrical network of artefacts, machines, processes and entities. I place human agency and soul above all else, and the prospect of "black-boxing" an individual, or a number of individuals, as a form of analysis does not match my sense of connection with people. I am too distracted by the emotions, flesh and blood presence, indeed by the soul of the other, to ever consider him a semiotic actant, object or effect of "relations with other entities" (Law, 2003).

Phenomenography is still a commonly used research paradigm in the intellectual community in which I work. However, I decided against phenomenography too, for a number of reasons. Firstly, the kinds of truths I wanted to write would not be objective generalisations, based on variation of a phenomenon in a population. I was interested in listening to and making sense of academic values *with* individuals, and phenomenography does not report findings or complex insights at the level of the individual.

Secondly, while I have constructed my analysis in the substantive thesis text around three metaphor categories – performing, caring, and directing – I have emphasised that the individual lecturer will draw on these and other images to makes sense of their teacher identity, and any one of these or other teaching metaphors does not sit in any preferred, or moral, hierarchical relationship to the other. For example, Trigwell and Prosser (1996) summarise a set of conceptions of teaching as follows, in order of sophistication, with Conception F being "the most sophisticated".

> Conception A: [teaching as] transmitting concepts of the syllabus;
>
> Conception B: transmitting the teachers' knowledge;
>
> Conception C: helping students to acquire concepts of the syllabus;
>
> Conception D: helping students to acquire the teacher's knowledge;
>
> Conception E: helping students to develop conceptions;
>
> Conception F: helping student to change conceptions. (Trigwell & Prosser, 1996, p. 277)

Teaching (and learning) are thus reduced to simple notions of information transfer, and helping student acquire and develop knowledge and concepts. Reluctantly I admit to finding such statements of phenomenographic categories of variation to be less than imaginative, though of course they are easily generalisable across a range of contexts. My bias towards the singularity and unexpected insights of individual case studies is clear. Perhaps what concerns me more is the judgmental ranking and simplifying intent of such conceptions, where "Conception F: helping students to change conceptions" is judged to be a more favourable practice than "Conception C: helping students to acquire concepts of the syllabus". In my study, caring is no better or more sophisticated an orientation than performing. My intent has been to introduce and communicate more complex, imaginative, and ideologically self-conscious perspectives on teachers' conceptions of their role and identity. Webb (1996) best summarises my concerns, noting that phenomenography

> claims an orientation towards human subjectivity and qualitative explanation, yet it is method driven in an attempt to make the kind of generalisation associated with positive science. There is little of the hermeneutic openness to the Other, mutuality and the expectation of change in *both* conversationalists. The conversation is uneasy as only one of the parties has the power to categorise and judge. (Webb, 1997, p. 8; author's italics)

Thirdly, in phenomenographic research, the researcher's agency and reflexivity are not accounted for in any open or adequate way so as to ensure that issues of validity are

addressed in the process of data-gathering by interview, and the interpretative process of "immersing oneself in the data". For example, phenomenographic interviews tend to rely on the linear dynamics of "researcher-questions-and-participant-answers". Participants are not encouraged to see and reflect on specific research questions beforehand. In this study I approached the design and conduct of the interviews more as "a conversation between two trusting parties, rather than… a formal question-and-answer session between a researcher and respondent" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 43). I cannot deny the contaminating effect of my researcher presence and agency in the interviews of this study. The (re-)wording of questions, the tone of my voice, and my non-verbal cues and responses to the other, are an important part of the contextual influence on meaning that is created in the conversation.

Having addressed the critical methodological choices I made in the design and conduct of this study, I also need to consider some of the limitations of my naturalistic study.

Limitations of the Study

Reactions to my work so far remind me that, when presenting my findings, I must acknowledge clearly that this is not a study of students' perspectives on academic identity. It is a thesis about *academics' perspectives* on their engagement with (student-centred) teaching and learning, and how they perceive their relationships and responsibilities are being disrupted by current neoliberal discourses of "student-centred, flexible" (online) learning. That is, the claims I make in this thesis and elsewhere about the constraints and affordances of online and blended teaching and learning are based on the experiences and insights of the twelve academic participants who consented to be part of this study, and whose stories and views I have interpreted and written up, while mindfully and reflexively acknowledging my role as researcher, academic and academic developer. In part, there is an attempt here to model my own professional practice, where I work with academics, and not with students, and I must work with what my colleagues tell me.

A second possible limitation of the study is that, apart from communicating via email, I did not engage more actively with the participants via the contexts of the medium under discussion. Indeed, I did not even engage reflexively with my own thinking using ICT, for my PhD journal has been handwritten! With some bemusement, I have pondered this tendency to avoid using electronic media in managing the most intense, interactive aspects of my research process, and my preferences confirm two firm views. Information technologies can be perceived by some as "asocial" (Cousin, 2004), and in a study of changing academic identity and online teaching, it seemed natural and appropriate to collect academics' views about (online) teaching (and learning) in face-to-face circumstances, rather than via an electronic medium that might occlude communication, heighten participant anxiety, and affect the honesty and depth of participants' insights. I did consider group-based online discussions and chat early in the project as contexts for data gathering, but I abandoned these options due to concerns about participants' workloads, attitudes towards online technologies, and participants' conscious or unconscious awareness of (the potential for) scrutiny online. Indeed, my own findings suggest that carrying out the conversations electronically would most likely have produced different research results. These observations about how the study might have been conducted differently underline the trustworthiness of my methods and finding.

As for my small hand-written journals, they have offered me a reflexive retreat, a place to go to quietly with sticky notes, "to do" lists, references, new quotes, and with new ideas about my study. My journal has accompanied me to many libraries and conferences, and I have recorded in it many conversations my supervisors and interested colleagues about my research study. My journal reminds me that my research is creative and imaginative. Perhaps this might be viewed as a strategy and gesture of resistance to new technologies, but for all that it was hand-written, my diary has been no less a site of intellectual pleasure. (And I secretly like the "bite" of the fine pen on the thick paper).

Chapter Review: Methodology

If case study is to be justified, it must make its process accessible to the reader, so that it is possible to evaluate the reasonableness of the construction of the case (Kemmis, 1980, p. 102). In this methodology chapter I have set out the values and epistemology that determined the collective case study approach to this study of academic identity. I have addressed matters of quality and rigour in the study, and introduced and explained the role and function of metaphor, as a method of elicitation, and an organiser and unit of analysis for my interpretative process. I have also laid out my research design for the project: the university contexts, the methods, the processes of data collection, and the interpretative analysis, including my rationale for using metaphor. Methodological dilemmas, options, and limitations were also considered.

The methodological choices and issues that have arisen in the design and conduct of my study, to lead to the thesis proper, are bound up in the exploratory nature of the study and the centrality of my research role in the process. Ball observes that, for the researcher, ethnography involves risk, uncertainty, and discomfort (1990, p. 157). To cope with these circumstances, I have engaged mindfully, and reflected critically, on my actions and assumptions. This has entailed honest, sensitive and ethical communication, a high order of critical reflexivity, organisation, attention to purpose, and an awareness of my research and developer roles. I have had to confront my own opinions and prejudices in the analysis and interpretation of the material and, in this account, I have sought to make explicit the limitations of the study, some of the dilemmas I have faced, and how I have responded to them. This self-conscious engagement is at the basis of the claims I make to rigour in this research (Ball, 1991, pp. 159, 170).

In imagining the case/s and creating this study (Kemmis, 1980), it has always been my desire to explore university teachers, their identities and pedagogies in times of change, and this interest intensified as the study progressed as I started to view the positionings and role of academic development in universities more critically. My study started out as

exploratory by nature, and over time its focus has sharpened, so that in its presentation now, the logic of the thesis overall should be constant and it coherence evident. I believe that my theoretical framework, methods, design and processes combine to form a study that engages critically with theory in the field of (ICT and) higher education teaching and learning and that, in its analysis, has generated both description and understanding, all qualities that establish merit in a qualitative research study (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 42).

In the next chapter, I present an overview of the two university contexts, along with short profiles of each participant and their reasons for the move online. My interpretative analysis then begins in chapter 5, with my presentation and discussion of the first teaching metaphor, performing.

Chapter 4
The University Contexts and the Participants

> Hear me! For I am such and such a person. Above all, do not mistake me for someone else. (Nietzsche, 2000, p. 673)

> Yes, yes, yes… I hear you. … Go on, I am singing your memory so that you do not fall into some abyss of forgetfulness. (Irigaray, 1991, p. 3)

Introduction

This chapter introduces the twelve participants and the two university contexts. For each university, I give a brief description of policy, relevant projects and practice in respect of (online) learning and teaching. A brief biography of each participant is provided, along with their reasons for making the move online, and details of their online and face-to-face teaching.

Southern Rural University (SRU)

In the late 1990s, Southern Rural University (SRU) comprised metropolitan and regional campuses, and five broad super-faculties (Health Sciences, Business and Social Sciences, Science and Technology, Humanities, and Education). One of the University's regional campuses formed a sixth faculty. SRU could be considered as a "gum tree university" (Marginson & Considine, 2000), a university established in the late 1960s to draw on, and support, a young and growing population in the expanding, leafy northern suburbs of Melbourne. There was no approved policy in place to develop and fund teaching at SRU, and a university policy for online teaching and learning only started to be developed in 2000-2001. Until 2000, there was no Learning Management System (LMS), such as

WebCT or BlackBoard, that was specified or recommended for university-wide use. In 2000, a new multimedia unit took up the dual responsibilities of multimedia production and online learning implementation, focused around WebCT with a templated homepage. There was a separate academic development unit in the university, which held online and face-to-face workshops about online teaching for academic staff in conjunction with staff from service units of the university (eg. Technology Services, Multimedia Unit).

At the time of this study, the five lecturer participants at SRU had each developed and used some online teaching components for at least 18 months. As a new developer, I was keen to learn from them, and understand their perspectives on ICT. While they shared an enthusiasm for ICT in teaching and learning, they did not have common teaching histories and beliefs about teaching, nor did they utilise the same online and face-to-face teaching practices. These lecturers were not pressured overtly by their department or by the university into making the move online. The technology enthusiasts were ahead of most academic staff at SRU in their adoption of new technologies; indeed their technical expertise and confidence intimidated many of their teaching colleagues and some managers at the University.

The Five "Technology Enthusiasts" at SRU

In this section I will present a brief profile of each participant along with the reasons they gave originally for participating in the study. The details of their face-to-face and online teaching, and an indication of the online teaching artefact they shared with me, are set out in Table 1.

TABLE 1

SRU participants' subject structures (face-to-face and online components) and online teaching samples.

**Each component was held on a weekly basis during semester time, unless otherwise specified*

Lecturer ***Discipline*** **(yrs lecturing)**	**Face-to-face components***	**Online Components**	**Online Interaction Samples**
Hilary *IT, Bus* (17 yrs)	- Lectures - Tutorials	detailed assessment task outlines, past exam paper, discussion list (Discus tool), e-mail	discussion list posts, e-mail exchanges
Seb *Computer Science* (22 yrs)	- Lectures (& intensive blocks) - Tutorials (f/nightly) - Semi-formal study groups	lecture notes, tutorial exercises and (delayed-release) answers, examples, resources (eg. past exam papers, URLs), announcements, e-mail. (Departmental server)	e-mail exchanges
Zhang *Chinese* (8 yrs)	- Computer lab classes - Lecture-tutorials	study notes, student web pages, quizzes, presentations, discussion list (non-assessed), e-mail (WebCT)	e-mail exchanges
Paul *Nursing* (21 yrs)	- Lectures	lecture notes, announcements, discussion list, e-mail (WebCT)	discussion list posts, e-mail exchanges
Ron *Health Sciences* (25 yrs)	- Seminars (lectures, computer-based tasks, student presentations) - Group meetings (f'nightly)	lecture notes, announcements, quizzes, discussion list, e-mail (TopClass)	discussion list posts, e-mail exchanges

Ron.

Ron had been lecturing in the Health Sciences for more than 25 years. He taught subjects spanning e-health, e-health research methods and health informatics. A constant critic of state and federal health policy initiatives and drug company practices, he was an ardent campaigner for social justice and equity perspectives, and he collaborated on several large national and international projects focussed on ICT and health. In response to the question

on the Participant Information Sheet that asked, “Why have you introduced an online component into your teaching?”, Ron wrote:

> - introduce students to “real-world” where these skills are important
> - good online resources
> - good back-up for busy post-grads who cannot always attend class.
>
> (Ron, Participant Information Sheet, 1999)

Ron also told me in our conversation, “My own sort of interest [is] in developing repositories of information on the web and using it to communicate again. And I suppose the other parallel stream has been my interest in national networks and national committees and the need to communicate.. y'know across the nation”. He was based on the large metropolitan campus of the university, where he maintained his own website and ran a departmental server to support the LMS, TopClass, for his online subjects. The other four participants at SRU were all based at one of the university’s rural campuses, where ICT and online learning assumed particular significance for them.

Zhang.

Zhang was a native Chinese speaker who had been teaching Chinese language and culture subjects in Australia for eight years. Previously he had taught in a range of educational contexts in China and the UK. He taught his local students using traditional face-to-face modes (weekly lectures, tutorials and laboratory sessions), and he facilitated a non-accredited online Chinese language subject for interstate and international students. Zhang was enthusiastic about his teaching, and he enjoyed the challenge of learning new software applications and new technologies generally. Zhang was using WebCT in particular “as part of course assessment”, to manage and make the assessment of students’ learning more efficient. Zhang explained further his reasons for integrating face-to-face and ICT in an email he sent me.

> I think it's important to combine face-to-face and online teaching as the two types of teaching can complement each other very well. Through this combination we can make teaching more productive and innovative. However, in order to make the combination work, teachers would need to prepare themselves well by working hard to upgrade their professional and IT knowledge and skills. This is a tough challenge, but it is very rewarding. I have benefited from taking up the challenge, and have found that my teaching work becomes more creative and effective with the mutual support of the conventional and online approaches. (Zhang, email communication, April 8, 2003)

Seb.

When he became involved in this study, Seb was an experienced teacher of Computer Science subjects. He said he had taught undergraduate and postgraduates about computers and with computers for 22 years. He particularly valued face-to-face teaching for the social contact and interaction it enabled. Seb enjoyed lecturing, which he viewed as a performance. He wanted and needed his students to attend his face-to-face lectures where he could explain, demonstrate and perform, he told me. Seb taught Computer Science via a combination of face-to-face lectures, a departmental website, and email, and he deliberately restricted his online teaching to website material and email contact for his remote and overseas students.

> In the case of the [program name] many students travelled considerable distances [he names distant Australian towns and cities] and web availability and email gave the students better opportunities to access resources and communicate with the lecturer in between visits. In the case of Singapore, the lecturer visits only once for a week and further access for students was essential. (Seb, Participant Information Sheet, 1999)

Hilary.

Hilary began lecturing in librarianship in the early 1980s, and after several years she moved to lecturing in a business/IT context. She had a Masters of Education, completed largely through distance education study, which stimulated her interest in student-centred teaching,

she told me. When I first met Hilary, she was very active within university teaching and learning circles and committees. She held a responsible, related position on her campus, and quite understandably she was vigilant about how ICT was being implemented on her campus. More than this, Hilary was very concerned about video-conferencing and online learning, which were being used to connect programs of study between campuses of the university. At the heart of Hilary's teaching lay a commitment to developing relationships with and between her students. Hilary's was technically competent in a range of online technologies, and keen to include online CMC in her Business Communications subjects. Hilary, who was using a "freeware" online discussion board, responded by comparing it with the modes it had replaced (email, a hand-written journal).

> - Vs. email, a discussion group is more efficient in staff time, and builds the students' sense of community
> - Vs. a journal, it allows feedback from peers as well as tutors; allows feedback more frequently; and it takes away the risk of disclosures I don't want to know about! (Hilary, Participant Information Sheet, 1999)

Paul.

Paul had been teaching Nursing, as a lecturer, clinical educator or nurse educator, since 1978. He had a Bachelors degree in Education; he had also studied instructional design, and he had a particular interest in health informatics. Paul liked discussing his teaching and he was always very focussed on his students. He enjoyed interacting with his students and in his view, the best thing about teaching was "seeing the people developing and learning something". He told several stories to exemplify moments when he felt pleased to know that he'd "done something that has made a difference". Paul wrote in the Participant Information Sheet that he used WebCT for managing and providing students access to "Web-based resources – lecture notes, key links, use of email". Very much a "technology enthusiast", Paul also admitted that you could get carried away too easily by ICT too.

> It's constantly challenging me, to think about what I'm doing and why I'm doing it, and sometimes I've tried things with the technology and I've thought "God, what did I even bother with that for?" Ahm, y'know, it would have been easier just to go and read the chapter in the textbook and not waste the energy! [*Paul laughs*].

Northern Metropolitan University (NMU)

The research participants at Northern Metropolitan University (NMU) were in a markedly different context, though the circumstances for online teaching and learning were no more developed. At the commencement of the second phase of my study there in 2001, this large inner-city "sandstone" university (Marginson & Considine, 2000) comprised 16 faculties and ten city and regional campuses. NMU had a long history of research excellence and traditional on-campus teaching for high-scoring HSC students, and many prominent people in Australian society and politics were among its graduates. The first goal of the University's 1999-2004 Strategic Plan states that NMU "will maintain and enhance its position as an outstanding provider of high quality undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, both in Australia and internationally." Indeed, in 2001, NMU's Academic Board approved a new policy on teaching performance indicators, which guaranteed funding to the faculties based on, for example, improvements in student evaluation of teaching data, and academics' engagement with a scholarship index for teaching and learning practice, awards and scholarship. In August 2001, the University's Academic Board approved a new policy entitled "Guidelines for Good Practice in Teaching & Learning" (Appendix J: extract). The policy was intended to be

> …of greatest importance to senior academic staff with responsibilities for organizing, managing and ensuring the quality of teaching. The document is couched as a series of criteria, which can be used as a checklist by administrators, deans, heads, co-ordinators of courses and units ("subjects"), and by individual academic staff, in evaluating the quality of their contribution to the educational experiences offered by the University. (NMU Academic Board Policy, 2001)

The many guidelines in this document are prefaced by “Good practice means that:...”. While there were policies on distance education and flexible learning these did not offer comment in any extensive or practical sense on the planning and implementation of online learning within the University. At the time of my interviews with the lecturer-participants (2002-3), the e implications of the regulation of “good practice” were starting to emerge from the discursive funnel (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) onto the professional landscape of teaching and learning at NMU. Funding to improve teaching and learning, for example, was now attached openly and conditionally to individual and faculty-wide improvement in teaching performance, based on a set of university-wide Teaching Performance Indicators. However there was no actual online teaching and learning policy, though there was some discussion at this time within management about the need for one. The university’s policy on e-learning was approved by NMU’s Academic Board in 2004, after my most intense communication with NMU participants had concluded.

The Seven Participants at NMU

In this section I will present a brief profile of each participant along with the reasons they gave originally for participating in the study. The details of their face-to-face and online teaching, and an indication of the online teaching artefacts they shared with me, are set out in Table 2. Note that all participants had already made their subject outlines available online. For the Humanities academics this was a requirement of the faculty and a template was supplied.

TABLE 2

Table of NMU participants' subject structures (face-to-face and online components) and online teaching samples.

** Each component was held on a weekly basis during semester time, unless otherwise specified.*

Lecturer ***Discipline*** **(yrs lecturing)**	**Face-to-face components***	**Online Components#**	**Online Interaction Samples**
Rose & Cora *Humanities* (3 yrs each)	- Two intensive blocks – at beginning and end of rural placements - One staff placement visit per student	WebCT: discussion list (incl. private peer support groups), students' photos, preparation questions and readings, calendar, e-mail	Discussion list posts, e-mail exchanges
Evan *Humanities* (4 yrs)	- 2 Lecture-seminars	WebCT & Departmental website: readings, resources (eg. links to key media, disciplinary-specific websites), students' web pages, discussion list (non-assessed)	discussion list posts, e-mail exchanges
Rahime *Humanities* (14 yrs, some print-based distance ed. experience)	- 2 Lectures - 8 tutorials per 13 week semester (reduced from previous year)	Departmental website only: Study notes, useful links, study/writing guides, announcements, e-mail	e-mail exchanges, open website access
Jane *Humanities* (19 yrs)	- 2 Lectures - Tutorial	WebCT: lecture notes, tutorial readings and prep., resources (eg. links to institutions, media websites), assignment info., submission, students' home pages (stories, photos), bulletin board (Q & A), chat ("office hours"), e-mail, discussion list (private tutorial groups - same as f2f groups), evaluation feedback from previous year	Access to entire WebCT site
Aurea *Health Sciences* (23 yrs, some print-based DE experience)	None	Wholly online, distance ed., WebCT: readings, links and resources, discussion list, e-mail - both WebCT (for teaching-learning) and university server-based (administration)	discussion list posts, e-mail exchanges
Frank *Health Sciences* (5 yrs, C-B* teaching and learning only)	None	Wholly online, distance ed., WebCT: incl. admin and resources, readings, references, assignment information and submission, calendar, quizzes/surveys, discussion list posts, e-mail	Access to entire WebCT site

Jane.

Jane was an Associate Professor in an Economics and Business Faculty, and she had been teaching at university level for 19 years. She enjoyed her teaching and contact with her students. She had completed a Graduate Certificate in Higher Education, and she was an active participant in academic development seminars and events. She had been making gradual steps in online teaching, using email, discussion lists and later introducing live chat. She co-ordinated and lectured in one politics subject which had around 500 students; the tutoring was conducted by a team of tutors. In her initial Participant Information Record, Jane gave her reasons for the move as

- Student need for more flexibility
- Personal interest in technology
- Interested in exploring the possibilities of making teaching and learning a richer, deeper experience for all concerned.

(Jane, Participant Information Record, 2002)

Aurea.

Aurea had been lecturing in the Health Sciences (including social and behavioural sciences, counselling skills, and clinical and fieldwork education) at undergraduate and postgraduate level for 23 years. She started her career overseas in the late 1970s, before taking up an academic position in Australia in the early 1980s. Aurea had previously taught several subjects in off campus-distance mode using print materials, phone, and e-mail). Aurea's opportunity to make the move online came in the form of an interstate project partnership, which allowed her to build on her positive classroom and distance education teaching experiences. She reflected with me on why she had taken up the challenge of this project.

> Aurea: Because of my interest in theory, although I haven't read a lot of the content that we decided needed to go into this particular subject, I felt that it's.. that here's now the opportunity for me to go into that content… Now for me this is the opportunity to go really deeply into that content…. This is what I was telling Kath… I was thinking [about] why I

> took this on. [*chuckles*] I said to Kath, “It’s a false sense of self-confidence and insanity!” [*laughing*]
>
> Kim: Do you still think that?
>
> Aurea: Well, reflecting on it, that’s probably the reason why, but I think the content appeals to me. The technology - certainly I am not a techno person. I would be the first to say, “No, I don't want to touch that”. But… I thought, “We're breaking new ground there. Unless we bite it or take it on, we really wouldn't know”. And I'm the kind of person who would venture into such things. So yeah. I took it on. I like the challenge. Although… [*laughing*] in terms of technology - I'm afraid of it. (Aurea, C1b)

Aurea and Frank were the two NMU participants who were teaching wholly online DE subjects, Aurea for the first time. Frank was more experienced in online DE.

Frank.

Frank was lecturing in distance education subjects in an international program run out of the teaching unit of a large Sydney metropolitan hospital. For Frank, teaching by distance – “mostly web-based” - was normative teaching. Frank had been teaching in this way for about five years in pharmacology, neuro-biology, multi-disciplinary team management, and diagnostic strategies. He used computers to support “everything” related to his teaching, including preparation, presentation and assessment. He was starting to make tentative forays into face-to-face teaching, for a number of reasons, including: a. the need to prepare himself for conference presentations and workshops (he rehearsed for these alone and with a colleague), b. to teach an occasional residential or summer school class which only some of the DE students could attend, and c. to fill in for an absent colleague in the summer school program.

Rose.

Rose had been lecturing in social work and conducting post-grad co-ordination and supervision at University level for three years. Previously she worked as a social worker.

While she had not taught previously via distance mode, she had had the experience of distance education as a student. Rose team-taught a new rural practicum subject comprising online/distance and intensive face-to-face components with Cora, and I always spoke with Rose and Cora together about their face-to-face and online teaching. Rose enjoyed teaching and she had completed a Graduate Certificate in Higher Education, and she participated actively in academic development seminars and events. Rose and Cora were encouraged to go online by a faculty-funded project. As Rose noted in her information profile record, they were making the move to online teaching so as to, "Replace the need for the students to attend the campus component of [subject name]. In so doing students will be able to take their placements in rural settings" (Rose, Participant Information Record, 2002).

Cora.

Cora team-taught the social work field education practicum subject with Rose. Like Rose, Cora had been teaching at university level for three years. However, she was employed in a non-academic, general staff position. She had been very involved in small-group teaching (15 - 20 students) in the undergraduate program, and blocks of her time were taken up organising student placements. Cora also designed and ran seminars for groups of practitioners who supervised their students in the field education program. She had not had any prior experience of distance education teaching or learning. In Cora's view, she and Rose were making the move online was made so as, "To support rural/regional field education placements primarily (unable to offer these placements otherwise). I'm also hoping to use this approach for teaching and supporting our external social work practitioner educators in the future, if this pilot program is successful" (Cora, Participant Information Record, 2002).

Rahime.

Rahime had been teaching Arts subjects at university level for 16 years, at all under-graduate levels, and in postgraduate coursework and supervision. At the time of our first conversations, Rahime was co-ordinating and teaching a two-semester first year subject

with 400 students. After committing to involvement in my research study, Rahime decided not to introduce other online learning contexts using the institutional learning management system, WebCT, opting to place readings and resources in the School website. However, for the first time in her teaching, she actively invited her first-year students to communicate with her via e-mail, and she was enjoying the sending and receiving of messages with some of her undergraduate students. In the early days of the semester, Rahime forwarded me copies of several student e-mail messages. Although Rahime had experienced some of the "tools" and components of WebCT via an IT project the previous year, she had chosen not to use it in teaching this first year subject. Rahime explained her views on WebCT in her Participant Information Record.

> Because WebCT is designed for the transmission of course content and is somewhat unwieldy to use. I was preparing the equivalence of a junior handbook on line and
>
> (1) I cannot institute a first year system which colleagues and administration staff are not trained in.
>
> (2) the material on the web was designed for free access but WebCT is for enrolled students (this is actually going to change next year though - but I am not sure how yet). In fact, more material went on the web associated with teaching than was originally planned and this was useful and appreciated by students, but a lot of work. I also decided that emails might be a better way to start than discussion groups and so far I am pleased with this decision - it created a better relationship between myself and individual students which I valued. (Rahime, Participant Information Record, 2002)

Evan.

"Evan Preacher" (self-titled) had been teaching undergraduate and postgraduate history in an arts faculty for approximately three and half years at his current university, and he had taught previously in the United States and in New Zealand. He put up web pages (course information, readings) for all his courses, and he was a participant in the study because he was about to make the move online, and the content of a new subject he planned to offer

was explicitly web-related. As to his reasons for making the move online, in his Participant Information Record, Evan wrote:

> The opportunity in terms of teaching relief to develop WebCT resources [faculty-funded project in 2001], and the example of colleagues in the US, who use discussion lists in courses, focussed on online material as this one is. I am also aware that I can be a dominating presence in classroom discussions, & hope that I can remain in the background on-line. I hope that some students who contribute little in class might feel more able to contribute on-line. (Evan, Participant Information Record, 2002)

The Winds of Change

Evan, and the other Humanities lecturers at NMU experienced considerable change in their departmental teaching contexts while they were involved my study. Practices that imposed regulation, scrutiny, and judgement in respect of learning and teaching were starting to be felt by the academics and, in our final conversation, Evan described some of those changes and his colleagues' responses.

> Evan: I mean this a very *laissez-faire* department in terms of teaching, ahm. One of my frustrations in a sense is that people can really do what they want.
>
> Kim: So there's an autonomy here …
>
> Evan: Yeah and I think I think that that's.. one of the tensions in the department at the moment is about trying to bring a little bit more consistency and transparency ahm to the way that we teach, and a lot of the old members of the staff are very reluctant to do that. But I think we are ever so slowly moving in the direction. I have certainly been one of the people to have pushed that.
>
> Kim: Course outlines have to be produced and scrutinized…
>
> Evan: And a standard format - but that's never.. that's only happened in this department in the last couple of years ahm…and I think that so in the past somebody would have walked in and said, "Oh we'll deliver this online." They'd have said, "Fine. You do whatever you want". Now I'm not so certain. Now I think it's more likely they're going to be stopped and

> said… "Well that's not really how we teach". And what they want to do is more likely to be scrutinized than it once was, because I think.. I mean with… We have another University review with the faculty coming round, and everybody with an informed opinion is still [inaudible] coming next year. Ahm and I think that what that's done is "put the fear of God" up a lot of older members of staff and made them more willing to give up a little bit of their autonomy… Ahm.. and I think that it's a combination of knowing that they're going to be scrutinized, and being worried about what people are going to find because I think the laissez-faire system has allowed some people to get away with um…quite a degree of…. I think that there's a lot of skeletons in the departmental and faculty closet, and I think that those people have determinedly clung to the way they want to do it and it's only [when] faced with the possibility.. and the department's faced the possibility that they're going to be tarred by what people.. Because I think what the reality is, it's been too much trouble to do too much about colleagues whose teaching is a problem. I think it's only under this degree of review where people are worried about what the broader consequence is you know they can stomach a degree of usually not very.. any great.. They don't enjoy it, but they can stomach student complaints and things like that about people's courses and they do what they do [inaudible] courses, but fundamentally they know they are a problem. (Evan, C3)

Evan's remarks here draw our attention to the "winds of change" (Nelson, 2003) that were sweeping through the corridors and closets of his Humanities department, and Evan seemed to know which side he was on, at least publicly. There were pressures to make teaching more consistent and transparent; a university review was to take place within the next 12 months, and some "problem" colleagues feared being "tarred" – singled out and judged in some sense. The fluid, *laissez-faire* culture was now going to be subject to managerial scrutiny, producing tensions, and the gradual encroachment of agonising reflexivity, or so it seemed. The "winds of change" would be felt in the form of new projects (eg. a "HumsOnline" project that offered some teaching release), incentives (eg. teaching improvement grants) and other initiatives (eg. new administrative roles, such as a faculty Associate Dean of Learning and Teaching) that were offered in the name of improving student learning. It was clear that teaching was to become more regulated. Subject outline

templates were to be put on departmental websites, and subject evaluation survey results would be made available to faculty management scrutiny in order to tap into special university funding that was focussed on improving student learning and fostering teaching excellence. It was in this climate of tension and pressure that the Humanities staff in this study (Evan, Rose and Cora, Jane, Rahime) had decided to make the move online, and this chilly, windy climate of change provides a stark backdrop for considering the move online through the lens of all three metaphors: performing, caring and directing.

Chapter Summary: The 12 Participants and their Contexts

The twelve participants in this study worked at two universities in south-eastern Australia, Southern Regional University (SRU) and Northern Metropolitan University (NMU). The five participants at SRU (Hilary, Paul, Zhang, Seb, and Ron) were technology enthusiasts, and experienced in online teaching. Hilary, Paul, Zhang and Seb all taught at a regional campus of the university, with mainly local and cross-campus students. Zhang, Seb and Paul had also taught, or were teaching, national and international students at this time of their most intense involvement in the study. The seven participants at NMU (Evan, Rahime, Aurea, Jane, Rose, Cora and Frank) had more mixed teaching histories and motives for engaging with online teaching. Frank's experience of teaching was largely in distance education (DE), in particular through computer-based and online learning. Aurea was about to teach a new DE subject, and she had also introduced some online components into her on-going, on-campus subjects. Evan, Rahime, Rose, Cora, and Jane were lecturers in different disciplines in a large faculty that was about to enact significant change in the policy and regulation of teaching and learning.

As a collective, the twelve participants in my study embody diverse backgrounds and perspectives, in terms of university teaching experience, disciplinary affiliation, (online) teaching modes and practices, and reasons for engaging with flexible, online learning.

Chapter 5
Performing

> A meaningful world is a world in which there is the other through whom the world of my enjoyment becomes a theme having a signification. (Lévinas, 2002a, p. 525)

> There is no way to have a meaningful life and to develop particular skills and the skill of being a good human being without taking risks (Dreyfus, 2002, p. 376).

Introduction

My analysis has been organised around the archetypal identities of the academic teacher – performing, caring and directing. These three metaphors emerged out of my readings of the research transcripts, and after much reflection on the diverse metaphors that the participants articulated in our conversations. The three metaphors are best understood as arch-metaphors of lecturer identity that any academic, like the participants in this study, might take up in a particular context to articulate some aspect of their university teaching. In our conversations and communications, each participant would draw on a range of metaphors, including mixed metaphors, and variations on these three arch-metaphors. Even as a lecturer might start to talk about their pedagogical identity and relationships through one image - say that of a "tour guide" - other conscious and unconscious metaphorical references intruded. Sometimes Rose also needed to be "policewoman", and then she would also talk about how she allowed students to choose from a "menu" of topics. Attention to metaphor in any communicative exchange will reveal that we all utilise and mix our metaphors. Metaphor enriches and supports meaning-making, and in my conversations with each of the participants, there was never a pure, unified discussion that developed around one metaphor, unsullied by other images.

The three metaphors – performing, caring and directing - embody particular teacher-student relationships, and teacherly ways of "being" a lecturer. Recently I was very surprised, and very reassured, to hear a visiting academic at a teaching and learning "showcase" day at my own university, preface her keynote presentation with the observation that, under pressure of change in recent decades, universities teachers had moved through three emblematic types. Firstly, she said, we used to be "the sage on the stage", then "the guide on the side", and now we needed to become "muddlers in the middle"! This series of images coincidentally, yet fittingly, reflect the three metaphors for analysis in my study: performing, caring, and directing. These three orientations on university teaching reflect different values and practices and, in this and the following analysis chapters, I aim to put them to work as analytical lenses for examining traditional and emerging academic teacher identities in times of change. In this study the chosen sign and materialization of change is the move to student-centred, online learning (and teaching).

In my analysis of each metaphor, I am particularly interested in attending to the nature of the teacher's relationship with the other, the student, who is a key signified in determining teacher identity. Therefore, in the case of the performer, the metaphorical subject of this chapter, I am also interested in the audience and the spectator, without whom it is difficult to give a performance. I will also give some space to a consideration of participants' descriptions of performer-lecturers (in particular "the old, charismatic professor") whom they knew or remembered, for such stories reflect collegial and student attitudes towards lecturing as performance in the contemporary university, as well as establishing some of his core beliefs and practices. Later in the chapter, I will go on to address what happens to the lecturer-student relationship when the performer-lecturer adapts his scripts and skills for departmental websites and online CMC.

The Performer

> There can be no excellent teaching or learning unless teachers and learners delight in what they are doing. (Ramsden, 2003, p. 253)

Performing was a very common metaphor for teaching that all participants mentioned at some point in our conversations, though it was noticeably more meaningful for some participants, who would return consciously to its images and associations in subsequent communications and conversations. But it was not *the* single, essential teaching metaphor for any individual in the study. Ron for example, spoke of his teaching self as not simply a performer and model, but also as a (pastoral) carer, an "elder of the tribe", a resource, and an entrepreneur of ideas. While the performer metaphor was very meaningful for Seb, he also made reference to being like a hunter and, like a machine or computer, he was a good trouble-shooter, both as a computer scientist and as a teacher. That is, the metaphor of the performer, as profiled in this chapter, is a collective construction, interpretatively pieced together by me, utilising what each individual in this collective case study said about performers and performing.

In the next section I will establish a general profile of the performer-lecturer, by introducing the performing metaphors that the research participants shared, and reporting some of the participants' observations, experiences and attitudes to lecturing as performing. This will include a consideration of the performer's "brief" (fun and entertainment), his relationship with the other – the audience and the spectator – and his pleasure in spontaneity and risk.

The Metaphors of Performing in this Study

When academics talk about lecturing as performance, mostly they are referring to what they do in lectures and sometimes in large group seminars. Typically the lecturer speaks from a central space (from a raised platform or a low arena-like flat floor) to a large number of students - often hundreds of students. The performer-lecturer might stand behind a lectern.

Sometimes the performer will pace the stage and move around quite energetically. Regardless, he holds the floor, and he "stands and delivers" (McWilliam & Palmer, 1995, p. 34). Sutherland and Badger (2004) refer to the lecture as a "medieval educational format" (p. 286) and they noted that most of the 25 participants in their study of lecturers' perceptions of lectures, viewed the lecture as one-way medium for the transmission of information.

In Table 3, I have set out in the first column the various metaphors mentioned by lecturers in my study that individually and collectively associate teaching with performing. The three table columns are based on Lusted's (1986) model of pedagogy – a model which comprises three agencies: "the teacher, the learner and the knowledge they together produce". In the Student and Curriculum columns, I have fleshed out the implied pedagogical context of the metaphor, as not all of these aspects were supplied by participants when they were discussing the metaphors. However, "spectators", "audience", "objects", "script", "stock stories", "humour", "jokes" and "improvisation" were explicitly mentioned by one or more participants. One could also extend these metaphors to describe the physical university context, in terms of entertainment venues, the theatre, the market square, the United Nations, television, the church.

Table 3: Teaching is like Performing

Teacher-as-Performer Metaphors	**Student**	**Curriculum; Knowledge Production**
model	spectator, imitator, fashion buyer	a desirable pattern, object or process to be imitated, fashionable clothing to be admired and copied
juggler	onlooker, audience	juggling balls, objects
interpreter, communicator	speakers who want to communicate and understand	language and message of the communication
gospel preacher	congregation	bible and gospel readings, hymns, epistles
"talk show" host	TV audience	live interviews, Q & A format
performer, actor, entertainer, comedian	spectator, fan	script, stock stories, "the plot", improvisation, humour and jokes

The imaginative focus of the performing metaphor is on teaching as an embodied act, and the various types of performers are always "in the spotlight" - at the centre of attention - or central to the transmission and interpretation of particular forms of language and/or knowledge. The performer is an actor first and foremost, a player who is doing something he has either practiced or rehearsed, or that may require particular qualities and skills that audience members may not have, or may not be able to develop easily. The student is a spectator, in an audience most typically, and is someone who comes to listen, and be engaged and entertained. In this metaphor, curriculum and knowledge are quite "flashy", so as to catch the attention of the spectator, and indeed many an ageing professor has enthralled (and, in equal measure, probably bored) his audience with his enthusiasm for his own research.

"Ah, Showtime!" - The Charismatic Professor Performs

> [This] professor in another discipline - who I know personally - who is shy and socially uncomfortable, gets up and… He said to me once before he did it, "Ah, Showtime!" So up he gets and does this incredibly confident performance. And there are people who can do that. (Cora, in Rose & Cora, C3)

In this section I will relate some of the participants' stories of performer-lecturers they know or knew, thus revealing their beliefs about his values and practices, and their attitudes towards him.

"Born to teach"

It is interesting to note, firstly, that a number of the participants in this study suggested that teachers, and by implication performer-teachers, were "born to teach". That is, their teacher or performer identity was an innate Nature-identity (Gee, 2001). Evan Preacher commented, "I started off terrified of teaching. I didn't do a PhD to teach. I wasn't one of those people born to teach (Evan, C1a)." In a similar vein, Seb said to me, "I don't know if you can take a complete non-teacher and make them a good teacher. Same with like an actor.. I don't know if you can teach everyone to act... maybe".

Rose summed up what a number of participants were suggesting. "Some people are natural performers. They have it in them… [They] have a charisma (Rose & Cora, C1a)." Rose repeated what she perceived as a lack, "I know there's some people that I believe are natural performers. They have it in them. And I've seen that…. and that have a charisma. And I don't believe that I'll ever have that (Rose & Cora, C1a)." In fact, unlike the male performers in the study, Rose was quite self-critical of her lecturing performances, believing herself to be "not that hot" at lecturing. Like Rose, other participants desired a little more confidence, humour, lightness in their lecturing practice. While Jane took up the metaphor of performing in her lectures, she also wished she were a comedian "at times". Frank, whose introduction to teaching was via computer-based and online teaching,

admitted he'd like just a little of the face-to-face teaching confidence and performance skills of a certain anatomy Professor he knew. Hilary best summed up the desires of participants with her wistful comment.

> And the thing I think I'd like to improve most of all is, is the sort of, ahm.... evidence of enthusiasm when I teach. Ahm...I think I need to go to drama lessons and, ahm yeah because, I'd like to sort of, come across more.... more dynamically. (Hilary)

At least four participants (Rose, Hilary, Jane, Frank) in my study wanted to be more dynamic, enthusiastic, humorous or confident - just like the ideal performer they thought! It seems that this belief, that the performer is a Nature-identity, is a difficult fiction – an ideal – to which some teachers continue to aspire. Nevertheless, entertaining and enthusing students is a vital part of the performer's act, and the participants in this study thought it was best achieved by modelling one's own enthusiasm for the subject matter – giving the students a "vicarious experience of relevance" as Hodgson (1997) puts it.

With dynamism and enthusiasm, and humour and confidence, the performer both performs to instil a "learning desire" (Todd, 1997) in his students, and he also produces the desire to be a charismatic performer in his academic peers. Rahime made reference at one point to the "male peacock syndrome" – a character plumed in fancy rhetoric, but lacking in "substance". The image of the strutting peacock performer invokes a masculinist pedagogy of display, seduction and desire, as discussed in feminist accounts of embodied teaching and learning (Gallop, 2002; Johnson, 2005; McWilliam, 1999; Todd, 1997).

An Ageing Male Professor

Some of the participants remembered charismatic performer-lecturers, who were colleagues, or lecturers who had inspired them. The following four extracts tell of four performer-lecturers, who had clearly made an impression on each narrator's memory. With Cora and with Rahime, the stories came up in the context of talking about lecturing to large

groups; with Frank and Seb, I had asked them each if they knew or recalled good university teachers. When reading these descriptions it is interesting to reflect on how the student/s is/are represented.

> The professor... was one of these charismatic people who used to sit up the front of the room and, sort of sit on a desk, and just talk off the top of his head. And.. he used to go off in all sorts of directions, and was.. just entertaining, the students loved it. But he never actually stuck to any of the curriculum. So the students felt really inspired. (Cora, in Rose & Cora, C1).

> Certainly I can ah, recall my Psychology lecturer at Queensland Uni…. Ahmm…a lovely old gentlemen who's in his seventies - still lecturing. And.. er.. his teaching methods probably to some degree influenced me because, he always wanted to demonstrate what he was saying. I mean even to point of when he demonstrated evolution he got on all four legs, and his biros went everywhere across the floor out of his pocket, and it didn't worry him in the slightest. And I think you've gotta be someone that.. if you're going to do good teaching, things will go wrong, and I think you've gotta be able to just take that in your stride. If you become embarrassed and y'know, the class'll know that, and they'll respond accordingly, particularly with young kids, y'know, as I say: the youth. Ahmm, so..y'know I think you've gotta be someone that can take it all… and he was definitely like that. And what he did, I think it was third year, but I was doing my first year subjects - an elective - and at the end of it I wish I'd majored in Psychology. That's what the effect he had on me was... (Seb)

> One of my favourite lecturers at university was probably a lecturer who was actually really unpopular, because he was really growly, and so formal and unapproachable [*chuckling*]….. And he was the Politics prof.… He just absolutely knew his stuff backwards, and was incredibly passionate about it and had lived it… [*Rahime recounts the details of his life*]. So it was pretty grim, a grim story.… He was an absolutely classic, old-style lecturer - there were no two ways about it. He would never cope with [this] University today, because he wouldn't tolerate students coming in late or leaving early, and things like

> that [*chuckles*]. But I just think he was wonderful. And it is partly because he knew his own material and knew why he was teach-.. you had a sense that he knew why he was teaching it. (Rahime, C3)

> Frank: He has a great reputation for being a very, very good teacher and I think.. he has routinely got awards from the students for being best teacher.… He is an old-fashioned lecturer. I could see why they would do that, because he has got tremendous stage presence and he loves a crowd. A lot of it is ego - he loves being a performer - and he was playing to the crowd and playing the crowd as well.
> Kim: You don't aspire to be like this fellow, do you?
> Frank: Not at all, I couldn't be. It would be very false and artificial.
> Kim: Is it good teaching?
> Frank: On the whole his teaching style is a bit "over the top" for my taste. He is very flamboyant and some of the things he says I think are wrong, but he goes like, "I'm right. I know I'm right! Don't argue with me! If you do, you are a fool". That sort of thing.
> Kim: Some people can feel drummed over with that style?
> Frank: He is a bit like that, yeah. I have seen him engaged in some "dialogue" - for want of a better word! [*laughing*] He was once teaching downstairs a number of courses and one of the students stopped - just couldn't contain herself anymore. She just exploded, and laid into him. [*laughing*] (Frank, C2)

In these stories, the students are young ("the youth", "young kids"), who felt really inspired – or really intimidated - as suggested in Rahime's description of her growly, unapproachable prof. Frank's account - complete with exploding female student - draws our attention to the silencing and power differential between the performer and his audience. The effects of the power differential between performer and fan can lead to some odd interactions between them both off stage. Rahime spoke of being accompanied by students (acolytes? novice attendants?) back to her office after lectures. Sometimes, individuals would drop by to see her and discuss assignments in between the weekly lectures.

> Rahime: One student for instance came to the door to see if he could make an appointment with me. [*Laughing*]. It was quite funny, but it was sort of symbolic in a way. He just looked at me like he'd never seen me before in his life – shock! "Oh," he said, "I'm sorry. I have never seen you close-up before."
>
> Kim: Oh really?
>
> Rahime: The distance you know.
>
> Kim: Yes, you are down there at the front.
>
> Rahime: They find you are a real-life human being; they don't know quite how to deal with that. So you think you are being really contemporary, warm and accessible in the lecture, theatre lecture, but there are [limits?] to that physical space, what it does. (Rahime, C3)

Rahime's story of " distance" between herself and a student is particularly resonant when we reconsider her own experience of feeling slightly intimidated as an under-graduate by the "growly" professor. There is something about the student's deference to her authority in this story that seemed to produce an uneasy reflexivity in Rahime, supported by her uneasy laughter. Is it possible that Rahime and others might be repeating on a new generation the same intimidating presence and generational distance that she herself experienced? Or perhaps she is uncomfortable about this response on the part of the student? The physical proximity of lecturer and student to each other in this way – one-on-one - is another highly risky pedagogical scene (best discussed in terms of the caring metaphor, chapter 6).

Age and Seniority

The charismatic performer-lecturer is an archetypal character in the history of university teaching and learning. The lecturers in the study characterised him as an eccentric, egocentric, ageing, male professor. Nobody recalled any charismatic women performer-lecturers – though several women in the study desired some of his performer attributes. The performer is old and old-fashioned, a senior member of university staff, often with a high academic profile for his research. He has experienced the passing of time, and change

in universities. In this study, Ron spoke of being “an elder of the tribe”. He reflected back over 35 years of university teaching, referring several times to “the good old days” in universities. The charismatic performer-professor draws our attention to age, seniority and the generation gap (note Seb’s reference to “the youth”) in higher education. Hilary referred several times to age and to the generation gap she perceived between herself and her students. “Y’know, you do tend to just… like they will stereotype me as their mother’s age and y’know, beyond all interesting things. And I might stereotype them as... eighteen year olds” (Hilary). Seb mentioned the “rigid and strict” deference of his Singapore students “to adults and people they consider senior”, and he delighted in the fact that he was perceived to be “a bit more light-hearted than they think an academic would be” by those groups of students. The performer-lecturer expects younger students at least to recognise and respect his authority and seniority. In this way he achieves recognition for being a performer.

In fact, Evan Preacher still found the performer metaphor to be very relevant for describing his face-to-face teaching “style”, and he prided himself on his energy, conviction, and enthusiasm when giving lectures to his undergraduate groups.

> But you know to get them up off their feet, and get them moving, get them motivated, get get it, get something across to them, so you know.… My wife jokes a little bit about the fact that yeah, as a teacher, I’m very much like an evangelical preacher. And you know I tend to come out of lectures dripping with sweat and exhausted, ‘cause I do literally work myself into that, depending on what the topic is, but you know I mean. …. It’s preaching. It’s much more one of those old style, evangelical [Kim: Gospel?] sort of gospel-tent preachers standing up at the front, ending up gripping at, you know grabbing the lect.. and walking around. Yeah and just you know working themselves up into it. (Evan, C1)

> As with a good theatrical performance, you have to hold their attention so they're at least listening to what you have to say and this is where being a good 'performer' comes in. Following that comes the understanding of the concept you're putting across, but once you

> hold their interest, I think a lot of the work is done. Some of the concepts I deal with are very technical in nature but some modification to real life (rather like making them into a biblical parable) can simplify and enforce the concept far better than simply regurgitating content. I guess this is where 'performance' comes in too. I'd like to think these are key traits of my teaching personality and style. (Seb, e-mail communication, 04.05.00)

Seb's co-incidental reference to "a biblical parable" resonates with Evan's description of his highly animated preaching-lecturing. The preacher is ever ready to welcome converts to the faith, and his evangelistic, spiritual presence might well be divinely inspired. The preacher metaphor is not new. Sutherland and Badger (2004, p. 283) identify and discuss the notion of the lecturer as a minister of religion, who "tries to induct the class into the mysteries, ideas, values and practices of the subject just as a minister does in his/her sermon" with what Philip Smith (2000) refers to as "salvation narratives". One particular source of excitement and tension for the performer – whether one is preaching, acting, modelling, juggling or interviewing - is the arrival of the unexpected, the possibility of spontaneity.

Preparation and Improvisation

The pedagogy of performing can be construed as highly risky in its reliance on embodied presence, spontaneity and deviation from the script, or improvisation. In making an interesting case for teaching as improvisational performance, Sawyer (2004) points out the lack of creative challenge and intellectual stimulation in the scripted curriculum, which is not unlike Derrida's (2002) notion of teaching as "repetition". It is the unexpected moments – Seb's Psychology professor on all fours – that are most often remembered by the students. Improvisation is a risky skill, and Seb was proud of the fact that he had recently improvised a lecture when the lecture theatre technology let him down.

> I can give a lecture. I gave one lecture the other day - we couldn't get the monitor going - I had no notes, I didn't have the textbook with me and I, thankfully, I was able to just

> completely give the whole lecture with whiteboard marker. [Kim: Improvise.] Oh totally. (Seb)

This risky attachment to "seat of the pants" improvisation, is also exemplified in Cora's story of the charismatic performer-professor going off "in all sorts of directions", making spontaneous decisions about what to do and how to respond, moment by moment, during a lecture, while sitting on a desk at the front. Indeed, one of the silences I have detected in the lecturing-performing metaphor is the issue of preparation for a performance/lecture. None of the participants discussed lecture preparation, though Rahime was clear about the importance of subject design.

> I enjoy course design, well subject design, ahm, and I do put a lot of time into that. I think you have got to teach something a few times to really do it well. It has to be designed from the beginning as well. I spent an enormous amount of time designing courses. You can end up doing so much that you barely need to write lectures because you know where you are with it, and even when I teach a course for a first time, I tend to write a fairly formal lecture for myself anyway, whether I give it as a formal lecture. It tests how much material I can cover, and the ways I want to cover it, and the kind of linkages I can make. The relationship between all the lectures and the structure of the course I spend an enormous amount of time on. (Rahime, C3)

Reading between the lines, there is some flexibility in this model of planning for adapting and changing material from lecture to lecture in response to student needs – a recognisable teacher behaviour that fits well with a performing approach to teaching. Yet at its extreme this flexibility could be highly risky. Although Cora's charismatic "Showtime" professor "never actually stuck to any of the curriculum", we get the sense that he exuded some kind of conviction and authenticity in his improvisation – just enough enthusiasm to send students rushing to the library to read up on the topic that had just been presented to them so enthusiastically. Of course, all this enthusiasm might well be a cover for a lack of

(student-focussed) preparation, because the performer was getting on with his real work – research - and teaching was a secondary academic activity. It was actually all an act.

Prepared or not, and under the guise of many metaphors, the performer entertains a crowd, an audience, a spectator – or indeed a soul who must be saved. With the power-differential of the preacher-performer metaphor, we find undergraduate students in particular being positioned as acolytes and souls that need to be saved, although they are not always complicit or compliant. (There is always the risk that a student will explode).

The Student: Spectator, Disciple, Acolyte, and Heckler

> And I can remember being in class with a load of kerfuffle going around - I think I've still got it if I can find it - but at the end, this petition was put up, about Seb not being their lecturer for the second half of the year, and: "We want Seb" and "It's not fair!" and all this kind of stuff. And I thought, "Well, I can't be doing too bad a job". (Seb).

There is pleasure for the performer-lecturer in having fans, although no one in the study used quite this term in reference to their own students. I was told however of followers, disciples and acolytes, or attendants. Immediately after lectures, the performer reported being approached by some of the students who had sat through the lecture. Evan was "barraged", Hilary was thanked and, as we read before, Rahime was often accompanied back to her office by individuals who had attended her lectures.

Recognition of a lecturer's performance can come via student evaluation feedback, and in one-to-one conversations. Evan said that the "students respond well to me. They like my enthusiasm" and, as evidence, he referred to "amazing comments on student evaluations about how much they enjoy the course" (Evan, C1a). Thus, Evan not only ascribed to himself the performer identity – as a rousing evangelist-preacher – but he also believed he had achieved that identity in the eyes of his students. He believed he was a popular lecturer, and he mentioned several times the followers, "disciples" or acolytes who would take only his subjects in the department from year to year:

> Kim: I'm wondering about how you see your relationship with your students. And how do you think the students see you?
>
> Evan: Yeah, it's interesting – I saw that on the letter. I mean the students respond really well to me. And it's clear that they like my enthusiasm. I've got just *amazing* comments on my student evaluations about how much the students enjoy the course, and enjoy me as a lecturer. They seem to …they find me… they obviously find me very approachable in the sense that I am *barraged* by students, around the courses. And you know I've been really pleased by the fact that I've had a bit of flow-through too. So you know I have a core of students who've taken every course that I've taught here. You know a core of maybe 30 or 40 or 50 students who've followed me round. And that seems to be an on-going feature. So the students really are engaged (Evan, C1a)

Yet, not all the students are likely to be engaged. Both Evan and Seb had experienced hecklers in their lectures – "tricky" students who challenged them and their ideas, and who needed to be "handled" carefully, according to Seb. As he said, "there's always one that crops up that will be 'a thorn in your side' that you've gotta learn to handle." The possibility that one or more students in the audience might explode, heckle or ignore the performer and walk out, can unsettle the performer. Evan recalled a "saboteur" – a student who used to challenge him in the smaller face-to-face tutorials that he ran between lectures.

> And there was one guy in particular who won't be in second semester who was ….[*exhales*] he needed to take over the discussions and sabotage them. So who was on the one hand sort of vaguely interested in the material, but who on the other hand very negative about it, and very…completely unable to imagine possibilities, and he would also sidetrack the discussion to issues that in fact weren't the ones we wanted to talk about. He'd always manage to talking about you know corporate take-overs of the web, and things like that. He was a major obstacle to the class that he was in, and I'd often end up essentially in both arguments with him and then having to just say, "Look, <u>no</u>, that's not what we're talking about. <u>No</u>, that's not what we're talking about." And in that sense I was back… and then I'd have to take on a much more kind of evangelical kind of role to get people <u>back</u> into the

> discussion, once this guy had derailed it. This guy was one of those people that needed to be shut up. Ahm, in the sense that he had, that he took ov.. He's a guy I've taught before and part of the problem is, that he doesn't do the reading. But that doesn't inhibit his desire to talk. So he has his stuff he wants to talk about. And he'll talk about it… [Kim: His agenda, hmm]. His agenda - by default - when he hasn't done the reading and he doesn't know what we are supposed to be talking about. And in that sense he drags it back to that stuff all the time. And he was a real struggle. And he's quite a dominant personality. And even the better students in that group are not quite as assertive personalities as he is. So there were a lot of people who disagreed with him and who were aware, you know, who were thinking what we were wanting to think about, but couldn't talk him down. So in the end I would have to be the one who came in to talk him down, and to shut him up. And I think in fact he frustrated a lot of the students, the better students in that course as well. [Kim: Sure]. But he won't be around again, so that will change. (Evan, C2)

It is not hard to imagine the conflict and tensions in the tutorial room as the heckler and performer confronted each other in this actual scenario. Both dominant personalities, it would seem. Those present could not ignore the exchange and the emotions it engendered. The very embodied nature of live lectures and seminars or tutorials means that the affective responses of teacher and students are highly visible and audible. Everyone is aware of how others in the same space are sitting or standing, their postures and gestures, their eye contact (or not), whether they are blushing, stumbling over their words, chatting. The riskiness of moments such as Evan describes – and the adrenalin rush it produces, in the performer in particular – is a distinctive feature of live, synchronous performance. Whatever the orientation of the performance, everyone present is aware that the demands of such performances are considerable for the performer-lecturer.

Performance Fears

Performing before a lecture theatre full of students can be quite demanding, emotionally draining and highly risky in terms of rapport and audience response. Rahime admitted that walking in to lecture in front of 150 students can be "terrifying" and Jane revealed that

sometimes she felt extreme anxiety before giving a lecture. Indeed when she returned to lecturing after her last sabbatical, she "got help" and anti-depressants. Ron and Jane spoke explicitly about "losing the plot". "They started to laugh at me, because … I think I was getting on too serious…. It was a terrible experience ah, this huge lecture theatre and overflowing and feeling that I'd lost it (Ron)." Jane articulated some of the shame she felt when this happened.

> Jane: Sometimes when I am giving a lecture, I just know it is not working, I have lost the students, and there is no way out of it.
> Kim: How do you feel?
> Jane: Ahm, oh, I feel ashamed of myself - I should have gone about it this way or that way, disappointed or frustrated. (Jane, C1a)

Being in a risky space at the centre of attention, can leave one feeling quite vulnerable. Perhaps it is just co-incidence, but both Seb and Evan unconsciously drew on "hunting" metaphors as they were describing their particular experiences of live lecturing. Evan feared coming "under fire" in his lectures.

> You know I'm somebody who.. who paces around and gestures. It's very much a dramatic performance with me. You know a lot of overheads, but you know I'm whipping things on and whipping things off. So I'm very much a moving target, kind of thing…. (Evan, C1a)

If Evan might sometimes feel himself to be a "moving target", Seb holds the gun (metaphorically) in his lectures. In describing for me how he adapted his teaching to cater for the diverse student backgrounds in his subjects, Seb made four references (in the space of 27 lines of transcript) to aiming down the middle. Perhaps to avoid being hunted, the performer feels the needs to be "on the defence". (The implied rendering of the student as the hunted, or as prey, in this metaphor is slightly disquieting too). Some of the male performer-teachers in this study spoke of the need, as part of their communicative act, to grab, or reach out to, or get some thing across to their spectator-students. Ron felt that

online modes gave him a "more powerful means of reaching out there". Seb said, for example, "I don't think I'll ever get away from face-to-face 'cause, y'know, body language is so much easier to get a message across to them." Evan liked to "capture their imagination" (Evan, C1a), and "grab hold of students" for the department and the discipline right from the first year.

That one's physical and emotional health can be affected to this extent by the demands of lecturing underlines the very fragile, embodied nature of one person lecturing to a large group of students in a space that limits audience interaction and movement. A healthy body is critical for maintaining a good performance. In fact, Seb commented he was dead "if the machine [was] down". Bringing theory and ideas, and indeed the students, to life was valued highly by the performer. Ron's solution to the terrifying moment when he lost his students was to turn to "some real live examples". Rose observed that in lectures the students "seem to come alive as long as you give those practice examples" – anecdotes that can "connect and engage" students and motivate them to "do their own learning" (Rose, in Rose & Cora, C2). As you "make things come alive" for the students, you also keep them, and their interest, "alive".

The Attributes of the Performer-Lecturer: A Review

It is all too easy to anthropomorphise the metaphor of performing as a caricature – as a charismatic, eccentric professor. To this point, this has been a deliberate strategy that has enabled me to draw out the values and practices of the performing metaphor as it applies to university teaching and lecturers. However, performing was something that all participants in the study discussed as a meaningful metaphor for elements of university teaching, whether they ascribed those values and practices to themselves or to other lecturers. The key attributes of lecturing as performing are, firstly, the desire, on the part of the lecturer, to engage and entertain students, particularly by exploiting the spontaneity of live lecturing for improvisation and diversion. Secondly lecturers embody their seniority, authority and power by pacing, posturing or by "holding the floor" at the lectern, and students are

positioned as silent listeners. Thirdly, the embodied, proximate context gives rise to the thrill and fear of risk: an unexpected accident or moment, impromptu lecturer stories, the student who explodes. While seeking to "capture" the students' interest, the performer-lecturer runs the risk of hecklers, or of losing the plot. Of course, handling these matters spontaneously as they arise also models very subtly and visibly for all students present how one might cope with moments of risk and crisis. This is one of the hidden thrills of being party to a live lecture – for both the performer and the audience.

> Proximity, immediacy, is to enjoy and to suffer by the other. But I can enjoy and suffer by the other, only because I am-for-the-other, am signification, because the contact with skin is still a proximity of a face, a responsibility, an obsession with the other, being-one-for-the-other, which is the very birth of *signification* beyond *being*. (Lévinas, 1991, p. 90; author's italics)

We might limit our reading and understanding of Lévinas if we take the notion of contact here too literally or physically, yet in this quote Lévinas manages to capture some of the unspoken, shared intensity of the teacher-student relationship within the teaching as performing metaphor. It is interesting to reflect on the meaningfulness that both performer and spectator bring to and take away from a performance – a risk of joy, a risk of suffering.

While performing is risky teaching, it does represent a particular relationship that connects student and teacher. Inherent in this teaching metaphor is a particular teacher–student relationship that depends on mutual responsibilities of one toward the other. For a performance to be successful in the eyes of both the performer and the audience, each party needs to be aware of and responsive towards the other. The performer reads his audience for clues and encouragement, as much as the audience is reading and responding to him.

In light of this analysis of performing, I will now turn my attention to how the performer makes the move online.

Performer-lecturers Making the Move Online

Viewed through the lens of performing, the move online is not an easy transition. Indeed, as my participants and I shall show, it is impossible for the performer to perform online in the ways discussed in the previous sections of this chapter. Most importantly, the pedagogical relationship that exists between the performer and his audience/spectator is impossible to maintain, and this was a source of frustration for several lecturers in the study. From the perspective of the performer, four factors contribute to this breakdown in the pedagogical relationship with the student: scrutiny, which had implications for an already burgeoning workload and new tempos of work, and the absence of the embodied other.

Scrutiny: "You can get away with things in a live situation" (Ron)

The performer draws attention immediately to the theme of scrutiny in online teaching, precisely because he appreciates, and exploits, the privacy of *in camera* lectures for conducting risky, pedagogical displays. However, a similar privacy is not to be found online, where one's words were more permanent, accessible for reading and re-reading, and liable to be archived. Ron, for example, asserted strong political views in his live lectures as well as online. He was aware that these views could land him in trouble, but he remained committed to airing them.

> You can get away with things in a live situation where, it's transient. I mean I can get up and I'll rant and rave about uh, y'know, the past Kennett government and the sort of inequities of the system, and I'll get the odd feedback [*laughs*] at the end of the year saying that y'know, you should keep politics out of your lectures. Um, but ah, to me, I mean that's part of me and my passion that I was passionately upset by some of things that [the then state premier] did to the hospital system, and.. that's what you get. But if I put that down online it'd be like [*Ron laughs*] I mean if I put that down in writing ahh.. I mean this, I've got the odd lecture where I've been a bit freaky and I… have put those online... (Ron)

Ron was aware of a difference between criticising policy and people in his field in face-to-face lectures and online. By his own admission he would "get away with a lot" in his live lectures, and he was aware that posting those same ideas on his website and in online discussions meant they were more visible, perhaps even to the very people and organizations of which he was critical. "But if I put that down online it'd be like [Ron laughs]… I mean if I put that down in writing ahh.." (Ron). Indeed, it was Ron's wife who alerted him to the risks of publishing some "facts and figures… that were not meant to be released" on the university's website.

> Ahm, and, I actually got, I mean my wife was so sort of worried that I was going to end up with libel cases and she insisted that I, sort of get it vetted by several other people who sort of subtly changed some of the words. (Ron)

Ron continued his critique in online contexts for a while, and it came as no surprise when, several years later, he was threatened with legal action for doing something similar on his university website by his university and a national health department. In live lectures, Ron could and did ridicule politicians and government policy quite openly. Ron's story of visibility and accountability in online teaching raises similar issues in terms of copyright, authorship and intellectual property, although no other participants in this study spoke about these matters in any great detail.

Rahime and Jane echoed Ron's concerns about writing down difficult and delicate matters. Like Ron, Rahime liked to take a risk in a live lecture, and she wondered whether one might really be able to capture the sense of (what seems to be a "live") debate in material written for online learning. Jane mentioned how she made a "spur of the moment" decision (something performer-lecturers like to do) to tell an illustrative, personal story.

> Rahime: There are things I can talk about in class for instance that I am prepared to take risks in relation to, but I would not be prepared to put on paper…. It is so difficult to get that sense of debate into written materials and ahm..
>
> Kim: The immediacy of it, yeah.
>
> Rahime: And there's a sense in which people see the written word as having a kind of truth…. I think in a sense what do we think we are learning [live, face-to-face] and what I think we are learning is something about relationships. We are not simply learning content. (Rahime, C2)

> In my honours class last week we were talking about [a topic] and we were talking about the ageing of the population and rights and responsibilities of people getting older and their care…. Of course it is a very difficult and intriguing issue and I decided to tell the students something of my own experience.… And it helped me and helped them to illuminate some aspects of the rights issue... I wouldn't write it down or put it anywhere where it could be printed or distributed - that was more permanent - but in that little room it was good, because it arose at that moment and had a purpose. (Jane, C3)

As Jane tells it, anything written down – even online – is more permanent than what is spoken. Unlike the ephemeral "words that would blow away when everyone walked out of the lecture theatre" (Jane, C2), the words she read in online discussions would be "sitting there waiting" for an answer from her. "I would go to a fair bit of trouble to think about answering them", she added. She was also very aware of the potential for her teaching to be scrutinised.

> Yes… potentially more teaching is opened to scrutiny in the sense that other people can potentially tap in, or there is a record kept - a record of words spoken or written - but it hasn't been an issue for me. Personally I don't worry about it. Maybe if I felt an obligation to go online I would feel differently than… from the actual situation which is me choosing to do it. (Jane, C1a)

Words online are more permanent and accountable. One's ideas and views are traceable, potentially archivable, and more often than not replicable, with implications for intellectual property and copyright. Rahime felt vulnerable about publishing her own material and ideas as lecture notes online.

> I am using my own material in most of my courses, with exception of this first year one. You can't publish without being accountable for people, and I think there is a revealing of self in that, but it is very scary. I think it is particular scary for women and I think it is the reason why women find it so hard to publish. (Rahime, C2)

These lecturers are suggesting that there is increased potential for scrutiny and monitoring of online activities and teaching – a possibility that leaves them feeling intimidated and vulnerable to the critical scrutiny of others. This was not simply an issue for the performer-lecturers in this study. Those who spoke of caring, directing and facilitating were also aware of the gazes of unknown others, including management. The potential for the performer's online work and communications to be scrutinised, adds extra pressure to the growing workload of teaching.

The Facilitators' Workload: "I seem to be a lot busier" (Paul)

Increased workload is a theme I have identified already in the literature on academics and ICT (Brown, 1998; Graham & Scarborough, 1999; Hartman, Dzuiban & Moskal, 2001; Lynch & Collins, 2001; Taylor et al., 1996; Youngblood et al., 2001). Nevertheless, in this section, I will select particular insights and quotes from individuals to draw attention to how this felt and why it was such a concern for the academics in my study. All of the participants spoke about how their demanding, stressful workloads were exacerbated by the demands of online teaching, but it was through the perspective of the performer in particular that the teaching workload assumed some significance, and perhaps this is due to the strong value that the performer attaches to improvisation and spontaneity in face-to-face

lectures and seminars. Online teaching workload was an issue common to all participants, and it remains a problem from the perspective of caring and directing, too.

The easy pace and ephemerality of face-to-face teaching is a particularly valued by the performer-lecturer. While he might prepare for a lecture or tutorial at the last minute, online the lecturer must instead be organised well in advance, and have online material and activities prepared and ready for students to access often weeks ahead of the topic schedule and anticipated delivery. If we break this stage down, there is a demanding hidden workload associated with preparing oneself technically and pedagogically, by attending workshops, looking at sample sites, tinkering with software, and rewriting one's course and subject outlines so as to integrate the online "innovation". Added to this is the preparation of materials and activities that must go into the design and set up of the LMS site or a website which, in many universities, needs to be prepared well in advance of the semester in order to meet approval process and technical checking deadlines. Paul was the first participant who explicitly drew attention to the fact that preparing for online teaching required more time and effort than he might give to the preparation of face-to-face teaching. He reflected on the fact that text-based online teaching, like print-based DE which he had taught previously, took a lot of time to prepare. Aurea was also aware of the scrutiny of her preparation.

> Why spend three or four days writing a couple of pages to put on the web site when you can say, "Well, I really want you all to go and read chapter two...of the textbook"? [*Laughs*] 'Cause it says it much better than I can. [Kim: Yeah, mm]. So y'know, it's certainly made me think about that. Particularly when y'know, it's very easy to walk into a lecture and talk for an hour on a topic that you're interested and enthusiastic about, but to write three or four pages of text either as a DE or online, or something like that, takes a lot more effort. Mainly 'cause once it's out there, it's out there for a long while, ahm (*laughs*) and y'know, your face to people is out there. (Paul)

> Kim: Oh, I remember one of the other participants in the research, Paul, was saying to me

> "Oh you know, once it's up there, your face is out there to people" you know... He was saying he felt he was being scrutinised and watched.
> Aurea: Yeah, I think there is more time for scrutiny. There is more time for scrutiny, because with spoken word there's no record. So you know and you can always dispute: "Remember you said this?" "Oh did I say that?" But with paper you cannot dispute. I mean it's printed there. It's.. [Kim: Yeah]. If they have a hard copy of it – it's there. So.. they have more time to scrutinise. In the same manner that you as a teacher have more time to scrutinise what they have written. (Aurea, C3)

If your preparation is online, your "face" is online, Paul suggested. This awareness of imagined others looking at your efforts online – a "panopticon" effect (Foucault, 1977) – puts more pressure on the lecturer to put more time and effort into preparing carefully. The online material must be sound, appropriate and the site must look good. The potential for scrutiny drove Aurea to divert a lot of her energy and time into preparation - and it still wasn't enough, "I still feel I could put more into the [online DE] subject, especially if I had more time. I would not do it again. Having done that, it just opens a lot of possibilities for me with the other subjects I have" (Aurea, C1a) and "There is a lot of preparation. You need to invest in preparation" (Aurea, C2). Clearly Aurea was thinking strategically of ways to reuse some of the material she had spent so much time preparing.

Preparation can be quite demanding on the lecturer, because the imagined eyes of many others, apart from the target students, could well look at the site: technical staff, the LMS administrator and sometimes even friends of the students. While the workload of preparation is invisible, the material on the website is not. It is evidence of one's efforts at providing quality and excellence in university learning. And once the preparation is complete, the online teaching starts.

> I commonly spend an hour to sometimes an hour and a half - two hours each day - coping with email from all over the world, and it's been a very value-added sort of professional interaction er, keeping in contact, doing things, keeping networks going ahm, getting schemes and plots going across y'know, every country on the world…. But.... there's

> absolutely no doubt that trying to track what's going on, in the big wide world which is part of my professional activities, trying to extract what's relevant and putting [it] on the [university department] website, which is certainly, y'know, professional activities, and trying to cope with the sort of email correspondence.. has probably added a couple of hours, at least a couple of hours a day compared to six years ago. (Ron)

> Rahime: I think one of the other things it does is increase the sheer volume of stuff that we have to deal with…. but the speed we are expected to do things.. [Kim: Updating things, keeping things up-to-date and connected..] Ironically there is more emphasis on things like notices and up-dating materials and things, because of the way.. And it is all immediate, the kind of immediacy of that is very, very demanding. I find it very demanding. The expectation that you look at emails every day is intense. [Kim: Ahm, I find it is too]. That is a real pressure. It annoys me, people complaining because you didn't look at their emails.… Yes it's really very burdensome and I don't know how people manage it, but I find it quite oppressive. (Rahime, C3)

As discussed in my review of the literature in chapter 2, the increased workload includes learning new technical skills and pedagogical ways, setting up a site or "web presence", preparing material, being "present" to students online by answering their email messages, and reading and responding to discussion postings. This does not take into account increasing commitments too in the research and administration roles. The sub-text that comes with the LMS and the website is that the technological innovation is excellent and student-centred, and by implication how one taught before was not (Clegg et al, 2003; McWilliam, 2002). Equally the new demands that ICTs place on the facilitator imply that the pre-online performer wasn't working hard enough. And nowadays, with electronic communication now ubiquitous within the university, everyone expects a quick response.

The Tempo of Facilitation

The performer is used to a routine where he goes to a teaching space to see and respond to students. This is a difficult habit to break, for online the facilitator must remember to log on to respond to students who are not accessible to him immediately or proximately.

> I would really have had to have been in there posting and responding, posting and responding - in a way that would have essentially replicated my role in the face-to-face teaching. Ahm... I would have had to keep it going. And the reality is and again - much like the face-to-face teaching - even though in theory [*draws breath noticeably*] everybody had to go through the WebCT site in order to get on, get the links to read the online readings, ahm - a lot of people weren't. And ahm therefore you know without doing that, they were never, they were never in a situation to actually engage with it. (Evan, C2)

Evan realised all too late he should have been going online, "posting and responding", so as to initiate and monitor discussions online. The delayed nature of the turn-taking is unsettling and disorienting for the performer who is used to more immediate response patterns. This also happened to Ham and Davey (2005) and their student teachers and they thought that this lack of attention to the other in virtual or online spaces, might be put down to everyone being "out-of-sight-out-of-mind" online.

The technologies of enterprise require the enterprising, autonomous lecturer to find (self-) strategies and (self-) rules to manage one's personal and professional life, and so the challenge for the performer (as online facilitator) is to find new ways to become more attentive in responding to his students. For example, the new tempos of online teaching resulted in Seb having to learn to "turn off", and put up some boundaries, particularly in terms of whom he responded to, and when. Frank, who is an experienced online (self-ascribed) facilitator, takes such arrangements for granted.

> When? Anytime of the day, even weekends. That's another thing - I've done this on Sunday night; I've done this when I'm on sick leave. When I had the heart trouble I was off for nearly eight weeks and I still had students firing questions at me. I answered them 'cause I was at home and I was feeling all right. Ahm, it tends to.. I think you've gotta turn off. I think you've really got to, say to yourself "OK, there's a student needing a response there, but it's Sunday night. No, I'm going to look at that tomorrow." Ahm, because otherwise, you could be completely eating into your quality lifetime. [*Seb laughs*] (Seb)

> Kim: Do you put time boundaries around your online teaching?
> Frank: Well it is my job. So it is what I do first thing in the morning, yeah and sometimes it can take to midday to get through it all, yeah especially if it is stuff that needs to be sorted out. I try not to do anything at the weekends. I have online access at home now but I tend not to use it. I know some do and I prefer not to and also in the evenings I prefer not to. I do occasionally. (Frank, C2)

> Kim: Have you given a guarantee about your communication online?
> Frank: I promise I would try and get back to them within forty-eight hours [Kim: Oh, right]. It is not down in writing as a definite guarantee. I do try and get back fairly soon. (Frank, C3)

The use of ICT has also undermined the quantification of learning as "contact hours" with a teacher, and students can readily initiate communication with a lecturer or tutor via email. Asynchronous email and online discussions mean that one can teach "anytime, anywhere" as Seb put it. All participants reported increasing expectations on the part of their students for lecturer responsiveness online. Jane discovered that her students wanted online chat sessions with her later in the evenings than she was prepared to hold.

> Jane: Yeah, when I talked to students [to find out] who used chat and the ones who didn't, one thing they said - they would not go on chat at six in the evening. They would go in at ten in the evening. So, I wasn't going to go into the chat room [*laughing*] at ten o'clock in

the evening, thank you! …. My work day isn't finished at ten o'clock but my contact with students is. (Jane, C2)

No, I think I initially was planning the online hours at about five o'clock and then they said, "We don't turn on our computers on at five o 'clock. We turn them on in the evening". [Kim: So what time?] I did it like seven or eight o'clock, but they actually said it would have been better at ten o'clock. (Jane, C3)

These two quotes from Jane suggest that in fact she did compromise her time to suit her students. However, her casual tutors resisted the "push" to go online at later hours than would be usual for on-campus classes too.

Jane: The cyber-tutor issue was raised by someone in the department.

Kim: They used that term?

Jane: Yeah, because we used it last year, and because there is quite a big bunch of casuals - and some of them have not used technology in that way - the general feeling of the group was, "No, we do not want to do that". I think one of the worries was that they would never be away from the students. They weren't thinking of it as contained office hours - twelve 'til two - they were thinking it would open up private email, because a lot of them would use their private email if they were just coming in to tutor a few hours a week. So that actually didn't happen in the end. (Jane, C3)

Paul told me a story about how he marked an assignment from a DE student that came in overnight at 2.00am. The same student had contacted Paul again the next morning to change something in the piece, only to find that Paul had marked it before breakfast!

There were a few participants in the study (Hilary, Cora, Aurea) who had put boundaries around when and where they would respond to students online. They were clear that they would not go online for their students over the weekend, and they were definite that they would only communicate with students at work, and not at home. As Aurea (C2)

commented, "I have decided work is work, and home is home". However, it seemed that most participants in the study no longer maintained for online teaching the regular, on-campus (daylight, "9-to-5") teaching hours that the performer of the past once knew.

In making the transition to online teaching, the performer as facilitator draws attention to issues of increased teaching workload, time management and the tempo of work. A new order of self-management is required: one where the enterprising academic must learn to manage one's time better, prioritise carefully and "work smarter". In all of this, tasks like responding in a timely manner to students' online posts suffer. The tempo of work must change therefore – and by introducing new technologies of self-management, he is distracted from responding to his students, who need him – now!

The Body of the Facilitator

The fourth limiting factor on performing in online CMC that participants in this study were keen to discuss was absence of the embodied, proximate Other. This was a particularly difficult matter from the perspective of teaching as performance. At its extreme, a highly animated, but clearly, highly risky performance was a spectacle of desire, evangelism, and seduction. Evan spoke of "whipping things on and whipping them off" – he was referring to his plastic transparencies. Seb spoke of "turning his students on", adding that, "if you're out there, entertaining them, bit of acting, they're gonna listen and you'll get a lot more across that they will do from just plain reading". It was Seb who made a particularly strong case for live, face-to-face teaching on the grounds that "body language [makes it] so much easier to get a message across to them" (Seb). (See also: McShane, 2006).

Performers and lecturers are used to "standing and delivering" (McWilliam & Palmer, 1995, p. 34) at the lectern and "being the empowered subject of knowledge" (Deutscher, 1994. p. 36) at the centre of attention. Perhaps it is not so unexpected then, that all of the performers, including Ron, the "communicator on a world stage", struggled with how to

enact their performer identity in interactive, two-way environments. As Ron had discovered, there were real limits to performing online.

> But I mean, I suppose what I'm just trying to express is my limit, limit [*he exhales*]. You know, you're asking me why, what's the limitations of the online media, and why do I like getting up in front of an audience, and using all the technology, but doing it in association with me? Ahm, and I suppose the trouble with that online stuff is I'm not in it so much. I mean there's, and I think I'm a useful ingredient, being self-centred and sort of egocentric, ahm.. I mean obviously one's ego is something you get in a sense if you devised it and put it together, and the graphics and imagery is all part of you, but… (Ron)

It is interesting to note here that Ron considers himself to be an "ingredient" in a blended curriculum – but in becoming "a useful ingredient" he is no longer at the centre of attention, but part of a bigger "mix". Evan Preacher's experience backs up Ron's insights. An energetic gospel preacher-lecturer, Evan introduced WebCT online discussions (in March 2002) in part to reduce his dominating presence in face-to-face tutorial discussions.

> It's an issue for me in my teaching. In small group sessions I tend to dominate far too much. I have too much to say.… It's an issue for me. It's one of those things that I've tried to monitor myself in seminars with anyway. That's at the top of my agenda. The first thing on my agenda for discussion *per se* is trying to decentre the discussion, because I so go to the centre of discussions. The one tutorial that I'm taking [face-to-face] for the first time yesterday… It's the first tutorial and there was a lot to cover, because I became very aware at the end that we hadn't even scratched the surface of what the students had to say at the end. And my persona is very much to be in the middle and I wait to be pushed out. It [online discussion] will be good for them. (Evan, C1b)

Evan also thought that online discussion might encourage more contributions, especially from quiet students who didn't tend to contribute in class. He thought he would have to

initiate the discussions, to lead the students. However, in our early conversations, he revealed some uncertainty (both on his part and on that of the students) about what to do.

> My impression is that they're not at all certain what it is they're supposed to be doing. They're waiting for cues for just precisely what belongs in this forum. So I have to try and do that before the week's out to see if I can get some response….. [*fading, uncertain intonation*]. (Evan, C1b)

He admitted to me, "I'm actually not so into the discussions" and later in the same conversation he said, "The online discussion is the place to go with those questions that are not for me". Five months later, in August 2002, we met for a third research conversation, and Evan informed me that neither his preacher metaphor, nor the tutorial discussions, had adapted to the new online modes. "Neither I nor the students had the time to really make that take off…. It had its moments. But I just don't think anybody really.. It never developed momentum" (Evan, C2). Evan gave weight to his views by voicing his concerns from a shared teacher-student perspective. Like, Seb (the expert computer user and Computer Science lecturer), Evan maintained that the students thought that the online discussions were "artificial".

> I just can't quite work out what the added advantage of online discussion would be. You know I think that you could ahm you know I think it's very hard…[*stops, exhales*] … I think it's an artificial environment. I mean it's artificial for the students to communicate with people they know they can communicate with face-to-face online, and I'm not certain what they would gain by communicating online when they can communicate face-to-face. (Evan, C2)

Unless the lecturer invests time and energy to regularly read and respond to email and discussions, as Ron did, then online CMC is not likely to be a successful or satisfying experience for the lecturer and his students. For the performer, spontaneity represents a more efficient and stimulating use of one's time. Students might go online to communicate

with each other, but not with him, as Evan discovered. In the end he was happy for it to remain that way.

Risky Performing Bodies

"The mercurial tyrant who cajoles, berates, teases, provokes and fulminates; who is maddening, elitist, fascinating, sentimental and bullying, is being made over as a more disciplined body – less spectacular, more sanitized" (McWilliam, 2000). Teachers' old, risk-laden bodies cannot be trusted any more, and online teaching is a convenient technology (in all senses of the word) to implement risk minimisation in university learning and teaching. Responding to the other becomes time-consuming, but very safe. Indeed the experiences of Frank ("the Facilitator") lend support to this view.

> The online discussions, for example - I never felt self-conscious in any way…. I feel no risk online at all, ahm, but I do feel more risk face-to-face. Online - because you can read what people have written and you can consider it and compose a reply and edit it and then, when you are really happy with it, you can send it. But face-to-face, whatever the question or challenge is, you have got to still respond to it. And I am one of these people who can think of really brilliant things to say afterwards. Many teachers are failed actors who want someone to really enjoy [them] being in front of a crowd. I never stood and enjoyed being in front of a crowd. (Frank, C2)

For Frank, online facilitation was normative teaching. He preferred the measured pace of asynchronous communication, where he felt he could be more "laid-back". In face-to-face contexts, you have to respond and that, he implies, is risky. Seb begged to differ. Faced with the prospect, as Seb sees it, of becoming "a machine, ethereal, out there on the Internet", he would rather the familiar proximity of face-to-face teaching, with all its riskiness, its contingency (in all its senses), and the pleasures of regular contact hours with his students. For the performer-lecturer, the "compulsion of proximity" (Boden & Molotch, 1994) might also represent a defiant stand against any further migration of his teaching to

online modes. Indeed, those participants who have retained online teaching since this study, have done so by blending it, selectively, with their face-to-face practices (McShane, 2004).

A parallel discussion about the risks of embodied and virtual pedagogical contexts has been taking place in philosophical circles. The philosopher, Hubert Dreyfus (2001, 2002), has drawn attention to the spontaneity and risk of physical proximity. In terms of Internet education, Dreyfus' concerns focus on risk and the individual. After Kierkegaard, he notes: "There is no way to have a meaningful life and to develop particular skills and the skill of being a good human being without taking risks" (Dreyfus, 2002, p. 376). In his writings about Internet education, he privileges face-to-face learning, arguing that learning as expertise is best developed with a teacher and best acquired in proximate contexts where teachers and students speak, share moods and take risks - including the risk of being challenged, heckled, and "put on the spot".

> Only in a classroom where a teacher and learner sense they are taking risks in each other's presence, and each can count on criticism from the other, are the conditions present that promote acquiring proficiency, and only by acting in the real world can one acquire expertise. (Dreyfus, 2001, p. 91)

Dreyfus' argument finds its application in the teaching practices of Sawyer (2004), who argues for improvised performance in face-to-face teaching. Improvisation is an uncertain, creative teaching act that stands in opposition to the centralized, scripted curriculum in which practice is made uniform. Both Sawyer and Dreyfus present arguments in favour of risky classroom pedagogies that offer, respectively, the methods and theory of helping students to feel and cope with uncertainty, risk, the other. Reviewing Dreyfus' (2001) argument, Ray Land (2005a, p. 157) has also pointed out the riskiness of being online: boundariless anxiety and disquietude, and "the many risks to identity, confidence, emotional security and esteem that are encountered on a daily basis by participants in online learning environments". Yet, as my analysis through the caring metaphor in the next

chapter will show, it is easy for students (and facilitators) to avoid risk online by lurking, by not responding.

Finally, while Dreyfus and his detractors (Blake, 2002; Burbles, 2002; MacPherson, 2002; Peters, 2002; Standish, 2002 – all papers published alongside Dreyfus (2002) in a special issue of Educational Philosophy and Theory[6]) engage in philosophical debates over dualism, nihilism, embodiment and the Internet, their interest tends to focus on the individual, with Dreyfus, in particular, overlooking the political, ideological implication of Internet education in universities today.

Chapter Review: The Performer Cannot Perform Online

In this discussion, I have illuminated the difficulties for the performer-lecturer in making the move online. The performer values immediacy, spontaneity, risk and excitement, and these conditions could not be experienced in the delayed, "laid-back" environments of text-based, online CMC. From a performer perspective, the to-and-fro interaction with students is curtailed by the potential for scrutiny and by the delayed response patterns and tempo of online CMC. Apart from adjusting to new teaching tempos, there did not seem to be any lessening of these problems over time, even on the part of the experienced online lecturers (at SRU, and Frank at NMU) in this study. Indeed, by becoming more mindful and regular in logging on to read and respond to students' postings and email, their diligence merely translated into an increased workload. Whether a participant was a self-motivated, "technology enthusiast" (Seb, Ron, Hilary, Zhang, Paul, Frank) or a subtly pressured, novice, online facilitator (Rose, Cora, Jane, Aurea, Rahime, Evan) made little difference to the challenges raised in this chapter, (or indeed through the lenses of the other metaphors, caring and directing). In fact, by 2003, Hilary had dropped online discussions from her subject design, and the teaching workload remained a problem for both groups. Those participants who continued to use online CMC, maintained it in a context of blended teaching, and thus held onto the risky spontaneity of live lecturing and/or seminars.

[6] *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 34(4).

It seemed that the visibility of online teaching, the difficulties of adapting to new tempos of teaching, and workload pressures, challenged the performer to maintain any online (flamboyant, risky) "presence". In fact, when it comes to performing online alone, the performer is perhaps best understood as "a disappearing act". Evan was a case in point. He did not find the move to student-centred flexible learning via WebCT to be as easy, successful or as satisfying as he expected, and he made it clear to me that he much preferred to continue with his on-campus, animated lecturing practices. He was disaffected with online discussions and with WebCT in particular. As he spoke about this he revealed that his real motive for becoming involved in the online project and online teaching was pragmatic.

> The online discussions part was honestly only ever there because the HumsOnline Project provided teaching relief. 'Cause I don't like WebCT. I think WebCT is a waste of time. And a huge waste of money. And If I look around at all the things that we're trying to get the department to do, in terms of using online materials, the money that's been spent on WebCT materials could have a huge, would have an absolutely [sic] impact in the Faculty in terms of what's being done with online materials - a far more massive impact than WebCT ever will. (Evan, C1b)

It seems that Evan never really wanted or expected the online discussions to be a success. Perhaps he was just unsure about it all. The discussion board became a space for post-face-to-face, tutorial follow-up between the students, but student contributions there were not assessed. In all of our conversations, he continued to extol the virtues of teaching with "energy" and "fluidity" that, he argued, were only possible in face-to-face teaching contexts. During his involvement in my study, Evan went on to win a national research grant, which meant that he would only teach during one semester for the five-year duration of the grant. He would only teach first-year too, because "large class lecturing… is something I do well". The apparent inability to perform online might also explain why performers are satisfied with a blended curriculum that allows them to put content and

resources online, while at the same time enabling them to keep live and risky, face-to-face lectures, seminars and tutorials.

Online learning environments appear to provide very safe and risk-free educational environments – something that appeals to risk managers in the university. In my next teaching metaphor exposé - focused on the metaphor of caring – I will uncover more about how the possibility of visibility and scrutiny in online teaching and learning discursively constrain lecturers (and their students), so that they look to controlling themselves, and turning away from the other. Nevertheless, the performer's experience of making the move online already highlights a shift in the pedagogic relationship. The performer and the audience find it difficult to respond to each other in familiar, risky ways online.

Chapter 6
Caring

Contact is tenderness and responsibility. (Lévinas, 1987, p. 16)

It is the parent or teacher who is capable of inclusion;
it is she who sees with two pairs of eyes. (Noddings, 2003, p. 70)

Introduction

The three arch-metaphors of university teaching that are discussed in this study offer insights on how lecturers perceive the work and relationships of teaching and learning, and when we bring these metaphors to the move online, they also offer perspectives on changing pedagogical relations. In chapter 5, I discussed the performer metaphor as one lens through which to examine changing contexts and challenges to university lecturer identity. In this chapter I will examine these university teaching and changes through the second metaphor lens of caring. Once again, I will integrate the metaphors, stories, and artefacts of individuals in this research so to outline the teaching values, beliefs and practices of the archetypal carer-lecturer. In my analysis I will also draw on the work of Noddings (2003) whose theorising of caring, ethics and moral education provides useful insights for examining caring in higher education contexts. What challenges arise for the carer when she makes the move to become an online facilitator of student learning, and how does she react?

The chapter begins with an overview of the caring metaphors proffered by participants, and this is followed by a thematic discussion of the values, beliefs and practices if teaching as caring. My discussion will then turn to consider how teaching as caring translates to online interactions and environments.

The Carer

> Whatever I do in life, whomever I meet, I am first and always one-caring or one cared-for. I do not "assume roles" unless I become an actor. "Mother" is not a role; "teacher" is not a role. When I became a mother I entered a very special relation – possibly the prototypical caring relation. When I became a teacher… I entered a very special – and more specialised – caring relation.… As teacher, I am, first, one-caring. (Noddings, 2003, pp. 175-176).

The case for acknowledging Care in educational contexts was made originally by Noddings (2003). Caring is a state of engrossment in the other that emerges in the ethical, moral relationship between "the one-caring" and "the cared-for". For reasons of clarity and consistency, Noddings pro-nominates "the one-caring" and "the cared-for" as "she" and "he" respectively (the next quote illustrates this), aligning the "one-caring" with the woman, perhaps the mother. Noddings' writings explore and define the philosophical and lived experience of care.

> The one-caring, in caring, is *present* in her acts of caring. Even in physical absence, acts at a distance bear the signs of presence: engrossment in the other, regard, desire for the other's well-being. Caring is largely reactive and responsive. Perhaps it is even better characterised as receptive. The one-caring is sufficiently engrossed in the other to listen to him and to take pleasure or pain in what he recounts. Whatever she does for the cared-for is embedded in a relationship that reveals itself as engrossment and in an attitude that warms and comforts the other. (Noddings, 2003, p. 19)

This quote points to a number of care-related themes discussed by the academics in this study. The lecturers in this study expressed their carer-teacher identities in terms of empathy, helping and guiding students, and "nurturing" a love of learning, and key to these activities is the development of a relationship between teacher and students.

In taking our leave of the performer-lecturer, we forsake what Noddings (2003) refers to as a masculine "world of objectness" and, with the perspective of the carer-lecturer, we

embrace “the feminine world of subjectness”. Centuries of womens’ experience, Noddings argues, suggest a view of care as a “feminine” experience, but it is one which men might also live and feel. I do not seek to essentialise the performer and the carer as gendered teacher metaphors, and of course some male and female participants in the study worked with both images. Nevertheless this observation by Noddings hints at themes, related to nurturing and parenting for example, that will be explored in this chapter. Metaphors of care draw our attention to close student-teacher relations - self and other - and they characterise teacher identities that seek to develop particular relationships with students individually and collectively. While caring is more usually associated with parenting, friendship, support and intimacy, it is also expected in vocations or roles where one must respond to the needs of others with a “duty of care”, such as in nursing, education, counselling roles.

On this matter, Noddings (2003, p. 46) discusses “circles and chains” of care to characterise and theorise different ethical and moral relationships that are bound together by care. In the innermost circles, we care because we love: children, partners, parents, friends. Moving away from the centre we move through circles of people of increasingly diminishing acquaintance.

> As we move outward in the circles, we encounter those for whom we have a personal regard. Here, as in the intimate circles, we are guided in what we do by at least three considerations: how we feel, what the other expects of us, and what the situational relationship requires of us. (Noddings, 2003, p. 46)

At the outermost limits we meet strangers and those not yet encountered, but people who could potentially enter our closer circles of care as acquaintances, students, relatives, friends, lovers. Back at the heart of Noddings’ circle of care, we find particular qualities that distinguish caring relationships: closeness, intimacy, trust, warmth, security, comfort, listening, and empathy. Moving away from this intense centre, and taking into consideration the ever-widening concentric circles, we encounter acquaintances and

strangers, with whom the expression of these caring qualities might be muted or diminished somewhat. Noddings (2003) identifies three universal qualities of carers in care-based relationships: *engrossment* (setting aside one's own self-concern so as to be free to empathise with the other), *empathy* and a *disposition to act on behalf of the other*. The attitudes of warm acceptance and trust are also important in all caring relationships. I will continue to return to carer qualities throughout this chapter as I discuss the particular themes that have emerged more specifically in terms of carer-lecturers making the move online.

The Metaphors of Caring in this Study

The metaphors listed in Table 4 were elicited in conversation with the twelve participants in the study. I have distinguished several types or sub-groups of caring metaphors under the arch-metaphor "teaching is like caring". In the Student and Curriculum columns, I have fleshed out the implied pedagogical context of the metaphor, as not all of these aspects were supplied by participants when they were discussing the metaphors. One could also apply imaginatively the contexts of caring to the broader university context: the home, the dining table, the therapist's office, the mentor-guru's cave, an old town square at night.

Table 4: Teaching is like Caring

Teacher	**Students**	**Curriculum; Knowledge production**
Nurturing parent	Infant	Love, attention. Nutritious food
Uncle (“avuncular”)	Younger nephews, nieces	Advice, life skills, family stories
Body parts: a big ear, big brain, big heart, big eye	Students as interactant/s, other bodies and minds	The students’ intellectual, emotional and spiritual growth; ethics and values
Mentor, Obi-Wan-Kenobi (mentor to Darth Vader)	“mentees”, followers, acolytes	Mentee’s lifeworld and concerns; the follower’s (spiritual and emotional) development
Lamplighter	Apprentice lamplighters	The light of knowledge and understanding (research)
Social worker	Individuals seeking advice and support	Intellectual, emotional and spiritual growth; client’s life skills, self-reflective abilities

The “nurturing parent” and the “uncle” draw attention firstly to the familial and “relationships” focus of the carer-teacher identity. This will be explored at length as the chapter progresses. The “body parts” synecdoche - where the parts are called on to represent the whole - was proposed by Aurea. According to Aurea, this strong, embodied image describes an attentive, caring teacher who selectively utilises “a big ear, big brain, big heart, and a big eye” when interacting with, and supporting her students. The other metaphors in this table reflect socially recognisable roles that entail a moral obligation to care. That is, the lamplighter and social worker are committed to a duty of care, which contrasts with expressions of care that are spontaneous and natural, such as a mother’s comfort for a young child (Noddings, 2003, p. 43). Depending on the extent to which the relationship is formalised or not, a mentor may care out of love or obligation.

In her theorising of care, Noddings (2003) distinguishes between "caring for" (her focus) and "caring about", which she describes as "a poor second cousin to caring. 'Caring about' always involves a certain benign neglect. One is attentive just so far" (Noddings, 2003, p. 112). That is, while one might *care about* refugees, the poor at Christmas, a prominent individual with cancer, and or a stranger with no home save the street, Noddings (2003, p. 113) makes it quite clear that physical proximity elicits *caring for.* "The caring attitude… pervades the situational time-space. So far as it is in my control, if we are conversing and if I care, I remain present to you throughout the conversation" (Noddings, 2003, p. 19).

In the next section I will examine particular dimensions of the care metaphor ("family connections" "the generation gap", and "relationships, reciprocity and risk") that shed insights on how carer-lecturers understood and enacted their relationships and responsibilities towards their students. With care also comes the need to be careful, for one's engrossment and empathy, particularly when in close proximity, can be misunderstood or exploited by the other.

Caring: Family Connections

When discussing care in their teaching, a number of the lecturers in this study spoke of their own families or drew analogies with parenting and close relationships. Parents and children in particular figured in a number of the research conversations. The family connection in teaching was particularly poignant for Frank, who mentioned first of all that a colleague told him his face-to-face manner was "avuncular" (like an uncle), and he seemed pleased about that, and he mentioned this several times in different conversations. Uncles can be mentors of course, and his stories of online teaching and the roles he took up reflected these images. When I asked Frank how he learnt to teach, Frank cited the influence of his father, whose "professionalism was inspiring - a continual striving for perfection, improvement, commitment" (Frank, C1b).

> Kim: Did you ever see your father teach?
>
> Frank: Yes he taught me for about eighteen months when I was about ten or eleven. He

> was very good. [inaudible]… He was interested in the subject and keen to communicate it and get us interested in it, and he seemed to know how to do it. And he had a passion for teaching. It was very much a profession as a vocation, and he dedicated his life to it. (Frank, C2)

Jane and Aurea drew on their relationships with their own teenage children to plan their teaching, to develop relationships with their students, and to make the students' learning experiences positive. Thus from their perspective, caring takes on the cast of an instinctive Nature-identity (Gee, 2001).

> Teaching is really important to me. I like it. I get very stressed, though I enjoy all aspects of it. My own children are nineteen and fifteen, so I have a lot to do with young adults that I really enjoy. I feel like I know a lot about their ambition.… A number of students in my first year class I actually know, because my daughter is nineteen. I know a lot about nineteen year olds and I know what they go through. (Jane, C1a)

> Just thinking back or reflecting on the comments, written comments of our fourth year students for example last semest- last year… They picked up on how approachable I was and how I have a very good sense of humour, and how I understood their position as students. And I think, and when I read that I said, "Yes, I think I'm that as a person" and I think of myself too as - because these are young students. They're like fourth year – 20, 21 – and I have children who are in their 20s and it's just like yeah, you know, I think this could be my son or daughter and because of my experience as a mother it, it, and how .. and relating to young people, I think that has given me a lot of understanding of how young people are, and how they want to be ahm, and how to communicate with them, and the kind of reasoning young people in their twenties, or 21, would have. And I think that that influence, and that influences the way I mark as well. Now I consider myself as probably a.. not a hard marker, not an easy marker but somebody who marks someone's work at a level of their reasoning, where they are at in their stage of life. Like ahm, with empathy you know, like I want.. If this is an essay, my reasoning as a 53-year-old would be different from the reasoning of a 21-year-old. So because this is the reasoning of a twenty-one year

> old, it doesn't agree with the 53 year old teacher. Should I give that a pass or a distinction or a higher distinction? You know that comes into my mind when I'm marking, yes, yes. So I take that position. It's not the only position. Of course there are the guides, the marking criteria, and all of that. I really think about that when I am marking. Yeah, I suppose I have that empathy for where they're at in their life stage.
>
> Kim: And that's that personality thing.
>
> Aurea: Yeah, that is part of me, yeah, that's part of me, and I suppose I know just because of my interactions with my own children and with their friends I know what makes young people. I have an idea more or less what makes young people consider learning as fun. You know, I want to make learning fun, as much as possible [*laughs*]. (Aurea, C3)

Aurea's comments here also draw attention to the significant age and generation gap between herself and her students. She empathises with her 21-year-old students, and she acknowledges the age and experience gap between them, such that her empathy might cause her sometimes to adjust her expectations and her marks when she is assessing their work. In the case of the performer of course, this age difference and generation gap is often acknowledged and expressed in terms of an intimidating presence and claims to intellectual seniority and disciplinary expertise. As we read the stories and issues set out in coming sections, this age and generation gap will continue to come to the fore.

Caring: Across the Generation Gap

As I showed in the previous section, having children and being in particular family relationships can offer lecturers useful insights for planning and assessing learning, and how to understand and interact with younger university students. But the concept of "family connections" offers another useful filter by means of which carers understand their relationships with their students. Family metaphors and roles also imply relation to others within and across generations within a family. The generations in a family are distinguished by age and relational roles and responsibilities across those generations. As an example, Ron labelled himself an "elder of the tribe", and felt that his seniority and experience enabled him to fulfil a pastoral care role with his graduate students.

> I mean it's my pastoral care role. I mean I'd like to think that y'know the students come with their problems and difficulties, and I also spend time with them there, ahm, in that.. what I call pastoral care.… I sort of actually said this - that y'know, my role was team leader and pastoral care, ahm, for the PhDs and the postdocs. Because... the advantage of being old and grey and sort of having seen a lot of things is that y'know, you've been there and done that, and you know the disappointments and you know the troughs, yep, and the crests. (Ron)

Ron appears to be saying that his ability as an academic to offer help and guidance appears to be based on his experience, accumulated expertise and age, and that this gives him special insights or wisdom to support particularly postgraduate research students. If, in jest at least, Ron described himself to be "be old and grey", Paul (also Health Sciences) took up a more modern metaphor to describe the mentoring and pastoral care he offered his students in his teaching.

> I sort of would see myself very much as, suppose probably more along as a guide, but not, not the traditional sort of tourist guide that sort of tells them everything, more, more of the sort of ah....I suppose my, my interest in science fiction will come forward here. I'd like to think I'm a bit like an Obi-Wan Kenobi that sort of lets them make their own, let them make their own mistakes…. Ahh…he ahmm, he did withdraw, yeah, he withdrew from society. Oh no. Maybe I've maybe [got] that one wrong there…. Well, well he…. when Luke Skywalker came looking to him, he took on that mentoring role again…and was prepared to take the risk again. I haven't withdrawn yet - I don't think [*laughs*]. Yeah, yeah...maybe the sabbatical was my withdrawal! [*laughs again*]…. Letting people, y'know, find their own way, I think's fairly important to some extent. But be there to provide guidance and assistance if they need it. (Paul)

Paul's comments here about letting students make their own mistakes and find their own way highlight a watchful, mindful care that draws on human wisdom and experience in the field. Yet, perhaps this way of being a teacher stands in contrast to, and balances, the high

energy, egocentric performer. Paul and others in the study expressed a notable humility about their expertise – "'cause I know how much I don't know" (Paul) - and a preparedness to listen and reflect on their teaching and their students' learning. An interesting extension of this particular metaphor is that Luke Skywalker became Darth Vader and returned to challenge his mentor and teacher and, indeed, Paul recounted a time when he came face-to-face again with one of his past students - though this was a positive, friendly meeting!

> It's always satisfying if you meet up with a student a couple of years later and, y'know, they mention something that you've said or done that sort of influenced them. It's always a good positive thing.… Oh yeah, I remember one of the students that was probably one of my most challenging ones since I've been here - oh he used to always question everything - and I always tried to give him the best answers, but sometimes I'd think, "Oh, this guy's asking far too many. It's driving me crazy!" [*laughs*]. But I went down to see a problem student at the Children's Hospital, um, during the last clinical placement…. And ah, so I went down to deal with that sort of administrative issue, and lo and behold! who was this student but ahm, [he] was now in a senior management position only.. Well when I say senior - middle management - but ah, he was overseeing all their Y2K project things for the whole of the Children's Hospital Nursing Division, and he basically said it was the sort of things that I was talking about that got him interested in that area.. [*laughs*] so.. [Kim: That's great.] And he's doing really well in his career, so you get those sorts of moments and you think, "Oh…" [*laughs again*] (Paul)

Paul shares here a pleasure that many teachers know: the return of a former student. Paul's student had gone on to do "really well in his career" and Paul seemed pleased to think he may have played a role in his achievements. This is one of the secret pleasures of teaching, an experience that probably is intensified if one does engage in close and caring relationships with individual students.

Jane's lamp-lighter metaphor brings us fully to the notion of the generations which underpins a number of the images and metaphors of carers. The lamp-lighter is a role that no longer exists in society, and the image prompts us to re-vision the university as a close,

enlightened community in a medieval town that depends on Jane and her apprentice lamp-lighters to bring light to the streets in the dark night. The central source of light is Jane's (mother-) lamp, and the focus of the metaphor is in fact on the light that illuminates and is passed on.

> The image of the teacher as someone who passes the candle of knowledge from generation to generation has always appealed to me, but the notion of a "lamp-lighter" goes a little further. I believe that the love of learning has to be nurtured and protected - especially in these materialistic and "economically rationalist" times - and I like the idea of 'shedding light' for students - not so much telling them what they need to know, but helping them to see things differently, move outside their own frame of reference, and question what they have learnt so far. Thus, it is part of my responsibility to keep my own candle bright by conducting research, reading, thinking, debating and generally keep up with the field. If my candle is small and sputtering then I can't help my students to see the "bigger picture" - they will be confined to a narrow patch of ground. I try to "light lamps" that my students can carry into whatever corners of the earth they go. (Jane, email communication, April 16, 2002)

In our next conversation Jane elaborated on her metaphor a little, indicating that she used certain online practices so as to "spark" or stimulate students' interest and love of learning. The lamps, light, candles and sparks of the lamp-lighter image call to mind the warmth that Noddings invokes, in a quote cited earlier in this chapter: "Whatever [the one-caring] does for the cared-for is embedded in a relationship that reveals itself as engrossment and in an attitude that warms and comforts the other" (2003, p. 19). Jane spoke of passing on the flame, and I queried whether it was like a firestick or Olympic torch. Jane replied:

> Well I think the thing about real lamps is you can't run with them. You've actually got to nurture them and protect them, so it's a less competitive image and it's also because the lamp lighter, I have had many students who are much smarter than me, and that is one thing about the lamp-lighter. The lamp-lighter can contribute to a candle or whatever, much brighter than the one that sets it going, and I think that is true in teaching. I mean I have

> had some <u>fabulous</u> students, just you know who… really going on to make their mark. So I think that's another thing too. It's about seeing yourself in perspective, that teachers aren't the font of all knowledge by any means, but we have this special responsibility to create environments and provide resources, and encourage and nurture and protect and illuminate and .. bring people into the circle, I guess. So those things work for me…. And the fact that you can light a lamp or a candle or whatever and the person holding that can go off on their own journey, yeah. (Jane, C3)

Jane later told me that the lamp represents "the torch of knowledge that goes from generation to generation" (Jane, C3), reinforcing the family-like imagery of the context and its people. The other consideration with this metaphor is the suggested context - a medieval society that lacks the light of knowledge. It takes the special skills and efforts of the lamp-lighter and her apprentices that illuminate the darkness, and keep fear and ignorance at bay. The metaphor is interesting in that it depicts the community – rather than the university - as medieval and "in the dark". While Jane was happy to admit she was "old-fashioned", she was not at all averse to electronic communication and online teaching: "The technology is quite interesting. Some people find it quite alienating, where as I feel I have a personal connection" (Jane, C1a). Nevertheless she was clear that online communication contexts could not support the warmth and connection that she valued in face-to-face teaching and learning. "For me I have never learned how to do distance education and I am not a distance educator, and for me I believe in face-to-face and sitting around the table, and I am upset about the thought this would be seen as an alternative" (Jane, C2).

Caring: Relationships, Reciprocity and Risk

Relationships are what define the metaphor of teaching as caring, and indeed this metaphor for teaching highlights a strong "student-centredness" and "togetherness" on the part of the academics in the study. Rahime emphasised that, in her view, "teaching is a relationship, and you have to work on it" (C1). In her description, she spoke at length about how relationships are constructed between the teacher, the learner and the

curriculum/knowledge, much like the agents of "knowledge production" in Lusted's (1986) theory of pedagogy. Nodding writes of a vicarious "seeing" through the eyes of the other in caring teacher-learner relationships. "The teacher, because she is a teacher, must see things through the eyes of her student in order to teach him…. The work of the teacher is facilitated by her dual vision" (Noddings, 2003, p. 70). Sociality – getting to know the students – supports this dual vision. Seb placed a lot of importance on "social interaction" in his teaching.

> But, y'know, there's a lot more to teaching than just getting material across; there's a lot more.. I think there's social interaction involved. If you want your students to have confidence in you, to feel that you know what you're talking about, and if they don't you've got problems.. ahm, I think you've gotta have..or to prepare a small amount of your time with them that is a social contact time. (Seb)

Paul shared a similar view. "I suppose the thing I enjoy most is the contact with students… And when they've finally, sort of… you can see the light go on (Paul)." Hilary mentioned being concerned when not seeing "light dawning" in her students. Said Jane (C3), "We have this responsibility to create environments and provide resources and encourage and nurture and protect and illuminate and bring people into the circle. "Seeing the lights go on" is the warm reward of caring, signalling as it does the students' attentiveness and reciprocity. This was where informal feedback on the teaching and learning in particular was most important to the lecturers. Hilary noted, for example, that "it's really nice when somebody says at the end of a lecture, 'That was really good, that's helped me'". Noddings (2003, p. 72) comments on this. "To accept the gift of responsiveness from the cared-for is natural for the one-caring. It is consistent with caring. To demand such responsiveness is both futile and inconsistent with caring". However, a caring demeanour can be misunderstood or exploited. Some gifts are dangerous.

> The other thing is, the responses you're getting from students - particularly my Singapore students, because of their culture - are not always purely academic. They'll write and tell you about themselves, and "I work for a cosmetics company". And one girl said "I'm introducing myself. My name is May [pseudonym] just got one last [?]." "Oh, OK. I'll see you next week." And, in the old days that would have had to be an international phone call, right? With email, y'know, it's nice to.. But I've encouraged them to do that. I've said on the web page, "I'd like to get to know you before I walk in there". I mean I only see them for four evenings, right, in a whole semester, and I walk into a class of fifty students, y'know? It's nice if you sort of, y'know, when they come up to you, "Oh, so you're so and so?" Because they don't usually send a photo. They all know what I look like, because my photo's attached to all my notes and things. But, I don't know them and it's really nice. Although one girl really got up my wife's nose, because a) she's really pretty and b) she stuck a beautiful photo - colour photo - scanned into every assignment that she submitted [*laughs*]
>
> Kim : Just to remind you-
>
> Seb: -of who she was! [*laughing*]. And she was sending me these cosmetics for my wife and my daughter and all this. They do that, and it's not bribery, but you've gotta be so careful. (Seb)

Much as Seb enjoys the "social interaction" with his local and overseas students, he is on uncertain ethical ground. While it is hard to make contact with every individual in a large cohort, nevertheless most of the academics in this study, like Seb, were reaching out to their many students in new ways, chief amongst which was email. In fact, several participants reported unsettling, private approaches from students via email. I will investigate these electronic encounters when I turn to look at how carers make the move online, later in this chapter.

One-on-one attention (engrossment, empathy) for individual students is an important aspect of caring in teaching. Unlike the attention-seeking performer, carer-lecturers often find themselves sitting behind closed doors with an individual student or with small groups of

students.   The carer does a lot of supportive listening and reflecting back what she hears. The carer is thoughtful and responsive, and open to learning from her students. The emotional life of her students is often just as important to the carer-lecturer as their intellectual development, and the carer-lecturer role thus encompasses pastoral and therapeutic responsibilities. However, while carers might like to meet and get to know students individually, this kind of being together can become risky and dangerous. Meetings and consultations held behind closed doors are the invisible sites of caring teaching. What could be going on in these uncertain spaces of "social interaction"? Risky behaviours, imagined and unimaginable liaisons, sexual harassment, and absolutely nothing. Gallop's (2002) reflections on sexual harassment on campus are pertinent. In this study, (participant) Jane mentioned in passing a troubling case, an example of how pedagogical spaces and relationships are so readily exploited and abused.

> The student was a very difficult student, with a lot of problems and I dreaded it actually. Personal, sort of emotional problems and he, he was from a different cultural background and he had one of the women as his tutor and she'd already said to me she was worried about him. And he told her that he… He'd come into her office and said.. - amongst other things - he'd said, to her, "I don't have a wife, and you know what that means. And you know how frustrated that can make a man feel". You know really quite… sort of awful, upsetting stuff… (Jane, C2).

The relationships of care in teaching can be risky. While the caring relationship relies on reciprocity and responsiveness, in university teaching and learning, lecturer reciprocity may misread. The previous two extracts and examples were the only instances of such stories (not involving online interaction) in my data. The fact that in both cases the students were "from a different cultural background" may be coincidental. Nevertheless, "different cultural background" does draw attention to differing cultural expectations about lecturer behaviour (and care), with important implications for internationalisation policy and practice. As Seb realised, "you've gotta be so careful".

The Attributes of the Carer-Lecturer: A Review

Conceiving of teaching as caring challenges the oversight and hostility in higher education policy and the ICT literature toward transmission-based, "indifferent teaching" in universities currently. The qualities and pedagogical interactions of care are not recognised or discussed in higher education teaching and learning policy, nor are they acknowledged in policy at the institutional level, even though, from the perspective of the academics in this study, caring is actually quite student-focussed.

A number of the study participants drew parallels with their personal family roles and relationships when discussing the caring dimensions of their teaching. Carer-lecturers emphasise their relationships and interaction with individual students, and engrossment in, and empathy toward, the other are most readily expressed in physical proximity and private spaces. Responsiveness and reciprocity on the part of both teacher and learner are fundamental to the establishment and maintenance of pedagogical relationships based on care. Teachers must "look through the eyes" of the other, and maintain a disposition to act on behalf of the other, in order to care for the learner. There are risks however in that expressions of care, engrossment and empathy may be misread or exploited, giving rise to disquieting (some would say inappropriate) expressions of dominance and power, sexual interest and harassment and other behaviours that trouble in one-on-one circumstances. Carers have to be care-full.

Carer-Lecturers Making the Move Online

This chapter is organised around four themes that emerged in my reading of the data on carer-lecturers I gathered from the twelve lecturers in this study. These particular themes emerged from an interpretation of participants' stories and reflections about the move online mediated by their metaphors for teaching. The four themes, each exploring the pleasures and troubles of the carer online are (1) caring and class sizes, (2) trust and risk (3) care with words and emotions, and (4) reciprocity and responsiveness.

As I will show, these themes worked out against a back-drop of the two-way CMC environments that carer-lecturers seemed to prefer: email and online discussions. In reading the stories and experiences in this chapter, it must be remembered that if using email, the lecturer was communicating privately (one-to-one) with an individual students. In the case of online discussion lists and threads, the lecturer would be communicating with either the collective group, or with an individual student, and aware of the collective gaze. However, the discussion in this chapter is not organised according to this technical distinction, but according to care-related themes. It does also seem that the context (proximate or electronic) might have some bearing on the expression and reception of care, and on the development of caring pedagogical relationships.

Caring and Class Sizes

Difficulties arise, and the pressures on academics rise, when an online LMS is introduced at a time when class sizes are also increasing. Small group teaching and one-on-one contact with students are preferred practices of carer-lecturers. Jane had co-ordinated and taught the same large first year subject for ten years, with the support of six tutors. However, she and her colleagues in the department were experiencing a lot of pressure for change. "Dollars are linked to attracting students into the department", she said, adding that "growth measures, 'Do you actually attract and retain students?' - that sort of thing is looked at much more" (Jane, C1a). Her department was faced with increased class sizes (attracting and retaining (fee-paying) students), and a staffing shortage. Jane told me she had introduced WebCT as "an innovation for first year and a way of trying to deal with large numbers" (C3), while retaining large group lectures and face-to-face seminars, for, as she said, the best thing about teaching was "individual contact with students" (Jane, C1a). On the whole, Jane was actually very pleased with the integration of WebCT, as it still allowed her to lecture (which she enjoyed), and her students continued to have access to tutors. The online website was proving to be very useful in supporting up to 400 first year students in the subject, and the online components included many resources, readings and

links, student presentations and photos and active (assessed) online discussions and live chat sessions.

By May 2003, Jane had become Head of Department, and her first year teaching responsibilities had been given over entirely to casual staff – for there were no academics available who could teach it. The previous year, the part-time teaching budget had been cut and tutor-student consultations times had been "consolidated", and she had ended up teaching a "smallish-ish class with about 50 students - and I knew them all" (Jane, C3).

> We have never done this before, and it is not a result of cutbacks. It is just a result of our current staffing profile. We suddenly felt, when I became Head of Department, we just didn't have anyone to teach [that subject]. The person who would normally do it has gone on maternity leave and the other person was previously Head of Department and he is on leave. Another was running the Honours program, and suddenly we didn't have any more fingers to count on. (Jane, C3)

The suggestion had been floated that more of the first year subject could be moved online. However, ultimately, the online components of the first year subject were reduced to "more passive things like lecture notes, course handouts, not anything interactive" and two casual staff took over the responsibility for teaching the subject and its 500 students. The interactions (online chat, private consultations) that Jane used to have with students were no longer available to her or the first year students.

However, Jane has not responded to any of my follow-up email queries since that time, so I could not find out any more about her shift in academic focus away from teaching towards administration. Much as I might speculate, her motives for the change remain unclear. Perhaps Jane was finding it difficult to teach in the ways that her "lamp-lighter" metaphor suggested, and in the ways that she liked. She was a medieval "lamp-lighter" who could no longer carry out her teaching duties in the ways she valued in a rapidly changing context

distinguished by new technologies and new, corporate cultures. When 50 students is “a small-ish class”, clearly she is no longer able to be “student-centred” and care for individual students in the ways she would like in small intimate groups. Jane referred to a combination of pressures that she found stressful.

> Well, <u>everything</u> seems to be more pressured, and there seems to be y’know like in more.. in every single aspect of my work I must say. I’m under more pressure to publish, more pressure to be involved in community liaison and outreach and all that sort of thing, and <u>certainly</u> more pressure to ah… pressure to teach more, and also I think rising expectations about the standards of teaching, which I think are pretty good because I think the standards were pretty slack, but I think students expect more… and they respond to it. The other thing is, because our teaching is a bit more under scrutiny than ever before, I feel more pressure…. So, I mean, teaching is really important to me. I like it, a lot, although I get very stressed. I get very stressed about all aspects of my job, but I do get very stressed about my teaching. I enjoy all aspects of it. I love first-year teaching. (Jane, C1a)

It seems that a combination of reduced staff numbers in the department, cuts to the part-time teaching budget, the pressures on everyone to teach more students (staff-student ratio) and to higher standards, and overwhelming feelings of stress, made the decision to move sideways to administration easier for Jane. No one else in the research spoke about increased class sizes, though it is clearly a current pedagogical, institutional and industrial matter – both a symptom and a cause for change in university teaching and learning – and a challenge to caring relationships.

Trust and Risk Online

Notwithstanding class sizes, it would seem that one-on-one online communication via email might be an ideal channel of communication for the development of empathy and trust between teacher and learner. Indeed, overall, Hilary found email very helpful in getting to know her students.

> Hilary: I think it does help you know them more. And you have more of a feeling that there's... a real, it's.. it takes away stereotypes I think. Y'know, you do tend to… just like they will stereotype me as their mother's age and y'know, beyond all interesting things. And I might stereotype them as... eighteen year olds. ….I suppose the ones you notice are the ones you seem to have something unexpected in common with from something they post.. and some, sometimes it's quite.. peripheral. Yeah.. oh that's nice.
>
> Kim: So you're able to develop perhaps different relationships through the medium, than you would in a more traditionally taught course, which is not taught, which is taught through face-to-face tutorial methods?
>
> Hilary: Ahm.. I don't know that it goes.. quite that far. But it makes it easier to, I suppose relate to the whole person. And another nice thing about having things there, written down - I ask people to introduce themselves first - is you can go back and look it over - once you know who the students are - and say, "Ahh! So.. she's the one who likes gardening." You know, I like gardening, that's something, and you know, you've read them through to begin with, and you haven't a clue who these students are. But then you can read it through again a few weeks later... when you do have more of an idea of who's who, and it.. Yeah, there's more personality there. (Hilary)

Hilary enjoyed reading about her students and their personal interests. Being "more articulate in writing", she was most comfortable communicating with her students in this way, and felt she was better able to develop and maintain trusting relationships in email. At the very least it helped her to *establish* rapport with individuals, in a context where, at least initially, her age and the student's age didn't seem to matter.

> But using e-mail, ahmm.. I've used it instead of a journal – for a couple of semesters, and then I moved to using electronic discussion. And I really.. I really liked the e-mail a lot, because I felt I could talk, y'know I could actually have a conversation with the students, but gee it was time consuming! ….It was.. it was like... an hour a day just on this subject, responding to e-mail. And I.. what I liked was.. it seemed to me really good in establishing a rapport with students, who look at me and think, "You're my mother's age". And to actually, talk to me, they were.. there was more of a personal feeling. (Hilary)

The implication to be drawn is that, online, teacher and students are less likely at first to see age and generational differences. This was an environment where she felt she was not being stereotyped as a mother, and "beyond all interesting things". Her body was invisible; a certain personal connection was possible, free of stereotyping and the students' gaze. Yet, although Hilary might have felt she came to know individuals better through email, this didn't mean that the amount of dialogue and relatedness between her and individual students increased. Indeed, as I shall go on to show, Hilary experienced much less reciprocity from her students in online discussions, where her authority and her guidelines on appropriate communicative standards were being ignored. While email might be conceived of as a technology that fosters reciprocity, Jane had thought twice about this.

> I think maybe students felt they need a better reason to come to my door, whereas they might start with a tentative little query by email. If I responded in a slightly more than adequate way to them, then they would feel encouraged to come back, whereas somebody wouldn't come to your door to test you out in the same way.… I think they do use it to test out and obviously if a lecturer is too busy or doesn't want to start creating that sort of relationship with students… You can feel very intruded on. I am sure other people have said it to you. (Jane, C2)

Rahime's experience backed up this observation. Like Hilary, she used email to initiate contact with her students but, in the email extracts she shared with me, she tended to invite students with particular personal concerns to make an appointment to see her. Her email replies were usually brief and perfunctory. Rahime did the same with students who asked for more information about assignments, resulting in groups of students interacting in her office in a tutorial-like situation. It is interesting that Rahime welcomed email, but the caring was enacted in her office, in the presence of (the) other(s).

Hilary did acknowledge too that relationships can become uncertain in email, and trust can be put into question. She told me a story about how one of her students initiated, and then

attempted to maintain, an email correspondence with her. Why did this student reply a second time?

> Hilary: Oh, I had a kid ask something. Oh he asked a question about the exam, which was quite a reasonable question. And then he came back with another one, that I'd already said the answer to in my first question, in my first answer. And it was all written down anyway. But I'd answered the first one reasonably because... yes sometimes, you, y'know.. You may not.. you may have lost that bit of paper. But on the web, y'know, it didn't take me that long, to answer it the first time, but I really felt, I just didn't answer his second message. Y'know, he's just.. taking advantage. Or not taking advantage, he's.... he's just not thinking. He's sending a message, a query, when the answer's right there. He hadn't thought about it at all.
>
> Kim: Was he anxious, needing reassurance do you think - just to know that someone is there, that ahm...?
>
> Hilary: Oh I'd replied to him the first time. He'd got that reassurance [*laughs*]. He'd, y'know, he didn't- I'd answered his question, courteously and promptly, the first time. And I thought he just wants some online chat, that's what he wanted. He just basically wanted to set up a friendly correspondence [*laughs*]. Or whatever, and this was a, y'know. And I suppose..
>
> Kim: That is the "taking advantage" then.
>
> Hilary: Mm. And I mean, maybe, maybe it's.. that I haven't been as active since the lecture break these last few weeks. I haven't been as active on the discussion board as I have been. Maybe, he's missing me [*laughs*]. (Hilary)

It's hard to know whether this student was lonely, seeking some kind of intellectual friendship, or perhaps even trying "to take advantage". It is still possible that he was sincerely seeking more assurance, care and attention from Hilary. Her closing comments in the extract above hint at a little guilt on her part for not being as active online in recent weeks, and thereby withholding some attention and implied care from her students. Being a carer-lecturer in email at least is not easy.

Like Hilary, Rahime found it difficult to assess students' motives for sending an email message, and she was suspicious of queries about assignments. She thought that perhaps the students may have been trying to elicit particular and replicable answers from her in email that they could copy and paste across to guide their assignment writing, for example. Rahime was keen to tell me in email and in our conversations how much she was enjoying "interpersonal contact" with her students. She shared with me a number of one-to-one email exchanges with individual first year students. One young woman in particular, wrote a particularly gushing first email to Rahime. The easy willingness with which this first year student took up that opportunity, and used it to share her anxieties, desires and feelings was a little unnerving.

> Dear Rahime,
>
> I am one of the many faces in the crowd for your "[title] 1001" subject. I would like to start by saying your lecture last Monday was my very first lecture of my whole University experience and I liked it. You are my most interesting lecturer so far just in case you were wondering… (Rahime; email exchange/online teaching artefact, 12.03.02)

The student goes on to pour out her worries about being able to survive the competitive university context in which she finds herself. Rahime reassured her a little in email and invited her to drop by her office for a face-to-face meeting, and their email exchange continued after that. Over the weeks that followed, Rahime continued to respond to the student in a careful, but measured manner, yet displaying a commitment to reciprocity such as is necessary to, and a feature of, care-based relationships.

> Dear [student's name]
>
> Thank you for your email - that was a lovely way to start my day!….
>
> The confusion is normal - especially if you have started late. It does disappear in time but make sure you are keeping up with your work - the worse thing is to also get behind because then it can all start crashing. Look after yourself!

Rahime

Rahime even promised to attend the student's graduation ceremony. The first year student firstly expressed gushing praise and awe for Rahime's first lecture and, in later communications, revealed her self-doubt concerning her entry scores and her ability were a little unsettling. Was the student perhaps revealing too much, possibly trying to move a little too close to Rahime? Were there other motives on the part of the student? It is interesting that both Rahime and Hilary were confident of assessing students' intentions and motives when they were face-to-face. However, it might seem from these experiences that there might be essential differences in how we express and interpret care, communication and trust face-to-face and in online CMC.

In fact, there were other challenges to caring lurking in online discussions. In these public spaces (in a Communications subject which she taught via a blend of online and face-to-face contexts), Hilary placed notable emphasis on her students exhibiting proper behaviours and language. Disorderly and divergent online discussions were starting to break out that did not reflect the aims and assessment of Hilary's subjects.

> Hilary: I've got responsibility for making sure the conversation is not.. offensive and so on. I've cut out various things - whole topics, whole entries from people. I've written admonitory e-mails to people [*chuckles*] - only a couple of those. I've also had a couple of messages from students saying.. "I said this... I shouldn't have said it. Can you please delete this message of mine?" [*chuckles*] And I think once I did and once I didn't.
>
> Kim: I'm hearing censorship so far a little bit, or judgement a bit, ahm….
>
> Hilary: Ahm... not of opinions.. Of language I think. The one I cut was calling people who lived in the residences "cocksuckers". And he was full of this, and it was just really inappropriate language. And it was.... I can take the fact that they... that they are talking to each other more, and I suppose I'm inclined to stop the thing descending to a... just a chat group - a lot of them are used to online chat. And.. I didn't want it, y'know, I wanted to make an effort to stop that. With the [campus name] students, their first session which.. OK

> they are computing students. And their first session in the lab was full of one-liners about farting. And it didn't need to be censored or removed; it was just seven-year-old, infantile, crass stuff. Totally inappropriate, and I, y'know I just posted a reminder. I left it in, and I just added on to that discussion that I'd left it in on purpose.. so other people could see, 'cause I hadn't been able to believe how infantile they were being, and, "Remember this is to do with marks", and that this sort of thing actually loses you marks. (Hilary)

The fact that the offensive language and opinions were expressed in writing and were visible to everyone in the class online seemed to render the incidents all the more heinous in Hilary's eyes. In the face of what are to her "infantile, crass" behaviours, Hilary attempted to reinstate proper communication and conduct. Overall, it is difficult to discern reciprocity on the part of the students. Perhaps something else had happened in the course of the face-to-face teaching to break their trust, and cause them to "gang-up" online in this way? Perhaps they were prepared to be proper in face-to-face situations, but not in electronic environments? Some might laugh off the situation, or use it to make a point about language. Hilary disapproved, but left the posts in for others to see, and reminded the students about the assessment of the online discussions. Hilary also recounted another incident from the same subject where a student copied and pasted all of the posts from a particular online discussion topic about mis-spent university money, and emailed them to a university manager. While she said she admired this student's "initiative", the moral was clear. "This is not something that you do" (Hilary) in online discussions in Communications subjects.

Reflecting back over these examples, it is clear that the expression and reception of trust, emotion and reciprocity online is not an easy matter. In fact it can be highly risky. Rahime was careful to restrict the information and advice she gave online about essay content, for example. She was also careful in how she communicated with individual students who themselves might divulge too much personal information or seek pastoral advice. Rahime was not a therapist and, as the story of the gushing first year student indicated, discussion about delicate, personal matters was best conducted in private, face-to-face circumstances.

As noted in the previous chapter, in live lectures, Ron could and did ridicule politicians and government policy with impunity. Online, he ran into trouble and risked a serious libel case when a health minister became aware of his critique of policy. These sorts of stories draw out attention back to the permanent, archived nature of online communication ("there is a record kept, a record of words spoken or written" (Jane, C1b)), when compared with the ephemeral nature of lectures and seminars, as contexts where "words … would blow away when everyone walked out of the lecture theatre" (Jane, C2).

Care with Words and Emotions

Hilary's woes with words continued. We should remember how much Hilary enjoyed email; and described herself metaphorically as "a mentor in email". Nevertheless, another situation arose for Hilary in face-to-face circumstances that she then reflected on in terms of electronic text.

> Kim: Do you think that e-mail actually ahm.. the students often become more open and frank in e-mail? And reveal more in e-mail than they might in lots of-
>
> Hilary: More than I wanted. More than I wanted. Well no..
>
> Kim: Really?
>
> Hilary: The time I had got worried, was with a written journal, and this lad wrote this terrible story about dysfunction within his family. And I thought... I really was worried. I thought, "I'm not a counsellor, and this guy should be seeing somebody." And when he came to pick up - it's a good thing about a journal - when he came to pick it up, I said... "Oh, I don't know what to say here, y'know, this, this.." He was terribly sad. "Have you talked to someone?" He said, "Yes, I've been to see a counsellor". And I thought, "That's a relief!" It wasn't, nobody was being brutal to him, or y'know.. [There was] death in the family and nobody talked to him, and all that sort of thing. But this kid just.. I didn't know what to say; it was such a terrible story - I didn't know if he was having me on. And of course I didn't want to hint that I thought he was having me on, but I didn't want him to lay down some "I have been sucked in hook, line and, sinker" thing down, and it's very hard to know what to ..

> Kim: Issues of trust, I think.
>
> Hilary: Yeah. Well, and you think, "Well if he's…" I think I mean he was genuine. And he told me he'd been to see a counsellor, which was a great relief to me because I thought he's in big trouble. ….I think anything that isn't face-to-face.. It's easy to spin a yarn writing, I think, ahm, and may be fun, y'know? I can see that it would be fun to take on a persona that wasn't your own, even if it isn't for any sort of sinister thing. I can see it would be fun to pretend to be seventeen, or another sex, or anything. Y'know, that you could.. you could have fun playing that in writing. But to actually lie to somebody, face-to-face, and especially if you get their sympathy or ..anything...
>
> Kim: Play with their emotions?
>
> Hilary: Play with their emotions face-to-face. You'd have to be a pretty hardened, nasty person I think. And I don't think most of my students could fall in that category. (Hilary)

It was only when the student came to pick up his assessed journal, when Hilary could enact her caring role, one-on-one, face-to-face, that she felt she could truly judge and trust his state of mind and motives. Hilary doesn't feel she can trust what students write, and admits that even she too could "spin a yarn" in writing and "play" with a reader's emotions by assuming a different identity online. The assumption is then, that this is not only possible but permissible in text-based CMC, whereas only "a pretty hardened, nasty person" would sustain this deceit in proximate, face-to-face circumstances. Assessing the authenticity and intent of students' approaches in writing, and then responding appropriately, place a new set of demands on the lecturer. How can carer-lecturers, and email "mentors" like Hilary, trust what students write? It is only by looking through the lens of caring in teaching that we begin to appreciate the human, emotional complexities of pedagogical relationships.

The comments and posts that caring lecturers write for online CMC need to be worded carefully, and any response or intervention in an online discussion needs to be handled thoughtfully, as one's words remain visible and one thus remains accountable for what is written. "I am very careful how I put things", said Jane (C1b). Frank, who was very experienced in online DE teaching, noted that "sending emails and things you need to be

diplomatic in what you say because it doesn't disappear. It can be quoted back at you if you are not careful, so you have to be diplomatic" (Frank, C2). Cora was less focussed on accountability but nonetheless she was aware that she and Rose needed to communicate mindfully online with their students who were on extended rural placements.

> Early on some of the reflections were, some of the postings were superficial, as you [ie. Rose] were saying, and not very well thought out. And it's that dilemma about how hard do you go in then and start pushing it, saying, "We've really got to get them to think more critically", or do you just do that gently and hope that it picks up a bit by the feedback that you give? With that, the dilemma's about, - 'cause you're not there physically with them - you can't actually have a proper discussion. You've gotta be careful in the way you respond to things.… So it's about giving careful feedback to students and not putting them off, so it doesn't tax their confidence, or put them off the whole idea of doing it. (Cora, Rose & Cora, C2)

Cora returns again to what for her is a challenge in online teaching: the inadequacy of text-based CMC for sustaining careful dialogue with students. By pushing their students to reflect more critically in the online discussions, Cora and Rose risked causing their students feeling publicly criticised and "put off" if their teacherly responses were not clear and sensitive, before the eyes of the whole class. In any critically reflective discussion, a student could "lose face" more readily in text-based online discussions than in proximate face-to-face discussions, for the permanence and on-going availability of online text would exacerbate such a situation. The trust of the individuals in the group could be lost if one student was criticised unknowingly and "lost face". In face-to-face situations in the seminar room, verbal critique can be tempered with non-verbal mediating body language and vocal tones (Boden & Molotch, 1994). The effect of this is to soften what is necessarily a difficult message or challenging feedback. A sympathetic glance and a half-smile of encouragement may well reassure a student, even as the lecturer "goes in hard" verbally. However, online it appears difficult to present such divergent, encouraging cues (and jokes) that might defuse public embarrassment or shame on the part of an individual. Clearly

Cora had thought about this a lot, and it was also a central concern of a conference paper they wrote and presented about this new teaching experience. As Cora and Rose have suggested, workers in their (caring) field are trained to watch their communication – but even so it was difficult! The wording of one's responses in such contexts is a critical and subtle matter – and it takes time to do this well and thoughtfully. The extracts and views cited above on this matter also point to the notion that, in live, spontaneous situations, the lecturer is able to model for students more effectively how to cope with moments of uncertainty and anxiety, as exemplified in "losing face". In fact, Cora and Rose depended on the face-to-face components in their program in order to maintain elements of care in how they directed and taught their students in a care-focussed discipline. When their students went out on rural placements, they struggled to retain an ethic of care (as expressed through *caring for*) by means of online communication.

Indeed all the lecturers found it difficult to be subtle and sensitive in text online.

> I mean, the amount of times I use - as you know there are hundreds of little symbols in email for winking and smiley faces and grinning and all that - and I am using them all the time. And I even offended some person who flamed back at me. And I said, "Didn't you see the smiley face on the end?" "Oh is that what the colon and bracket is?" And I said, "Yes, you stick your head on the side. I was kidding!" [*chuckles*] Y'know, for a while there, this person was very angry at what I said, and rightly they would have been, if they thought I was serious. I just naturally thought they knew what a smiley face was and they didn't. We were all right after that, but you can get into trouble, because all they're reading is text. They're not seeing your face, they're not seeing…. This is why I don't think I'll ever get away from face to face 'cause, y'know, body language is so much easier to get a message across to them. (Seb)

Hilary lends strength to Cora and Seb's views in the following comments, which tell of the ease with which she feels she can share touch, empathy, jokes and spontaneous whimsical moments when she is physically present to her student/s.

> Kim: What about things that you can do face-to-face that you can't do online?
>
> Hilary: Oh the, the patting-on-the-shoulder type stuff. Ahmm, y'know the showing empathy, ahm, what else...? [*long pause*].. Probably sharing a joke or anything like that. The sort of thing that amuses me is often the sort of thing that goes down quite well as a, line of… y'know, a whim. (Hilary)

As we consider Hilary's comments, we need to remember the "escaped meaning" of caring here too – namely that in physically proximate settings, such (touching) expressions of affect and care can also be perceived as dangerous behaviours. In these times of risk, charges of assault could be the alternative response to a pat on the shoulder. There are similar observations to be made about stronger emotions in the classroom. Participants including Rahime, Ron, and Rose and Cora valued the expression of embodied, affective qualities, such as passion and enthusiasm, in their face-to-face teaching, and they felt restrained or frustrated at not being able to express such emotions online.

> Another thing you simply can't do in an electronic environment - is it has no emotion, I don't care what anyone has says. It has no emotion. I think it is very, very difficult to write teaching materials that are passionate. (Rahime, C2)

> I can inspire, cajole, communicate passion, ah, enthusiasm, face-to-face in a way that I think is impossible online. Absolutely impossible. ahm, because... you, you communicate facts, you can communicate knowledge, you can... certainly have a little bit of interaction through responding appropriately y'know, to emails and questions. And, y'know, that can be very valuable, ahm, and has it's own place. But ah, I don't think I can communicate any of the things I'm best at.. online. (Ron)

Overlooking their rhetorical effect, outbursts of enthusiasm and passion might also be understood as dangerous emotions in teaching spaces, leading to surprise, confrontation, conflict, silence. McWilliam (1999) makes the point that the mere risk of any improper

expression of emotions, such as the excess of the "mad professor" (risk associated with performing) and the seductive allure of a Miss Brodie (risk in caring relations), needs to be reined in. Emotional spillage and excess are improper teacher behaviours in the performative university. Clearly online pedagogies can have controlling effects on risky emotions, requiring both teachers and their students to self-manage and get on with the apparently unemotional task of learning, as efficiently as possible. The structured, measured environments available in any LMS offer just the tools to do it. But the participants in this study point out that, along with risky emotions, other human qualities may be lost too.

Reciprocity and Responsiveness

So far in my discussing of caring and the move online, I have considered care and increasing class sizes, (dis)trust and the expression of emotions in online CMC. These three factors have some bearing on the tenor of pedagogical relationships in university teaching and learning, especially so when viewed through the lens of caring. Relationships of care are founded on freely-given reciprocity and responsiveness. In this section want to explore how reciprocity and responsiveness translate in terms of teacher-student relationships online.

I detected some nervousness on the part of the lecturers in this study about the impact of online learning activities and CMC on the depth and intimacy of the relationships that they can have with their students. As the participants in this study reminded me, the gaze and presence of teachers and students in face-to-face situations would demand, and achieve, more responsiveness on the part of the students. Frank noted that, "in face-to-face teaching there is more of an immediate feedback – you need to give answers straight away" (Frank, C1b). This was in fact an issue that Aurea had thought about previously.

> Well, the student is not going to see me. How do I express myself in an encouraging way so the student will respond? Will I be this distant person or will I be talking from the page,

> like I am there face-to-face? And I am very conscious of that in my language as well. I like to be conversing with the person in front of me. (Aurea, C2)

At the time of our first conversations, Aurea was making the move online, teaching a new subject for local and international students in DE mode (online and print-based). For Aurea, caring entailed a particular engrossment that involved her in watching and listening, feeling and thinking, and in responding to her students. Aurea was certain she came to know her students better through online communication, and in particular the online discussion forums where her students summarised readings, and reflected and commented on each others' postings.

> Aurea: Are there images that describe me as a teacher? It's ahm… I'm thinking of [*giggles*] body organs [*giggles loudly*].
>
> Kim: No don't [worry]. That comes with the territory. That's Health.
>
> Aurea: Yeah. Yes. That's right. I kind of, if I can grow body or.. body parts that describe me as a teacher: somebody with a big ear, and a big brain, and a big heart [*laughs*].
>
> Kim: A big ear?
>
> Aurea: A big ear.
>
> Kim: And a big brain.
>
> Aurea: A big brain, and a big heart. Somebody who, who…and a big eye.
>
> Kim: Ooh, tell me about the big eye. What does the big eye do?
>
> Aurea: It's people who.. somebody who sees, and listens, and thinks and feels.…
>
> Kim: It's a very physical description. Can it equally apply online? Can you be physical? Can you have that physical metaphor?
>
> Aurea: Yes. I can when I read. I can listen. You know, I can listen to what they're saying. I can read what they say. I can think and I can feel, even if it's online. I think I can do that. I can. You can <u>hear</u> it [*giggles*]. You can <u>read</u> it. You can <u>think</u> about it. I can feel. I can <u>feel</u> their anxieties.
>
> Kim: So the heart does the feeling. [Aurea: Yeah] The ear does the listening. [Aurea: the listening] And the ahm, oh the brain-

> Aurea: The brain does the thinking, and other kinds of things, yeah. (Aurea, C1b)

I became quite intrigued by Aurea's comments about feeling her students' anxieties online, that I queried this again in a later conversation.

> I don't know.. how do I feel it? Or, maybe it is my anxiety [*laughing*]. But when I read online, for example, [that] they didn't know what to do and they are throwing ideas back and forth on how to organize themselves, I know they are very anxious. They know what to do, but it is just so difficult. I know what they are feeling. Maybe I am putting myself into their shoes and can feel what they are going through and that is when I say, "I am reading it this way". And I respond accordingly, whether that response is giving them more information that could help them put things into perspective. (Aurea, C3)

Whenever I read this quote, I always wonder if the anxiety Aurea felt, as she read and watched her students making their way online, was first and foremost her own anxiety. Regardless, with her sensitive, empathic response, Aurea feels she is not so removed from the inner life of her own students. Noddings (2003, p. 30) writes of the receptivity of the one-caring, that allows one to *receive the other into* oneself and at the same time to see and *feel with* the other. "Apprehending the other's reality, feeling what he feels as nearly as possible, is the essential part of caring from the view of the one-caring" (Noddings, 2003, p. 16). It would appear that the online contexts that Aurea uses (especially two-way email and discussions) have intensified her feelings of empathy with her students' circumstances as they make their way online. Yet while her feelings (and her anxiety) for her students might have increased, her students did not respond, or reciprocate.

Almost two months into the DE course, Aurea started a new thread entitled "Take a break (have a kit kat) Let's introduce ourselves!" In her first posting she revealed details of her professional background and family life, mentioned her academic story, her husband, their children and their ages. She added, "I'm going to be a grandma for the first time hopefully this year." Only two students replied straight away; another two replied over the next two

months, and all four messages disclosed less personal detail than Aurea's first message. The first student's reply didn't reveal any personal relationships, and the second student revealed little more except to say she was an "at-home Mum, with a little girl". The third revealed only that she had just bought a house, and she gave out her phone numbers, so that others might ring her to chat about the readings and issues they were raising. The fourth student to post ignored Aurea's original thread and started a new one entitled, "Lets take a break", apologised for joining the discussions late, and did not reveal any personal information. While there are any number of "ice-breaker" and self-introduction strategies for online discussions (see for example, Duggleby, 2000; Salmon, 2002), it was unlikely that such tactics would have been necessary at this point in the program, as this small group had been communicating and sharing summaries, examples and opinions online for several months. Aurea had also met some of them in person. But Aurea's self-disclosure drew a disappointing response, and it appeared that her invitation to share personal information - much as she had done - was being ignored in this online context. Like Hilary and Evan, Aurea was finding herself ignored and overlooked when she went online as a teacher.

Whereas in face-to-face settings, where students may well take turns to introduce themselves, online they were reluctant to post, no doubt aware of, but unable to see, the gaze and reactions of the others reading their introduction. There was no response, no reciprocity. The students simply got on with their reading and summarising in the discussions and at different points some of them did disclose something of their personal lives, but such information was not going to appear in a specially-devoted thread. Care-based, one-on-one communication in such open contexts is a challenge, and obviously the teacher must remain careful about what she writes to each and every student, before the eyes of many.

Ignored online by her students, Aurea certainly experienced some anguish and concern for herself. She became aware of her own watching and learning as her students engaged with the readings and communicated ideas in the online discussions.

> Aurea: We are now in Module 2. They're posting their discussions, and it's <u>wonderful</u>.
>
> Kim: [*slowly*] Is it?
>
> Aurea: The <u>quality</u> of the discussions - I'm so amazed. Because if I reflect on the theory side, I teach theory in the Masters program…. But on reflecting back I don't think I get so much discussion - in-depth and thoughtful discussions - verbally just in class you know, as compared with what I get now. That's one thing that I've noticed for the first few weeks. In fact *I'm* the one learning [*laughs*].
>
> Kim: Are you?
>
> Aurea: It's amazing.
>
> Kim: You're learning?
>
> Aurea: I'm <u>learning</u> from the discussion. I set up, I choose all the material, and I pose all these questions, but what they respond to these questions and they <u>react</u>, and interact with the material, and they post what they think and I read it. It's just amazing. And I'm <u>learning</u> a lot [*laughing*] just reading all these discussions. Yeah. So I sent them an email, saying you know, "I'm just delighted, and it's a very substantive discussion" and ahm. And I told them that "I'm learning a lot from what you are posting and I hope that you do too". (Aurea, C1a)

In a curious reversal of Rahime's gushing student story, Aurea told me how she was filled with awe and "admiration" for how her students were learning in the online environment she had set up. Aurea told me, "I admire the way they contributed" (C2). Yet, she was no longer so visibly central or necessary to her students' learning in the ways she might be in the face-to-face seminars she also enjoyed, where she could animate and stimulate discussion. She was ignored by her students in online discussions, and had become a bystander to her students' learning, a "guide on the side". Yet watching her students learn was a real teaching pleasure for Aurea. At the beginning of our final conversation, we were reflecting back on the first time the subject ran.

> Kim: I remember you said you did a lot of watching and reading and..

> Aurea: Yes I did. I did a lot of, you know, not as if you're playing. You're perving! [*gales and gales of laughter]* What a term to use! [*more laughter*]
>
> Kim: Yeah, but…there's a couple of good reasons you'd say that..
>
> Aurea: Yeah, like you're just, you know you go in there. A student may be addressing the whole group and here you are reading all those. You are - what do you call this? – "privy" to those conversations whereas I'm with or without any intentions of participating for example. You just want to know what's going on. Ahm.. Yes.
>
> Kim: Can I just pursue that a bit further? [*Aurea is still giggling loudly*] Cause normally the term we use for students is "lurking", and here you admit to "perving", and perving does suggest… some kind of pleasure – whatever way we judge that - there is a pleasure in actually reading and looking online.
>
> Aurea: Online - yeah, yeah. My thinking is: I wonder… how these students are reacting and interacting with each other? I wonder how they are interacting with the materials that they have? I just want to see. I want to see. And so you go there and read. And whenever I read something - because I enjoy it - there's that anticipation that I'll enjoy it. And I enjoy finding out what they are doing and how they are interacting and how they are relating to the materials that they're reflecting on, that they're reading. So I think that's where the pleasure comes. Yeah, I suppose ahm, I am at that point where you are just on the background and watching, reading, looking. Ahm. It is at that point that you make a decision whether you wanna participate or not. It depends on what the situation is.
>
> Kim: Hide in the bushes? Stay hidden, or are you gonna reveal yourself?
>
> Aurea: You will reveal yourself, and jump up – Hah!! [*laughs]* (Aurea, C3)

Aurea goes quietly online with anticipation, reading and watching her students learn. Ignored in discussions, although feeling their anxiety, and her anxiety, she stays in the background, while her students get on with the work of learning. She is invisible online. She decides to enjoy it anyway; she becomes a voyeur.

Zembylas and Vrasidas (2005) have argued for the potential of online CMC to enable ethical pedagogical relations through "listening" as "witnessing". They maintain that

online pedagogies might well be set up to represent "certain configurations of otherness that have the capacity to move students out of their positions of complacency, apathy, guilt, or feelings of pity or mercy" (Zembylas & Vrasidas, 2005, p. 75). However, the experiences of the carer-lecturers in this study do not support the views of Zembylas and Vrasidas who write that, "above all, Lévinas's ideas pave the way for creating a *theoretical* space in online education that promotes *actual* engagement with and care and respect for the other" (Zembylas & Vrasidas, 2005, p. 75; authors' italics). In fact, the authors do signal that this ethical agenda might well be neutralized or in some way contaminated by institutional demands that require students' contributions to be assessed.

And that was the case for the carer-lecturers in this study. Lecturers are teaching increasingly large classes, there are deadlines to meet, there is insufficient time for silence and reflection, and if what the student posts is to be assessed and judged, then only good and proper responses will be posted. In fact the caring perspective draws attention to the very fact that, online, students themselves become subject to similar mechanisms of control and (self-)management in ways that their facilitators are also experiencing. Aurea's *non-responsive* students who got on with their learning and did not engage in sociality online are a case in point. Perhaps Hilary's *irresponsible* online contributors were also reacting to the visibility of the medium.

The experiences of Hilary and Aurea in particular suggest that in communal, public CMC spaces, the online teacher – as facilitator - becomes an uncertain onlooker, watching but not engaging, as the students self-disclose, communicate or digress from the learning agenda. The lecturers in this study tended to turn to face-to-face contact, where they could find some reciprocity and responsiveness, to resolve doubts, distrust and uncertainties. Looking through the lens of caring, it appears most unlikely that lecturers and students can sustain reciprocal, empathic, trust-based relationships in online CMC. This finding is reinforced by Noddings' (2003, p. 19) observation that, for natural care to be enacted and completed,

the one-caring (exhibiting empathy and engrossment) and the cared-for (returning acknowledgement and reciprocity) need to be present to each other.

Chapter Review: The Carer Finds it Difficult to Care Online

In my chapter 2 review that investigated the naming of the transformed teacher as online facilitator, I noted that the literature frequently identifies the guide (mentor, coach, adviser, consultant), who implicitly exhibits some of the characteristics of care. The literature never explores labels, like "guide", in any depth. However, in this chapter I believe I have demonstrated the strength of my analytical approach by revealing, in this metaphor case study for example, a much more complex, caring teacher who manages the emotional support and risk attached to caring teaching in face-to-face and online contexts.

When the carer makes the move online, a shift appears to take place in the care-based relationships of university teaching and learning. There are risky moments and decisions to be made by academics when students reveal too much personal information in email, or attempt to use email for private communication with the lecturer. Lecturers felt these matters were better discussed and resolved in face-to-face circumstances and so, from a caring perspective, a blended curriculum still contains provision for private, intimate and face-saving interactions. For both lecturer and students, it is not easy to express emotions, reciprocity and responsiveness in online CMC, and the students may well feel that they have moved to more outlying concentric circles (Noddings, 2003) of a caring teacher's attention. That is, they may perceive they are merely being *cared about* rather than *cared for* by the lecturer. In some of the stories of online CMC recounted in this chapter, the students simply, and very publicly, ignored the lecturer's discussion posts, and continued writing and responding to each other, unaware of the lecturer's embodied engrossment in their ideas, or her empathy for their anxieties, for example. The caring lecturer seems to have become invisible; she feels helpless in her one-sided empathy, invisible engrossment and her ineffectiveness to act on behalf of the other.

Along with the performer (a disappearing act), but differently, the carer becomes an overlooked, invisible online teacher and, as Aurea's experience shows, perhaps even a voyeur. In sum, the carer as online facilitator cannot convey empathy, trust, passion and emotion online, and teacher-student relationships break down due to the inability to convey responsiveness and reciprocity. The moral obligation of teaching is eroded, such that a teacher can no longer maintain the teacher's pledge to respond to the other, the student. Stated clearly, my thesis is that online education facilitates "the end of obligated relations to others" (Readings, 1996). Asynchronicity interferes with the expression of teacher care, reducing the *caring for* that characterises online teacher-student relationships to *caring about*, and thereby limiting the intimacy of the relationships that carer-lecturers seek to establish online. Of course, as in the case of Aurea, the one-caring (the lecturer or tutor) can give care without reciprocity from the cared-for (the students) – but such relationships may founder.

> What the cared-for gives to the relation either in direct response to the one-caring or in personal delight or in happy growth before her eyes is genuine reciprocity. It contributes to the maintenance of the relation and serves to prevent the caring from turning back on the one-caring in the form of anguish and concern for self. (Noddings, 2003, p. 74)

The broken promise produces certain other effects on the part of the online facilitator (and learner). I will reveal these effects in the next chapter of my analysis that focuses on the third and final teaching metaphor, directing.

Chapter 7
Directing

> The director – one who ensures that all characters play their part and that the show moves smoothly from beginning to end, adding his or her expertise only when the actors seem to need assistance. (McVay-Lynch, 2002, p. 65)

> No responsibility without response, without what speaking and hearing *invisibly* say to the ear, and which takes *time.* (Derrida, 2005, p. 252; author's italics)

Introduction

In chapter 5, I discussed the arch-metaphor, teaching is like performing, to reveal, through the move online, three particular impacts on teacher identity and work as a result of change: an increasing workload, the changing tempo of teaching, and the impossibility of immediacy, spontaneity, risk and excitement in online CMC. My analysis in chapter 6 of the arch-metaphor, teaching is like caring, illustrated the difficulty the participants in the study experienced in expressing and receiving emotions, trust and reciprocity in asynchronous, text-based communication. In this chapter I will explore another teaching simile - that teaching is like directing – with a particular focus once again on how the values and practices of directing translate to online CMC. Like the performer-lecturer and carer-lecturer, the values, beliefs and experiences of the director-lecturer are considered against the discursive backdrop of academic teacher excellence and enterprise.

The Director

The teaching focus of the directing metaphor is on teaching as directing, organising and leading teams of people with diverse talents and roles, towards an assumed goal. By claiming to be a "director" of student learning, the teacher is acknowledging a certain kind of expertise and creative control of the learning process. And by directing students - by

motivating, co-ordinating and organising the conditions of their learning - the director aims to prepare the students for a metaphorical performance, a theatrical production, a movie, a game or match, and in some cases a future "real world".

The Metaphors of Directing in this Study

The drama, sporting, music, and tourism metaphors that constitute directing for the purposes of my thesis were noticeably focussed on entertainment and leisure activities – suggesting, much as the performer does, that learning must be fun. However, with this metaphorical orientation there is a serious edge of application, in that the students are not passive spectators and parties to a "vicarious experience of relevance" (Hodgson, 1997), but rather must be more active and productive in their learning.

Table 5: Teaching is like Directing

Teacher	**Students (a collective)**	**Curriculum; knowledge production**
Orchestra conductor	Musicians (back to audience)	Music score, rehearsals and shows
Stage manager	Actors, stage crew	Production notes, rehearsals and shows, scripts, the set
Coach	Sports team and players	Rules of the game, practice and regular matches, game plan
Team leader	Team members	Team task or focus, game
(Tour) guide	Tourists	Local culture/s, knowledge, practices, and history; particular clothes and equipment

The key understanding, articulated by the participants in this study, regarding the metaphorical director is that she directs a team, or teams, of people, in a creative and stimulating environment, rather than managing people in, for example, a corporate or

commercial context. We might imagine the learning context as a theatre, a movie set, a sports field or a series of significant monuments to visit. Whereas in the performing metaphor, the lecturer has the stage to himself, in this case the director-lecturer and the students are working together on and around the stage, testing out various approaches to different scenes or passages of music. The director is a leader who must inspire and influence a team of creative, talented people towards a vision of a final product: a film, performance, or a game. Of course, for some director-lecturers, the "end-game" may well occur only within the university curriculum, and will not be envisioned beyond the gates of the university.

In my analysis in this chapter I will show that being a director of learning is not so far removed metaphorically from being a manager, an entrepreneur and indeed a leader of learning. In this study several participants found that the direction metaphor was a mostly meaningful way for them to take up the higher education learning and teaching discourses of excellence and quality student learning. Directing represents a more recent way of being/becoming a university lecture, with new dispositions and skills. In fact, those who talked most in the study through this particular lens were younger or less experienced academics who had less sense of history, and of "how things used to be", in terms of their departmental setting and university culture more broadly. The director is a young, creative, energetic lecturer, part of a "new wave" of lecturers, who inspires a team. As I shall now show, the core values and practices of teaching as directing cluster around notions of responsibility (organization and preparation, "setting the scene" for learning), creativity, and autonomy (self-improvement and leadership). Later in the chapter, I will shift attention to focus on the director's experience of the move online.

The Responsibilities of Directing

A proper director of learning is prepared and organised. Preparation and planning for rehearsals and practice sessions are very important. That is, before helping the team to prepare for their performance or match, the director must prepare herself.

Self-improvement: Preparing oneself to direct others.

The director is keen to stay up-to-date with teaching practice, research, and innovation such as online learning and teaching. Understanding some of the theory and practice of directing (teaching and learning) seems to be important to the director-lecturer. Zhang, for example, trained as a teacher of science and technology in London. He, Paul and Hilary had Masters in Education qualifications. Evan and Aurea had studied short courses on the pedagogy of their discipline as part of earlier postgraduate studies. The director enjoys being a learner, even in short courses and workshops. Aurea was keen to assert that attending a series of WebCT workshops had made her teaching even more student-centred. Jane, too, had found participating in WebCT workshops really helpful for her online planning and teaching.

> Kim: …I don't know if you have had a sense of yourself as a learner?
> Jane: Completely, yeah. And that is why when I came back from my leave and I did all those courses in WebCT.. Absolutely – putting myself in the role as learner, yeah, yeah.… I loved those sessions because you were always talking to people who were using WebCT and had ideas. (Jane, C2)

In terms of preparation, Rose's background was exemplary. At the beginning of her involvement in this study she had been teaching at undergraduate level and conducting postgraduate co-ordination and supervision at university level for three years, so, having entered university life at the end of the 1990s after much change had already swept through her university and faculty, she was a relatively new academic. Prior to this she had worked outside the university as a practitioner in her field; she had had some experience of the "real world" on which she would often draw for anecdotes and credibility. Rose worked hard to make sure she had the qualifications, skills, and knowledge to "set the scene", and to be seen to teach well. Only a year or two before our first conversation, Rose had completed a graduate certificate qualification in higher education teaching and learning, and I noticed in our early conversations that she used the language of university teaching and learning

confidently, mentioning terms like "overall subject aims", and weekly or specific "learning outcomes", giving and receiving "feedback". After completing the formal qualification in teaching and learning, Rose undertook a series of WebCT workshops in order to learn how to set up a WebCT site and integrate the online environments that she and Cora needed to run their mostly online subject for students on rural placements. She co-taught with Cora a field placement subject which now relied on WebCT with face-to-face meetings before, during and after the placement period.

Zhang, was a self-ascribed "team leader" who devoted a lot of time in particular to improving his technical skills for online teaching. He was able to use research grants to obtain funding for projects that required hardware and software that he could also use in his teaching, and he was well-known within the university for his scholarship in computer-assisted language learning (CALL). His motivation for using ICT in his teaching seemed anchored in a number of loci: a personal interest in ICT, a commitment to his own professional development, and an awareness that students liked interesting, novel online activities. He wrote to me about this.

> In order to make the combination [of face-to-face and online teaching] work, teachers would need to prepare themselves well by working hard to upgrade their professional and IT knowledge and skills. This is a tough challenge, but it is very rewarding. I have benefitted from taking up the challenge, and have found that my teaching work becomes more creative and effective with the mutual support of the conventional and online approaches. (Zhang, email communication, April 8, 2003)

Zhang believed that ICT motivated his students to learn and it also encouraged them to be independent learners. Zhang was proud of his achievements with computers and ICT in teaching and learning and he was very open and comfortable with the notion of being a learner as well as a teacher.

Directing: "Setting the scene" for learning.

The director is always already a learner. This attitude also helps the director to "look through the eyes" of the student (Noddings, 2003) when "setting the scene" for student learning. Rose spoke in our first conversation of being a tour guide, and of helping her students to pack and unpack suitable equipment and clothing for their learning journey.

> Well actually when I read that question [about teaching metaphors] I was thinking back to just the discussion [inaudible]. I thought it still applied - about the tour guide thing. About kind of offering the kind of.. the array of things. And even just this week, for example, when we were talking about how you define violence or whatever and then someone came in - and quick, "But, what should I include, and what shouldn't I include?" and I said, "Well you know… Where does that leave us all?" You know. So yeah, it is about offering, and then the students try to unpack… and then to take up more as they're going along… That's why I'm thinking a tour guide thing… actually going and moving. Yeah. I suppose the tour leader's role is basically to ahm.. set the scene in a sense - the overall scene - and then to offer some kind of guidance along the way… (Rose, Rose & Cora, C1a)

By Conversation 3, 14 months after our first conversations, Rose had rethought her tour guide metaphor, shifting to a different context for directing, with some consciousness around planning so as to "ensure learning" in the discursively proper ways.

> Rose: In terms of face-to-face I wouldn't think I was a tour guide as such, but I suppose I was more of a…. director in some of these groups.
>
> Kim: What kind of director?
>
> Rose: Well that's what I was thinking. Ahm…I suppose in the ahm - not actually a film director with getting to manipulate - but it was more in a sense of directing.. well I suppose setting up the scene, with the learning and then facilitating, directing-
>
> Kim: Stage management?
>
> Rose: Yeah, stage management, I suppose that kind of way. It's not black and white, but getting more …. trying to ensure their learning. I'm very conscious of… We had particular

> learning outcomes and learning goals, so it's more in terms of wanting to ensure the activities are connected with that. (Rose, Rose & Cora, C3)

The implied contexts of several of the constituent metaphors listed in Table 5 suggest that learners undertake practice or rehearsal (for example, with the sports team or the orchestra) while they are at university, with the goal of eventual application in a real world context, such as a performance or a sporting grand final. Rose's comments draw attention to the forethought and goal-focussed planning that are the initial responsibility of the director-teacher, but which will benefit those students who practise or prepare themselves assiduously now. She hesitates to use the term "manipulate", but like all directors she has a vision – properly referred to here as learning outcomes and goals – towards which she aims to inspire and direct her students. The importance of vision will be revisited in the next section. Having prepared herself and the learning experience - having "set the scene", so to speak - the focus of this exploration of director-lecturer qualities and values now shifts from preparation to student learning and the important lecturer qualities of team or group leadership, vision and creativity.

Directing a creative process.

The focus of learning under a directing metaphor is on practice and rehearsal, though, in these days of student-centred learning, this can go beyond mere rote learning of scripts, physical drills and repetitive work, to encompass exploratory exercises, role play and creative improvisation, for example. In fact, under direction, learning happens in teams, or groups, and director-lecturers are very skilled at managing self-directed learning (Rose and Cora, Zhang) and various forms of group work (Ron, Aurea, Paul – in the Health Sciences). Rose and Cora valued being able to intervene at critical moments with their groups in class or with individuals in private, to check understandings, to focus attention of key understandings or to draw students out further in areas they thought were important. This was particularly true in the development of critical reflection, which is a crucial strategy for managing professional autonomy in their field.

Problem- and case-based learning are student-centred approaches (Boud, 2005) that depend on teacher planning and direction or supervision, though these did not a feature of the curricula of any of the participants in this study. With group work in her sights, the director must now bring to bear her leadership skills and share her vision of a quality group outcome or product. The group-based learning process will depend largely on her inspirational talents, and her insistence on a creative process.

Direction might also lead to creative production: a play or a film, a musical performance, a cultural study tour. For Zhang there were real pleasures and satisfactions in both learning and using new software, and in the interactions with his students.

> Kim: …I'm interested to know what you like about teaching, perhaps… what's the best thing about teaching?
>
> Zhang: Yeah, I think in teaching, you can ahm…[it] gives you a lot of room to develop your own ideas. And also you can learn, when you do teaching, you learn - that's the main thing, I think. What[ever] you like to learn - something new, something interesting - you can do it through your teaching, and the interactive elements between the teacher and the students, always there, and they.. so can encourage a lot when you do your teaching. I think I always enjoy teaching because I always get feedback from my students, and they, once you have teaching task, you will need to know more about your subject matter. So, you, you need to learn more, and also - I like to do more writing, once you have the teaching subjects, you need to develop your teaching material. So that also encourages you to create something new. And you get some outcome[s], and grow in your teaching, So, teaching is kind of a productive way to allow you to do something you really want to do. (Zhang)

Feedback from students encouraged Zhang to research his subject matter and develop his teaching materials, and he found this process creative, much as the conductor, stage manager, conductor and tour guide found themselves organising and leading student learning in creative environments. In the following extracts, Cora emphasises the creative

possibilities of curriculum design, and Rose picks up on Zhang's idea of being able "to do something you really want to do" in a different way, going on to emphasise the need to up-date continually the teaching material for students.

> That stuff [curriculum design] is creative; it goes beyond spouting facts. I get them to do the learning. It's about thinking through how they are going to engage with this stuff and enjoy it and make sense of this stuff that is really quite complex and that relates to their lived experience. (Cora, Rose & Cora, C1a)

> In a small group say 18 - 20 students or something, I see my role as like more of a facilitator or whatever. So you know I really enjoy that role, and try to encourage students, and bla-bla-bla, and have it all kind of in a sense clear in what you're hoping for their learning and whatever, but having - creatively - that's where the creativity comes in for me more - when you're in a small group in actually how you how you kind of in a sense assist them with the particular learning that you're wanting them to achieve and the outcomes. (Rose, Rose & Cora, C3)

> In one sense you have the freedom to pursue your areas of interest. No one's telling me, "Oh, you've got to do this, or you've got to do that". You can branch off or whatever - as long as you're, in a sense, meeting your teaching commitments around that. Across our small staff here, there's probably some people who use the same teaching material that they've had for a number of years. People like myself**,** every year, you've gotta review revise and make sure it's up-to-date. (Rose, Rose & Cora, C3)

"People like myself" – properly organised, professional academics – regularly up-date their teaching materials. However, Rose was ready to acknowledge too that her teaching was being regulated increasingly by university management, "with them being more prescriptive about workloads and performance. Now you have to show your research and be accountable and produce, so..." (Rose, Rose & Cora, C3). Rose seems to be suggesting that proper creativity lies in finding ways to help students achieve the learning outcomes.

Cora said she had noticed that the department took learning objectives very seriously, using similarly-worded level objectives between courses but, she added, “You can't just go off and design your own course” (Cora, C3). Through the lens of directing we can see already how new university policies, guidelines and codes of practice might threaten individual artistic brilliance – on the part of the director, in particular. In much film production for example, (and certainly of the large-scale, globalised “Hollywood” genre), the director has to be sensitive to the producers’ agendas, since they provide the finance, and they establish related accountability guidelines and practices (P. Donnan, personal communication, January 29, 2006). Perhaps it is only the “big name” directors (and academic celebrities like Dr Karl Kruszelnicki and the erstwhile Dr Julius Sumner Miller in Australian universities) who can continue to insist on the principle of artistic freedom in curriculum and teaching – the equivalent of some notion of academic autonomy, or “fluidity” as Evan characterised it. Of course, as discussed in chapter 1, even academic freedom is really under the purview of university management.

Directing and Autonomy

Directing student learning then entails leading the teamwork of student learning, with vision and creativity. Good leaders will enthuse, intervene and influence students to work self-critically, collectively and autonomously. Good directors lead by example, modelling good organization, critical reflection, and autonomy.

Leadership and vision will inspire the team.

When we look into the images of the conductor facing her orchestra, or the stage manager meeting with his crew and performers, we see vividly how directors lead teams of creative, skilled people. Directors must lead their students towards a vision (what Ron called “the big picture”), and the director must share that vision with her groups of students. The leader models the qualities of vision, creativity and leadership in the expectation that the students will adopt them too, for good leadership turns everyone into a leader. According to Ramsden (1998a, as cited in McWilliam et al., 1999), in the corporate university, a good

leader will transform the ordinary into excellence, by making everyone feel personally responsible for the work produced. Rose gives a classroom-based example of this when she spoke about how she actually intervenes and helps groups refocus and get started on a learning task.

> Rose: Yeah but I mean…[*exhales*] ideally, I suppose realistically though, when I'm in there, I get very, I can get very task-focussed. And that probably comes back from not only my experience but if I feel students "ungaging" or whatever, I do get quite ahm, I can get quite direct in groups to make sure and bring them in - 'specially the quiet ones. When you've got 22 and you don't know where they're up to or whatever, if you, they're in… just for example like on Tuesday we had a four-hour small group session that went from 12 to 4 which is..a long time…. So…I'll say to the students "These are the rough areas. When we go through, you know mark [down?] what we'll be doing." So with an example, say a case study, and we're gonna be looking at bla-bla-bla and whatever. And so we'll have smaller sub-group work and then they'll come back to you know another larger group or something. And then if I get, say that… Well to start with, we set up group rules and you know and the first things, so we know about… just intangible learning expectations, so people are clear of what we're expecting of each other. And it comes from the students: they want equal participation. So what's that? OK so… "What does anyone understand by equal participation in a group of 22?" …and so you know so you find out from them. And then, after that first day I've typed up that and so I say "Now this is our little list that you came up with", and I give them my expectations and then I just kind of refer back to that and in terms of if they wanna change or add, but it's very useful in terms of equal participation, when you have to accuse the students that they've been quiet for whatever reason, and ahm at 4th year I'll do a round robin, and say "Will everyone just give input now". So that's when I get to direct… so I know what they're thinking. (Rose, in Rose & Cora, C1a)

Here Rose describes directing a learning process, where she directed learning according to a plan, yet she was not always the centre of pedagogical attention. In fact she became a secretary to the group/s by typing up their list/s of participation guidelines. Indeed,

whether in rehearsals or in actual performance – and that could be a public performance, a practice match or an examination – the director sits in the wings, or on the sidelines, and looks on actively, recording the performance and/or taking notes for later relaying back of detailed individual and collective feedback, in order to help the students to improve their performance. Rose's colleague Cora found a coaching metaphor helpful in describing how she coaches from the sides, referring to tactics such as cadging, rewarding, reinforcing, inspiring and "keeping students enthused". Leaders must also have the ability to inspire students towards a vision and to the achievement of "great results". However, as Cora found, directing (as coaching) is hard work, and the rewards may not be immediate. Clearly, patience is a necessary virtue for both the lecturer and the students.

> I think back to when I was the coach of the Under 14 E-Grade netball team and for them it was about just.. They never won a game. They were hopeless. It was about keeping them interested, and just cadging them and rewarding for the little bits - the good things that they did - and just seeing them improve over time with that…. And so the coach metaphor when I first saw it, I thought it didn't seem quite right. But it is - I think about it…. many, many years ago when I tau.. when I coached netball teams - it just comes naturally. And in my field education teaching years, I had so many marginal students in a setting that didn't necessarily inspire them initially, and it's about trying to inspire them and in the end seeing some great results. So, one-on-one teaching, you can do that and get some good results. In a group.. in a small group? It's harder to do that in group teaching though. I'm not sure about the metaphor. But it is about keeping people enthused, particularly in this sort of learning. It's about their use of self and how they're reacting to their learning and reinforcing the good stuff they're doing and just building up that learning over time. (Cora, in Rose & Cora, C3)

This quote exemplifies in many ways how many teachers understand what it is to change their students in the name of teaching and learning. In an earlier quote in this chapter, Rose rejected the metaphor of a film director for its undertones of manipulation. Here Cora

articulates more clearly how that manipulation of learners can be effected, by using particular skills of persuasion to influence and change students' behaviours and knowledge.

Being a teacher who leads also means modelling self-managing qualities, in the expectation that the team members will go forth into the real world, utilising similar leadership attributes and critically reflexive autonomy. Yet, when Ron spoke about his leadership abilities and efforts, he also pointed out the "galling" loneliness of being out the front all the time.

> I think what I do best, is... inspire and cajole and having "the big picture", trying to lead people on to somewhere else ahm, and I think that's what I do quite well. It's, it's a particularly galling role, because being out there before everyone else, you're always waiting for other people to catch up, and by the time they've caught up you're somewhere else. And it's always hard to get resources for doing new things but.. I mean I think the quirk of my brain - and I have nothing much to do with it - is that I do take "the big picture" approach. (Ron)

Perhaps leading student learning all the time can constrain one too. Zhang claimed to slip between being a team leader and team player sometimes in his classes. When he invited me to sit in on one of his lab. classes, I noticed that he was most comfortable working alongside his students in the computer lab. While Zhang tinkered and continued to work on developing new electronic material for online delivery, his students were selecting their individualised learning paths from the online materials and activities he had prepared. Unlike performer-lecturers, Zhang was not the centre of his students' attention, for most of the classtime. When asked, he offered guidance or advice, and very occasionally stopped the whole class to clarify common queries or to check and direct group work.

Indeed Zhang's teaching style and activities highlight the pleasure the director finds in his own learning. This is not easy to realise while directing the team, but he and other participants in this study found some satisfaction in developing the research-led and

scholarly dimensions of their teaching, which in turn informed their curriculum design and planning. In fact, Zhang was a leader in computer-based language learning in his university. He was sometimes called upon to speak in seminars about his approach, his curricula and the latest technical interfaces that he used.

Autonomy and Reflecting on Performance

Anticipating the entry of her students into the real world upon graduation, the director consciously withdraws from the learning space, and puts in place carefully planned peer and self-directed learning tasks or projects. The director also sets up other less teacher-centred strategies such as peer-tutoring, collaborative group-based learning and mentoring, to support the development of autonomy and, above all, she emphasises the importance of reflection. Ron's afore-mentioned reflections on the loneliness of leadership highlight the feelings of isolation that come with the autonomy of the new entrepreneurial academic and student and, indeed, it would appear that self-reflection is just the antidote and strategy to fill the interactional gap – a gap that opens when, I would argue, intimate *caring for* is replaced by distant *caring about* in new teaching and learning contexts (caring for and caring about are discussed in chapter 6). Rose and Cora placed a lot of emphasis in their teaching on developing their students' (critical) reflection[7], which required students "to relate [content knowledge] to what they're doing, reflect on that, comment on that, share that with others and explore that together. That's different from trying to teach some kind of content" (Cora, Rose & Cora, C2).

> Cora: The philosophy of this program is great. It's about critical reflection, and not giving students certainty. Here it's really challenging students. "We're not going to teach you a tool box of skills." We frighten the life out of them, make them anxious, and through that anxiety a lot of students want some mastery over what they do and we're not giving them that. "You have to live with that."

[7] "critical" is bracketed in any discussion of reflective practice in Rose and Cora's teaching, as the ideological, emancipatory character of what they taught their students in the name of "critical reflection" was not ascertained.

> Rose: There's a bigger different picture in society - continuous change and uncertainty. It's all about developing students' independence as learners as well as interdependence…. We don't teach facts. (Rose & Cora, C1a)

It is clear that Rose and Cora are preparing their students to become the responsible, autonomous subjects that are so desired by neo-liberal institutions, organisations and governments. When the carer-director can no longer be physically present to debrief and help students make sense of process and outcomes, it seems that (critical) reflection is the proper "psy" (Rose, 1996) strategy that will sustain the autonomous individual in moments of uncertainty.

> The languages and techniques of psychology provide vital relays between contemporary government and the ethical technologies by which modern individuals come to govern their own lives…. They provide languages of self-interpretation, criteria for self-evaluation, and technologies for self-rectification that render existence into thought as a profoundly psychological affair and make our self-government a matter of our choice and our freedom. (Rose, 1996, p. 79)

This notion of (critical) reflection is not simply restricted to my discussion of Rose, Cora and their students, for it is a distinguishing, self-managing practice of the excellent, enterprising academic who was introduced in my literature review in chapter 2. To a point, the practices (that is, self-managing techniques or "technologies") of the enterprising academic sit comfortably with the directing perspective, however as I shall reveal through the lens of the move online, there are areas of dissonance between the metaphorical director and the institutional ideal.

Rose's personal motivation for participating in this study reiterated the value she placed on reflection as a means to improve her own teaching. On the Participant Information Sheet that I asked her to fill out, Rose gave the following points in response to Question 5: "What has made you interested in participating in this research study?"

- My interest in the area as a novice to online teaching and learning.
- It will encourage me to reflect on, tease out and articulate my experiences of the online component of [subject name].
- As I am team-teaching the joint interviews with my colleague will enhance my understanding of issues from her perspective and possibly raise things which we will pursue. (Rose, Participant Information sheet, 2002)

Clearly, Rose held a strong and proper commitment to reflection - "reflecting on, teasing out and articulating" - as a strategy for self-improvement, as well as a method for developing student learning and autonomy. Zhang reflected on his teaching too, but in a different way. He adopted a reflective, pragmatic approach to "setting the scene" for learning in his classes, based on his experience, knowledge of the context and the students.

> I think actually the teaching is more to do with your experience, with your own ahh way. I don't think there is a set of some principles you just follow. This is no such thing. You can't be taught in another way, but when you are doing teaching you have to figure out what are you going to do. And, what is the student, the background, and that sort of thing. It's more to do with the ahh… the real situation is live performance. So usually I don't do much, ahh, what - thinking - before you teach. But how do you teach when you finish a class? I usually have some kind of.. ahh… looking back and see what is laid out [?] and what I should do next. And, so, it's mainly based around experience, and sort of mainly by doing. That's the main thing, yeah. So, there ideas are in there, but sometimes you will find the ideas not always suitable for the practice. (Zhang)

Zhang was of the opinion that teachers can develop ICT and online learning to foster student autonomy and responsibility for learning.

> So, the computer is not the way to change your teaching. It is the way to increase your teaching proficiency, to allow students to have more free time, ahh with themselves, and to enable them to learn more independently. I think that's the thing, yeah, it's.. I think that

> with my teaching styles there's probably not much changed, that's nothing to do with computer. And.. but they just provide more challenge and more room for development…. That is very important; students have to be independent. And we have to tell them: they just use us, use the teachers to get their own way of learning. Not rely on teachers to know the skills, so the teacher should just give them many ways, not one way to go. So, once students know all the different options, they know the options, they will on their own to choose the one that suits, or choose several. So, I think the best teacher is to give more options to students rather than concentrate on one or two areas. That's my belief. (Zhang)

When Zhang said, "they just use us, use the teachers to get their own way of learning", he endorses his own commitment to autonomous student learning, and he reiterates Rose's comments about the leadership role of the teacher: "the tour leader's role is basically to ahm.. set the scene in a sense - the overall scene - and then to offer some kind of guidance along the way.." (Rose, Rose & Cora, C1a). The director is there to be used by students to advance their own learning.

When talking about their teaching as directing, some of the lecturers in this study spoke of the importance of developing reflection in their students. It seems that critical *thinking* – once an attribute highly valued as a process and outcome of university learning, and dependent on teacher modelling and interaction with others - has morphed in recent years into the inwardly-focussed practice of (critical) *reflection.* Self-reflection provides the internalised voice of the other – the carer, the parent, the mentor, the guide – who cannot be present to, and thus *care for* (Noddings, 2003), the individual who must become self-regulating and autonomous. As the discourses of entrepreneurship continue to infiltrate the management practices and disciplinary curricula of universities, self-reflection becomes an act of Foucauldian self-scrutiny, designed to support and regulate the self-managing, individual academic: the director, the creative, visionary leader.

The Attributes of the Director-lecturer: A Review

Directing represents the third archetypal image of the university lecturer that I have composed from a variety of constituent metaphors discussed by participants in this study, including the orchestra conductor, stage manager, coach, team leader, (tour) guide. The director manages herself and her relations with the producers (university management) mindfully, "walking the walk, and talking the talk" of enterprise culture, and its expression in the discourse of student learning. Rose signalled this with her easy, proper proficiency in the discursive jargon of student learning. Being a director of student-centred learning is a self-ascribed and an achieved Discourse-identity (Gee, 2001) – achieved though recognition in the eyes of their students, colleagues and university managers. It is also a very proper Institutional-identity that, of all three metaphoric profiles (performing caring, directing), is most readily defensible by reference to practices in the current literature on higher education teaching and learning: the student focus, teaching excellence, and leadership. Directing is a proper Discourse-identity and a safe, approved Institutional-identity (Gee, 2001).

The central pedagogical concerns of the director are the organisation and mobilisation of a team or teams of learners. The director's attention remains fixed on "the big picture", and so "setting the scene" is a crucial part of the director-lecturer's teaching role. In order to preparing learners for "the real world", the director aims to inspire them to engage with tasks they perceive to be relevant and authentic. This requires the lecturer to be organised, skilful, creative, up-to-date and very professional in preparing, supervising and reflecting on student-centred learning. The good director-lecturer self-consciously uses and models all of her defining attributes with openly reflective enthusiasm, for these are the desirable qualities of a professional in the field or discipline, to be passed on from teacher to student.

Directing is an academic identity that is relatively recent, and perhaps less well entrenched, in university teaching and learning than are traditional identities like performing and caring. As we have seen in this chapter, the director-lecturer self appears to align seamlessly with

the key discourses of management and policy, while remaining responsible to students. Directing learning represents a new third identity that we might understand best at this point as grafted onto performing and caring - and as a grafted identity it challenges academics to be, do, know and become in new, unsettling ways. As I shall go on to show in coming sections this chapter, face-to-face teaching remains an important means of maintaining this responsibility. Indeed, from the perspective of directing, making the move online is a proper thing to do. So how do the values and practices of directing translate to online teaching?

Director-lecturers Making the Move Online

6th February 2004

Hi Kim,

What an enormous task you had transcribing the tapes!! It was interesting for me to read over the conversations and to listen to myself. So thanks for that opportunity.

In terms of tour guide and director - those metaphors applied to me. But don't take the policewoman one seriously!

On reflecting on your further questions, my use of teaching metaphors has changed from being a director of a film to rather a director (conductor) of an orchestra. So in small groups in f2f teaching, students are members of the orchestra. They bring their own particular talents and skills which they can play in class and quench their passion for learning. At first I provide the music for them to follow and they are expected to go home and practise. I guess this is to do with my expectations of them and their assessment requirements and my authority as the facilitator of their learning. And when we're in class I initially conduct the proceedings but encourage them to use their own creativity in 'playing together'. However, as their skills further develop - they bring a different sound to the classroom which I nurture. At other times I sit back and invite some of them to share their compositions which we all participate in but I still tend to direct (conduct).

> My metaphor, however, is slightly different online because I feel I'm more in a chamber orchestra where I might introduce the piece and signal for everyone to commence but then it's up to everyone to produce the amazing sound. It may be my composition or at times it could be a colleague's composition (such as when I was teaching with Cora) or another chamber member's. But we are all playing our instruments and can all benefit from learning from each other. This usually happens with 4th year students who have sophisticated oral and written analytical and critically reflective skills.
>
> Kim I think the heat may be getting to me now, so by all means give me a call if you'd like me to elaborate on anything.
>
> Best wishes with your work
>
> Regards
>
> Rose (Rose, email communication, February 6, 2004)

Of the three metaphorical teacher types in this study – the performer, the carer and the director – it seemed on first examination that the director integrated and adapted most easily to online facilitation, as Rose's reflections to me in this email reveal. In this communication she identifies and separates her face-to-face and online teaching through claiming variations on a theme: a face-to-face orchestra conductor, an online chamber music conductor. (The shift to "conducting" lead me to ponder whether I had foisted the stage management and film director metaphors on Rose in our final conversation). Regardless, through the metaphor of conducting, Rose expressed pleasure about the fact that she and her students could "all benefit from learning from each other" online, and she enjoyed "the amazing sound" of them all playing together online in the chamber orchestra. However, the transition to online facilitation was not without its challenges for the director-lecturer, and the themes and values that were established in the previous section are tested in the move online.

Facilitating Online: Responsibilities, Autonomy and Loss of Control

According to what some of the NMU participants told me before they made the move online, the director is responsible for leading teams of students in their learning towards a vision. The director's leadership inspires creativity and a developing sense of autonomy. Let's see what happened to these values and behaviours when the director became an online facilitator of student learning.

Online facilitation and creativity.

Conductors, directors, and stage managers work in creative environments and on creative projects, and they enjoy, and take responsibility for "setting the scene" for learning. This creative dimension provides a pleasurable focus for the director, who watches to see what the teams she directs will produce or perform in the "real world". Rose and Cora found the planning of online teaching using WebCT to be a "creative" activity. As they noted in a conference paper they gave on their experiences of online teaching, "the experience of designing and delivering the program enhanced our own creativity". Cora also commented to me, "You've gotta enjoy it. To me if you don't enjoy it, the students aren't gonna enjoy it much.. I think your sense of enjoyment of the topic and creativity makes it more… I feel you've gotta enjoy it" (Cora, Rose & Cora, C3).

Rose, Cora and others in the study found it was not easy to communicate online their creativity and enjoyment of the topic to their groups. While the lecturers could lurk and observe their students' creativity, it was not easy for them to communicate their own encouragement and their pleasure in that creativity, as they would have done in face-to-face group learning contexts. Aurea enjoyed watching her students learn and she wrote posts telling them so. However, her students ignored her in their online discussions and, in fact, students in her more recent blended subjects have become suspicious of her reasons for taking up and integrating online teaching, suggesting she had increased their study workload, while lightening her own. (This will be discussed in detail in chapter 8). Given

such experiences you have to wonder if the students found much pleasure and creativity in their online learning. Overall, this doesn't sound like much fun – and certainly not from the perspective of the director. I have already noted how the performers and carers found it difficult to communicate enthusiasm, passion and inspiration to students online. According to Ron, Seb, Rahime and others in the study, these were attributes that were communicated better in face-to-face contexts. While the entertainment and leisure focus of the directing metaphor may still be very real and relevant for the teams of *students* engaged in their learning, the director as facilitator does not come to share their creativity and entertainment, for her presence is attenuated and she feels removed from the performance, the game, and indeed "the real world" of the online students. Her attempts to offer feedback from the sidelines may also be ignored. Her pleasure in creativity lies mostly in the initial practice of "setting the scene", and seeing how students respond creatively within it.

> In terms of just kind of the way we'd structured it in those fortnightly responses, and that I did have expectations that they'd all engage. Towards the end a few of them dropped off and I don't know whether or not I should have been kind of a little bit more heavy-handed; but I just ahm didn't bother chasing a couple of them up.… It was not what I imagined it to be… (Rose, Rose & Cora, C2)

> Cora: But the time involved in reflecting, in responding - for them and for us - is I think potentially good, but for all of us the time factor was a problem. The students were always saying, "Sorry I'm running late. I…was really busy on placement."
>
> Kim: That's funny! [*We laugh*] Yeah.
>
> Cora: Everything we did - for us for them - it was "Sorry". So the word "Sorry" came up very often. [*We laugh*]. Even in different languages, they were using different languages! [*We all laugh loudly*]. So they were usually away for when they wanted to do it. But they all did it. And they stuck to it. And we tried very hard to stick to our arrangement, and it was me that ahm didn't spend enough time.
>
> Rose: I mean we made an agreement, we'd sign both our names when we did our…

> Cora: …so they'd think my response was from Rose, when it was Rose in the end doing it. (Rose & Cora, C2)[8]

As online facilitators, the director-lecturers - and their students - struggled to remember each other, and to prioritise the time for communicating and responding to each other online. The apologies point to some guilt and anxiety, emotions that were muted or hidden by the asynchronous, text-based interface that was meant to hold them together in a pedagogic relation. Rose and Cora really struggled with the fact that they couldn't direct the online components of their blended program together as perfectly as they would have liked. The feeling of being disorganized was unsettling. Indeed, in the end, Rose gave up being a perfectionist and gave in to posting superficial comments at times when "the pressure of things happening" became overwhelming. Online, it seemed that the energy and enthusiasm of the director-facilitator dissipated and waned, troubling one's self-perception as an organised, responsible, teaching professional. Looking through the lens of the directing metaphor we gain further insights into how the teaching load of the highly organised director-lecturer (and all who teach online) increases with the move to online facilitation. Not only did the research participants feel the pressure of higher expectations in terms of their online materials preparation (performing), along with staffing cuts and increased class sizes (caring), but the director-facilitator finds she must teach more, by responding to emails and moderating online discussions, simply to feel organised in the old ways. This workload issue raises several interesting propositions. Were the academics lazy, and under-performing at their teaching, before the move online? Or perhaps they were not undertaking the right and proper kinds of teaching practice? Or perhaps their workload had increased quantitatively, and in terms of the complexity of what they needed to do in preparation and in response to online communications. I will explore these propositions further in chapter 8.

[8] This conversational extract also draws attention to authenticity and teacher response, when a pair or team of facilitators might share some of the (online) teaching load, as is common with large undergraduate classes. Two or more teachers will share a single "Instructor" ID in WebCT, for example. This has implications for students' responses online.

These examples of facilitator uncertainty and disorganisation point to loss of control in terms of managing student learning processes online. As I have shown, one can feel a loss of control through being sidelined and ignored by students. The loss of control that is reported in the literature (Blackmore, 2001; Graham & Scarborough, 1999; Lynch & Collins, 2001; McVay-Lynch, 2002; Taylor, 1996) is also discussed in respect of losing responsibility for one's broader pedagogical responsibilities. Some online facilitators in my study referred to this loss of pedagogical control over the curriculum and assessment practices. Jane reported on her colleagues' "aggro" about a faculty requirement for a new online template for subject outlines. Cora commented at one point too, "You can't just go off and design your own course" (Cora, C3). Procedures of approval and collaboration ensure that, increasingly, university teaching and learning are becoming regulated by committees and other authorities. Effectively control has moved elsewhere in the university. Someone else, other than the academic, is responsible for the curriculum.

Directors learning to facilitate: From autonomy to collaboration.

Several of the director-lecturers spoke positively of the WebCT workshops they attended in order to prepare for online teaching. After all, the director likes to learn! The directing perspective draws attention to the fact that the move online required most of the academics in this study to depend on disparate others who effectively directed the director in her learning about online teaching. These others who taught the director included academic developers, like myself, who ran teaching development workshops about online teaching using an LMS (such as WebCT), the LMS technical and support staff, and in some cases departmental staff who assisted with the technical preparation of material for online delivery.

Such experiences are also part of a shift in university work from teaching in isolation to teaching in collaboration, and academics are finding themselves drawn into teaching projects, teaching teams, and co-teaching in the manner of Rose and Cora in my study. With collaboration comes scrutiny, and through such mechanisms individual workers

become "multiple eyes that spy on each other" (Davies, 2005). I have sensed the unease of more senior academics in such workshops. While the workshop-based teaching-learning model may not always be what the director favours or needs (preferring instead group- and problem-based learning on a long-term project, for example), as a committed life-long learner, she submits nonetheless to developing her skills in this way in order to prepare for online and LMS-based teaching. Nowadays we find senior, experienced university lecturers learning about online teaching by sitting in a workshop, side-by-side with younger, technology-minded general staff and academic developers of lower status in the university. In an earlier generation, the director would have learnt to teach by being a team-member under the guidance of another director-lecturer - and performing and caring were experienced and learnt in a similar, cross-generational manner. Faced now with introducing an innovation - online teaching and learning - the director-facilitator has found another more satisfying way to learn, reflect and communicate (about) her teaching, namely research.

Facilitators reflecting responsibly: researching student learning.

Seven of the academics in this study also pointed the way to another strategy by means of which the director could continue to satisfy the desire to learn: research and scholarship in teaching. Researching one's online teaching was a strategy that aligned smoothly with the perspective of the online facilitator as bystander and "voyeur" and it was also a means by which the director-facilitator could achieve some recognition for one's facilitation from peers, colleagues and management. Zhang, Frank and Hilary presented and published on their online teaching beyond their own disciplines and in education research contexts. Ron and Paul presented at national and international forums in their disciplinary fields and they had also shared their teaching innovations with colleagues at SRU. Clearly, developing the scholarship of their teaching was an effective performative strategy that rendered their teaching more visible, and so enhanced their eligibility for the promotion as well as attracting the rewards and recognition that come with research. For Rose, Cora and Aurea, it was also a means of drawing attention to their teaching innovation in the eyes of their

wary, doubting colleagues (the Academy), and their seemingly indifferent managers (the Producers).

As part of their collaborative efforts in making the move online Rose and Cora decided to write up their experiences of their rural placement subject with a focus on analysing the dynamics of the online interactions. They attended a university seminar given by visiting Canadian researchers who were investigating "social presence" from the perspective of cognitive psychology in online CMC (see Garrison & Anderson, 2003; Rourke, Anderson, Garrison & Archer, 2001). Rose and Cora also co-wrote and presented a paper at an Australian conference in their discipline, in which they discussed their attempts "to create a community of collaborative and active online learners". The number of "benefits" (8) they list from their co-teaching experience quantitatively outweigh the "costs" (5). Benefits included: reflection on teaching, new technical skills, "flexible delivery", improved networks with field educators, new ideas for future teaching and collaborations with university teachers in other disciplines. The "costs" they identified are consistent with a number of the themes in this thesis, and these matters resonate with issues raised in this discussion of the director making the move online.

> - the time it took for our own training; planning and preparation of the online site (assessed at around 25 hours for each of us)
> - the time it took to deliver the program – individual and group feedback, daily monitoring of the site (around one hour a day for 15 weeks)
> - financial costs of mid-placement visits to distant sites
> - the absence of non-verbal cues in text-based interactions
> - our own anxiety about charting new territory. (Rose & Cora, conference paper, 2002)

By looking through the lens of the director, I have examined university lecturers' sense of responsibility for teaching and learning, and the significance of modeling and developing

autonomy. With the move to online facilitation, the directors firstly noted a loss of control. This was associated with an increased workload, with becoming a learner of new technology, and with feeling disorganised and unable to keep up with students' online communications. However, a number of participants had developed a new way to reclaim a sense of control, by researching their teaching. In the list of Rose and Cora's "costs" cited above, I believe that it is no coincidence that they reflected on their own anxiety. When the normally organized director-lecturer finds herself facilitating online learning (and feeling a little out of control), anxiety can set in, the form of heightened reflexivity.

Facilitating Online: Reflexivity and Anxiety

> Cora: So you've gotta be careful about the way you respond. So it's about giving careful feedback to students and not, not putting them off, so it doesn't tax their confidence, or put them off the whole idea of doing it.
>
> Kim: The difference between giving feedback verbally and feedback in writing?
>
> Cora: There are so many things that can be misinterpreted in writing. Additional things to think about. You gotta be careful the way you word things. Not just us, but the students as well. The way you respond to other students. (Cora, Rose & Cora, C2)

Rose and Cora tried to conduct debriefing and critical reflection online in WebCT threaded discussions while their students were on rural placement. However, they found the need to be "careful with words" demanded a particular kind of reflexivity of them as online facilitators. The facilitator struggles to find the right words, aware that others may well read postings that could be misread and interpreted ambiguously. As Paul said, "to write three or four pages of text either as a DE or online, or something like that, takes a lot more effort. Mainly 'cause once it's out there, it's out there for a long while, ahm (*he laughs*) and y'know, your face to people is out there". Online, the facilitator worries: Have I "covered all bases", addressed all concerns, modelled the right questions, given the right emphasis to matters? Reflexivity is agonizing and unsettling. In spite of her best efforts at being

prepared, being organised, and giving good feedback to her students, Rose learnt she had to let go of perfectionist tendencies sometimes.

> Rose: It's important that they [the students] know you're connecting and communicating and reading…. It's important in the way that you prioritise. So I went from being…I suppose if you've got a perfectionist tendency, you have to let go by the end. So it's how to… yeah.
>
> Kim: Being pragmatic?
>
> Rose: Yeah, being pragmatic. And I think being really organised. I'm more… We were getting into that routine. Yeah, well I'm fairly organised. I mean I just got into that routine: check the emails before I got into the office. Just check that and then: "Oh God, I haven't done that!" (Rose, Rose & Cora, C2)

Clearly Rose had to adapt to a new routine with new priorities each day. Whether she was "fairly organised" or "really organised", we sense her anxiety around her evaluation of her own efforts with facilitation. In a visible, performative environment, one could always do a little better, be a little more organised. This is when reflexivity starts to become agonizing.

Critical reflection online?

According to Lush and Urry (1994, pp. 10-11), "disorganized capitalism disorganizes everything. Nothing is fixed, given and certain, while everything rests upon much greater knowledge and information, on institutionalized reflexivity. People are increasingly knowledgeable about just how little they in fact do know". While this statement refers to disorganization and reflexivity at the level of society and institutions, I believe that online facilitation provides a new way to see these conditions in operation in terms of academic teacher identity. Indeed, Nikolas Rose has pointed to a proliferation of discourses, practices, and techniques (here I suggest, for example, "student-centred" online learning), "through which self-governing capabilities can be installed in free individuals in order to bring their own ways of conducting and evaluating themselves into alignment with political

objectives" (Rose, 1996, p. 155). Is it really so surprising to discover that Cora and Rose found it difficult to teach their students (critical) reflection online? This high order of listening and response is required for teaching students the art and skill of (critical) reflection, probing surface opinions and seeking out assumptions, contradictions and silences, so as to come to understand one's (or others') positioning and subjectification in relation to existing and invisible structures and flows of power. Critical reflection represents a challenge to neo-liberal governance and régimes, and while it may flourish in concerned and engaged communities on the Internet, teaching it as a skill to students in educational programs presaged on care, social justice, and responsibility for the other appears to be another challenge in the move online. Of course, through the lens of directing, what we are seeing is both students and lecturers grappling with the new reflexive demands of neo-liberalism. "The enterprising self is… an active self and a calculating self, a self that calculates *about* itself and that acts *upon* itself in order to better itself, " writes Rose (1996, p. 154). Reflection both verbally and in writing is a technology of "psy" that supports the conduct of conduct in liberal democratic societies.

> The languages and techniques of psychology provide vital relays between contemporary government and the ethical technologies by which modern individuals come to govern their own lives…. The provide languages of self-interpretation, criteria for self-evaluation, and technologies for self-rectification that render existence into thought as a profoundly psychological affair. (Rose, 1996, p. 79)

The difficulty with reflexivity is that, as one spirals tighter inwardly through technologies of self-interpretation, self-evaluation and self-rectification, this inevitable self-preoccupation means one can become less attentive to the other, and self-doubt is always a threat. Participant Rose was highly organized, discursively proper and care-full before she took up "student-centred" online facilitation.

From being organised to agonised: "Oh God, I haven't done that!" (Rose).

The director has to be highly organised so as to ensure that her teaching and student learning remain creative and inspiring. Cora and Rose were self-conscious about their broad subject aims, and weekly learning outcomes or objectives. In the next extract Rose reflects on how she lost sight of these in online discussions; she found herself being less structured online - going "with the flow" - and following the general questions and aims rather than the session-specific ones such as she would use face-to-face.

> Rose: Yeah. And then another thing I suppose, when you're doing your small groups… You've got your overall aims for your subj… - or the on-campus part - for a particular week, and maybe I didn't do this like I would in a face-to-face thing. I would make sure that the discussion really kind of brought out those issues to highlight. I don't think I do that [online]. I think I just kind of went with the kind of overall flow, and back to the general questions. And so that's the sort of thing I ah…
>
> Kim: So… sorry. What would you do face-to-face? You'd actually draw things together a bit?
>
> Rose: Oh well… in my preparation, I'd have, say, three kinds of outcomes from that small group I'd be hoping to achieve, that would link to the larger outcome. Whereas [online] I kind of just went with free-flow with this. I had, we had, the overall aims that we.. were set out in the subject, you know in their online site, but I didn't… I suppose. Maybe that'd be one way I could actually improve in my feedback to them when I'm drawing it together. But I kind of went with what they presented, and then kind of drew out what the key things were and what things there were that needed to be added. (Rose, Rose & Cora, C1a)

It seems that, online, Rose followed the lead of the students more, and a different pedagogical dynamic developed with her students. As she stated in her email message to me about her teaching metaphors, when she was online with her students in a chamber orchestra, "I might introduce the piece and signal for everyone to commence", whereas face-to-face she was more processually directive. This is no surprise, and is consistent with the literature on CMC that reports the reversal of teacher-learner roles, with teachers and

students working and communicating as peers, frequently developing supportive online learning relationships. (See for example: Berge, 1997; Dexter, Anderson & Becker, 1999; Harasim et al.; 1995; Hiltz, 1994; Mowrer, 1996; Smith, 2000; Steeples et al., 1996; Taylor et al., 1996). Rose appeared and "set the scene" at the beginning of the online discussion, but then became less sure about how to direct the learning process. Her classroom experience of directing reflective discussions was not particularly helpful when it came to an online discussion, where she just went with the "free flow". This appears to bother Rose for, in the quote above, she goes on to reflect aloud about how she might improve her feedback to students - a reflection that in itself is also another example of her self-conscious focus on good and proper teaching practice. Thus a different online relational dynamic created new pressures for Rose. She had to learn new work routines and facilitatory practices, and there was some on-going anxiety associated with evaluating her own efforts as an online facilitator. She was "fairly organised", yet aiming to be "really organised". Online the students' expectations of Rose had increased, with resulting increased demands on her time and energy. She didn't want to let her students down. So who was setting the expectations in the online contexts – the teacher or the students?

As in the case of performing and caring, another consequence of this additional pressure was that Rose and Cora found they had to put in extra time setting up material in WebCT, attending to email and monitoring online discussions. Adding to the pressure for Rose was the fact that, as the online course progressed, Cora's support with co-teaching dwindled, due to other administrative commitments in the department. Cora's coach-teacher role was inhibited by the fact that she was not an academic but a general staff member. She "was doing another job", and so was much more susceptible to the vagaries of departmental priorities and administrative commitments. While she and Rose enjoyed co-teaching and research on their online teaching, Cora was unable to enjoy these pleasures (and they were professional pleasures for her) to the same extent as Rose. As a "coach", Cora was less permanent and notionally replaceable - the industrial lot of many sessional teachers and casual tutors in universities currently.

The following discussion revealed the guilt and defensiveness they both felt about not being able to fulfil commitments to each other and to meet (what they thought were) their students' expectations.

> Rose: The first couple [of topics] we actually sat down and considered what we would reply, drawing - kind of drawing the threads together, so to speak - before they moved on to the next topic. 'Cause they had six topics over that period to engage with and then ahm. So the first couple, we did it and then with the pressure of things happening, ahm…
>
> Cora: I slacked off. Basically it was me slacking off.
>
> Rose: Oh I don't care.
>
> Cora: Oh not slacking off, but.. No..but..
>
> Rose: 'Cause you had other, major other..
>
> Rose and Cora: Commitments.
>
> Rose: Yes, and I kind of, I probably got more superficial in the end. I probably did it in the reverse to some of the students!!! I realise. But you know I just kind of would draw out a few key things, and kind of draw it together, and move on to the next area with questions…. And then I suppose you think, "Now, are these really the key things you should be bringing up?" I mean you know it's what you do in your classroom anyhow, in your preparation you know, while you're trying to [inaudible] the outcomes…
>
> Cora: Yeah. And [it's] something I really enjoyed and would love to have had more time to concentrate on, and next year I'll have to do something. Either I don't get involved at all, or I somehow have to negotiate with people here to have time to do things, 'cause this is not…I didn't get time to do it at all and [Rose: Yeah] I was doing another job. (Rose & Cora, C2).

While Rose agonised about her "superficial" online teaching practices in conversation with me and Cora, she was unable to communicate that same reflexive awareness about her teaching to her students. It was interesting that she and Cora said they found it nigh on impossible to model and develop (critical) reflection in online two-way contexts such as the

asynchronous discussion lists in WebCT. What is also interesting, too, is Rose's comment that suggests some of the students were posting in more depth in the online discussions than she was. Her uncertainty about which "key things" to raise, and her guilt about the superficiality of her posts, draw attention once more to the fact that, as in the case of the carer online, the lecturer can easily be rendered a bystander or voyeur to students' online communications. I concluded the previous chapter (on caring) with a quote by Nell Noddings about the significance of reciprocity. That quote merits repetition here, for it underlines a key finding in my research into academics' experience of the move online.

> What the cared-for gives to the relation either in direct response to the one-caring or in personal delight or in happy growth before her eyes is genuine reciprocity. It contributes to the maintenance of the relation and serves to prevent the caring from turning back on the one-caring in the form of *anguish and concern for self*. (Noddings, 2003, p. 74; my italics)

"Anguish and concern for self" are the very characteristics of the heightened reflexivity that I have discussed previously, both here in my analysis, and in a paper that reports on the face-to-face and online teaching experiences of the five "technology enthusiasts" at SRU (McShane, 2004). Reflexivity involves a turning away from the other - from the student. Ethical concern for, and contact with, the other break down and, in the gap vacated by reciprocity, one turns inward and monitors one's own conduct. The facilitator is no longer required to care-give or expected to care-take. The ontological security that was grounded traditionally in trust and sociality between student and teacher has dissipated, and "anxiety is what is felt when ontological security is shaken" (Lash & Urry, 1994, p. 40). I will discuss further the significance of this anxious, moral vacuum in the new pedagogical relationships of higher education in the next chapter.

Relations with the Academy

While this thesis is focussed on exploring academic identity as expressed in academics' responsibilities towards their students, the teaching as directing metaphor also conveniently

offers some other relevant insights into change in university teaching, namely the director-lecturers' relations with the Academy (their colleagues), and these merit some consideration at this point. I will address the director's relationship with the Producers (management) in the next chapter.

Rose and Cora came to be seen by their colleagues in the department and faculty as "the experts" in online teaching, which they thought was odd because the label didn't really fit with their recent experiences of learning about WebCT. In fact, the move online prompted hesitant, and cautious responses amongst the colleagues of some of the participants in this study. Some participants, including Rose, Cora, Jane and Aurea encountered suspicion or negativity from their colleagues towards change in the form of online teaching, when they first started to use WebCT.

> Kim: … How have your colleagues reacted to your online teaching? You might need to review for me a little bit if there's…at the beginning of your online teaching what sort of responses you were having, has that shifted in any way? How were your colleagues?
>
> Cora: Last year's program was the first time we used online teaching in.. the School. So it was all new, and initially people were very hesitant about it, from memory..? [Rose: Yeah] I just…it's hard to remember. People who just don't engage very well with IT at all, I think were worried that we were doing this.. we would build up such a momentum so that <u>all</u> the teachers would have to do it online and.. [Rose: They were worried about that] They don't want to hear about it. They want to just reject it without thinking about it. [Rose: Yeah.] And also that it would replace face-to-face teaching with this hidden agenda in the uni. that WebCT is a way of cutting back on resources. I guess some of the "old-timers", in inverted commas, had that view…
>
> Rose: Yeah and I think the other thing is I've got.. especially this year with so few numbers of students online that, at one stage it was suggested that I should also have a group of face-to-face group of students, that well…. I think it was in the context of one of the meetings, a staff meeting.. around resources. (Rose & Cora, C3)

> Jane: In our faculty at the moment there is a lot of codification of practice going on. For example, we had a small working party in the faculty that put together what has been called a template for subject outlines to make sure everybody includes information. The sort of thing that any competent teacher should do but it has caused a spawn of protest in some quarters. People think it is about controlling the content of your course and I think personally the word "template" is a mistake because it does suggest something rigid. I think I would have called it a checklist or something. One of the things on that was that people had to put their consultation times on the BlackBoard or WebCT site because all the subjects have a space for BlackBoard. So the head of school said, "Would everybody put their consultation times on BlackBoard?", which I thought was a reasonable thing to do, and it means the students would have one place they could go and look when they could consult their tutor and a couple of people said, "Now this is the beginning of everybody being forced to move their teaching online". So yeah, people were saying they didn't want that, and it was about undermining their freedom and employment conditions and so on, so yeah there has been a lot of aggro about it. (Jane, C3)

> Jane: I think there is wariness amongst colleagues about anything to do with computers and online. It would be an additional burden if it was going to be imposed, but that is very much a minority view. (Jane, C3)

> Aurea: Some people do not want to know about it. Some people are curious and some people just could not be bothered, or do not have the time. I think people are interested. When it was commented to me that "It is good you were able to get some time off to develop that and do something about it", which is good, because if I was not given the time, like half a day for example, to devote in developing it, I don't think I would manage. (Aurea, C3)

In these comments we read of collegial responses to change: fear, wariness, "aggro". Jane, Rose and Cora tell of the fear and the wariness they observed in their colleagues when they started to teach online. While on the one hand they were perceived as experts in online teaching – a perception that participants like Aurea, Rose and Cora found slightly amusing

– on the other hand, they were having to deal with negative attitudes from some of their colleagues, who feared that the directives of university management, and the expectations of students who undertook the newer blended and online subjects, would pressure them to have to make the move online too. Some colleagues, fearful of ICT and of being pressured to teach online themselves, suggested to Rose in a departmental meeting that she revert to on-campus lectures with her classes in subsequent years. As these extracts suggest colleagues' worries appeared to centre on increased workload (including having to come to grips with ICT and the technical aspects of online teaching), and restrictions on academic freedom and industrial conditions.

It seemed too that some colleagues were in denial about the increased regulation of teaching and learning, not wanting to see, or recognise, change in the form of online teaching. For example, a curious irony of the workload and pressure that Rose experienced in responding to email and moderating online discussion posts, was that her colleagues didn't see her visibly going about her teaching. There was some resentment, on both sides, about the fact that she appeared to have eased her teaching load by using WebCT.

> Cora: It's [online teaching] pleasurable. It's great. And I think you just have to have the time to do it. And I guess there's again a mind-set, that this is something you do in addition to your normal workload. And it shouldn't be so for me. I should negotiate it. A half-day a week would do it.
>
> Rose: But I think from other staff's point of view, they see me as having an easy time, I think. They did. Yeah, yeah.
>
> Kim: 'Cause they don't see you walking out with everything under your arms going to the lecture.
>
> Rose: That's right. Going, and no students coming. You know… no one's said it up-front. I suppose the co-ordinator of this subject said - who ahm, not mentioning names! - who would just made these remarks and would expect me to do additional things for the face-to-face classes at times, and there was a situation where you would do it for anyone, so it felt like I owed it to them, in a sense.

> Cora (ironically): Cause you were getting an easy run.
>
> Rose (ironically): I was getting an easy run. (Rose & Cora, C2)

Rose was a little unsettled by the fact that her colleagues thought she was "having it easy", as they no longer saw her physically walking off to present her lectures. They had no idea of the amount of time she had invested in technical and pedagogical preparation, nor did they realise the constant pressure she felt she was under in moderating and responding to online messages and posts.

Listening again to these and other conversation fragments recounting their collegial relations in respect of online teaching, I can hear Jane and Aurea's feelings of resentment and guilt, but also concern for their colleagues. Rose, Cora and Aurea discovered that their colleagues didn't want to hear about the fun and positive aspects of online teaching. Aurea described the response to a report she presented at a faculty teaching and learning committee meeting.

> There was a lot of focus on the disadvantages and the problems, potential problems. And I told them how I deal with it…. And at the end I said, "Well I will keep you posted, because there are, there is a lot of exciting developments." [*Aurea giggles*]. It's it's a picture where: here you, you know, telling your colleagues about this new thing that's happening and it's exciting, and although it's exciting, there are teething problems, and these are some of the problems that I've encountered so far… [inaudible]. I think the moment we talk about issues and problems, then they have focussed on the issues and problems, and they look at the way I don't use it, and then they themselves discuss what they perceive to be the issues and problems. (Aurea, C1b)

With the move to online teaching, Aurea, Rose and Cora must have signalled a new era of teaching to others in their department. They felt they were perceived differently by their colleagues and, as Cora said, "we don't know what it was like before" (Rose & Cora, C1a). Unlike the "old-timers", they had no memory of how things used to be in their department.

> Kim: Any anecdotes from the staffroom?
>
> Cora: There's lots of discussion about how [what] people are feeling is different, but we don't know what it was like before..
>
> Rose: They talk about greater demands on their time. Co-ordinating sessional staff. Extra preparation. Co-ordinating and holding hands.. of a part-time person.
>
> Kim: Technology?
>
> Cora: There are some of them who don't use it.
>
> Rose: [I was involved in the] HumsOnline [project] …now we're seen as the experts. It was just "a toe in the water".
>
> Cora: [This is a] female-oriented department.
>
> Rose: One staff member asked, "Can I just put up all my readings in WebCT?"
>
> Rose: and I just said… "Don't create extra work if there's no purpose to it".
>
> Cora: [There are] differences in the academics. You hear them talking about ARC grants taking them away from their research. [*Rose and Cora laugh*]. The "Millenium Grants"[9] (Rose & Cora, C1a)

There is a sense of "us" and "them" in this extract that points directly at generational change in university teaching. The director as facilitator represents the new, younger academic - pragmatic, enterprising and ready to try or adopt new practices such as online learning and teaching. Director-lecturers like Rose had little time and chance to explore their teaching through the values and practices of metaphorical performing and caring. However, the values and practices of enterprise were rewarded, and during the course of this study, Rose was promoted up an academic level, although the extent to which she made claims based on her uptake of online teaching was not clear. From the point of view of higher education and institutional policy, the move online made good performative sense. Aurea was praised publicly by her head of department for her improved and outstanding student evaluations of teaching, based on her online and (later extended) blended teaching

---

[9] The name of this University-internal Grant Scheme has been changed.

practices. However, most of the other participants in this study were not explicit about the extent to which they drew on their online teaching to demonstrate performance goals and achievements.

Chapter Review: The Director Finds it Difficult to Direct Online

I began this chapter by reflecting on how the (film, sporting, or orchestra) director likes to "set the scene" for creative, team-based learning. Learning and directing learning are the pedagogical pleasures of the director-lecturer who, with a vision in mind - "the big picture" - leads teams of student actors and players through a creative learning process that culminates in an exciting and/or creative act: a play, a movie, a sports match, a musical performance, or a production of some kind. The director is a teacher professional who is organised, reflective and experienced "in the real world", someone who encourages students to produce innovative acts and pieces of work. This metaphor opens up a rich, three-dimensional picture of university teaching as "direction", a role that has depth and complexities that are not easy to appreciate in the ready labelling of university lecturers as "managers and facilitators of student learning", for example.

The move online is an obvious teaching innovation for an enterprising director-lecturer; yet the move draws attention to several difficulties for university lecturers. Through the lens of teaching as direction we learn more about the impact of the broken "teacher's promise" to respond to the other: the perceived loss of lecturer control, and heightened reflexivity and anxiety. The direction perspective also allows a discussion of the difficulties that participants expressed in terms of their relationships with the Academy - that is, their colleagues - who were fearful of allied but unknown changes associated with the move online, and who were ever ready to discuss the negative impacts of online teaching rather than benefits.

With the uncoupling of teacher re*sponsi*bility for student learning also comes a loss of control and authority on the part of academics. In asynchronous online contexts, lecturers

find it difficult to direct and intervene, when care and experience suggest they ought to do so. Indeed there is no longer any moral obligation, as expressed in that "ought", to respond in such ways. Noddings' (2003) observations about the absence of reciprocity suggest that the teacher, disengaged from the student, may well turn inward, troubled by "anguish and concern for self". Indeed, the consequences of this dislocation, exacerbated by the burdensome workload and disorienting tempo of student-centred learning (and teaching), are heightened reflexivity and anxiety. The wariness and fear on the part of one's colleagues towards one's efforts to innovate by making the move online do little to relieve unsettled feelings. In the next chapter I will return explicitly to review these findings in the light of my thesis research questions, and go on to consider the directors' relationship with, and accountability to, the Producers - university management.

Chapter 8
Facilitating Blended Learning

He will never again respond because he will be in a position to have, already, always responded. (Derrida (1998, p. 62)

Introduction: Reviewing the key questions

In the previous three chapters I presented my analysis of the participants' experiences of their relationships with their students online, organising the discussion according to three arch-metaphors for teaching that were anchored in the participants' values about teaching: performing, caring, and directing. In this chapter I will reflect on and discuss the insights and themes to emerge from those three metaphor perspectives, according to my core questions as set out at the end of chapter 2. I will review the analytical findings in light of the literature on academic identity and online and blended teaching (see chapter 2). This discussion will conclude with some observations and reflections about the identities of the (blended) facilitator in a period of risk and uncertainty in higher education teaching and learning.

The questions that have guided the form and analysis of this thesis are restated here, and this discussion is organised to address each in turn. That is, in a climate of enterprise, excellence, and flexible, student-centred learning in higher education:

- How do lecturers conduct their ethical, pedagogical relations with their students? How are these enacted through academics' own metaphors for teaching and learning?
- In the transition to online facilitation, how do lecturers remain *responsible* to their students, in terms of their preferred (or new) teaching metaphors?

- In the conduct of their blended teaching, how do academics remain *accountable* to university management in respect of their teaching and teacher identity?

Teacher-Student Relationships Through the Metaphors

In this section I will review my analysis in terms of the first of my research questions, namely: how do lecturers conduct their ethical, pedagogical relations with their students, as enacted through academics' own metaphors for teaching and learning? This discussion will lead me to reflect further on a) the affordances and limitations of the metaphors, b) the findings of the three metaphors, and c) how the teachers' promise to respond within the pedagogical relation is enacted in each of the three metaphors.

Reflecting on the Metaphors

The three arch-metaphors of this study - performing, caring and directing - represent a thematic grouping of a much larger sub-set of metaphors types that participants in this study took up to speak about their teaching. While some of the academics in this study might have preferred one metaphoric orientation ahead of others, all participants discussed aspects of their teacher identity through these different images, and sometimes mixed metaphors. That is, the three metaphors are partial identities that encapsulate particular attitudes, values and behaviours that any university lecturer may well take up at different points in the work of teaching. As did the twelve participants in this study, individual academics will move across and mix these metaphorical perspectives, and no doubt others, in imagining and living their teaching. By looking at the move online through the lens of each metaphor, we can shed new light on academic identity in the contemporary, enterprise university, for online teaching and learning is metonymical of the changes that confront academics.

The three defining metaphors that shape the analysis of participants' contributions to this study are significant and effective because, firstly, they represent three different university teacher identities and particular values about university teaching and learning, irrespective

of spatial and temporal context (eg. online, face-to-face, distance education). The three arch-metaphors have enabled an exploration of *the complexities* of traditional and emerging university teacher identities. In this respect, they stand apart from those metaphors that I analysed from the literature about academics and the move to flexible, online learning (see chapter 2): the guide, learner, content expert, resource, and middle manager. The latter set of metaphors constitute different aspects or identities of the online facilitator, although in the literature they remain unexplored, "flat" and two-dimensional.

Secondly, performing, caring and directing reflect an integration of my (developer) perspectives with academics' own perspectives on teacher identity in the contemporary university. That is, these perspectives combine insights from my developer practice, from the literature, and from data provided by academics themselves. Thirdly, the three arch-metaphors integrate particular pedagogical positions in terms of teacher-student relations, and highlight an existing student-focus, which the literature suggests does not exist in the non-online, (inflexible) lecturer. This latter point is particularly significant. My conversations and communications with the participants in this study have left me with the abiding impression of student-centredness on the part of the participants. Many times, in spite of my best efforts to direct the wayward, student-focussed academic back to talking about themselves and their teaching, each lecturer would continue to talk about the teacher self *through* their students. This underlines the point that "student" remains a key signifier for "teacher" or "lecturer".

Performing, Caring and Directing

Before summarising the findings of my analysis of changing academic identity and online teaching through the three arch-metaphors, it must be noted that there were no significantly discernable thematic patterns within and across the metaphors that could be attached to particular contextual differences, such as discipline, gender, (online) teaching experience, and university context. With growing online teaching experience, it seemed that facilitators who persisted with online CMC, did adapt to the new online teaching tempos over time, yet

this necessarily regular, communicative engagement also translated into a constant, increased workload. Additionally there were no notable thematic problems or differences that could be attached either to the self-motivated ,"technology enthusiasts" at SRU (and Frank), or to the subtly coerced Humanities group at NMU, for example. In the process of online teaching, reflexivity and stress plagued enthusiastic Ron and Paul at SRU, for example, as much as they did Rose and Jane at NMU. By 2003, experienced "enthusiast" Hilary had dropped online discussions from her subject design, just as online novice Evan did, after his first experience. These examples draw attention to the potential analysis and depth of thematic insight that could be explored within the individual cases in this study. However, with twelve participants, I chose instead to develop a three-layered metaphor study across the collective, the findings of which I will now summarise.

The performer, who found it impossible to perform online, is a metaphor that, in terms of the ethical responsibility to the student, highlights the significance for teachers and students of being able to teach and learn through *responding* to students via the signals and cues of embodiment. The student as audience member or spectator is challenged to listen actively, and many performer-lecturers are dismayed if students appear to have come to a lecture simply to take copious notes. True performer-lecturers want to engage their students intellectually, and most want to entertain them. To do this well, they expect their students to watch them, and they watch their audience for signs of response. The lecturer may well then respond with a spontaneous response, or by adapting the scripted lecture in some way.

As a second arch-metaphor for teaching, the carer highlights the significance of *responsiveness* as listening, empathy and physical proximity in one-on-one meetings between the student and the teacher. This metaphor draws our attention to the ethical self-other (teacher-student) relationship at the heart of the pedagogic relation. While the pedagogy of caring is understood most famously through the writings of Noddings (2003), it is also the teaching metaphor that is perhaps most suitable for understanding and

applying Todd's (2003) theorising of "learning from the other", based on Lévinas' (2002a) notion of the moral summons to "the face of the other".

The director is a creative, organised academic identity whose drive for self-improvement and autonomy best mesh with the managerial mechanisms and culture of the enterprise university. The director is an academic who is prepared to self-improve, and she is at the ready to devote herself to student-centred, life-long learning, leadership, enterprise, excellence, and so on. She is *responsible* for her students' learning. In terms of her teaching, she directs teams of learners, according to a "big picture" vision, that is also reinscribed in a subject outline for the departmental website. For the director-lecturer, response takes a very particular, highly skilled almost intuitive form, in which she sets her students to work both autonomously and collaboratively in groups, while she as director is vigilant for critical moments, at which point she will intervene, and very carefully draw attention to something potentially important, risky, unethical, that she knows from experience must be discussed and recognised by students there and then. Similarly, it is important to debrief students after group work and placements in a caring manner, and if this is done publicly, which it usually is, due to larger class sizes, she needs to manage such session with sensitivity, so that individuals do not lose face for what they reveal directly or by implication.

The Teacher's Pledge: To Respond, to be Responsive, and Responsible

The performer, the carer, the director and their students were committed to what I call the teacher's promise: to respond, to be responsive and responsible. This notion of a pedagogical pledge (*spons* in Latin), or promise, implies a particular view of teaching, learning, and the teacher-learner relationship. The student is implicated in the discursive formation of teacher identity, not merely because teachers are being exhorted by policy and practice to teach to a student-focus, but also because a teacher *qua* teacher must have students. Can it be otherwise? To paraphrase Lévinas, as a teacher, one must look into the

face of the other, the student. And as Lévinas suggests, the face of the other always summons me, and I am required to be responsible to/for her.

> The face itself constitutes the fact that *someone summons me* and demands my presence. Ethical proximity begins here: in my response to this summons. This response cannot be conceived of as the communication of information; it is the responsibility for the other man [sic]. (Lévinas, 2002, p. 535; author's italics)

Teachers bear a responsibility – a kind of unspoken pledge or promise to respond to the student, at the very least to bear witness to the student's struggle to learn (Todd, 2003, p. 20). The student also pledges to respond to the summons of the teacher and others. Each maintains relations with the other by "discourse", Lévinas' term to imply language and communication. If learning as pedagogy demands alteration (change), then following Lévinas, the source and conditions of "alterity" are to be found in the face of the other, precisely because the other is not what I am, and the other always "brings me more than I contain", or "Infinity".

> The relation with the other who puts into question the brutal spontaneity of one's immanent destiny – introduces into me what was not in me…. To affirm that the passage of a content from one mind to the other is produced without violence only if the truth taught by the master is from all eternity in the student is to extrapolate maieutics beyond its legitimate usage…. A being receiving the idea of Infinity, receiving since it cannot derive it from itself, is a being taught in a non-maieutic fashion, a being whose very existing consists in this incessant reception of teaching, in this incessant overflowing of self (which is time). (Lévinas, 2002, p. 522)

Time for the other, "being-for-the-Other", responsibility for the other – these are key principles of the ethics of responsibility that Lévinas advances. Because he often refers to the ethical relation as a teaching relation, Lévinas' ideas have come to resonate with educational theorists, although they are still largely untested in terms of online education,

with perhaps the notable exception of Zembylas and Vrasidas (2005). This notion of ethical responsibility for the other is very pertinent to this analysis, as I shall now show.

My interest in this thesis has centred on how the ethical relationship between the student and the lecturer might alter with the move online. My discussion in the next section will focus attention on academics' perceptions of how these relationships were disrupted with the move online in the case of each of the three teaching metaphors. The various ethical positions represented by performing, caring and directing appear to shed some light on why the move online is so difficult and disorienting for many academics. As I will show, the constraints that emerge have less to do with the inherent nature of the technology (eg. WebCT, BlackBoard) and more to do with the discursive techniques of the enterprise university which these "technologies" (in both senses of the term) facilitate.

The Facilitator and Responsibility to the Student/s

The student focus of the academic participants in this study merits further investigation as it is clear in the policy and literature on ICT in higher education that the move to online teaching is viewed as a move to student-focussed learning. The implication is that traditional, non-online teaching may not be entirely student-focussed. Yet as my interpretative analysis via the lens of the three teaching metaphors has demonstrated, the student plays a key role in each of the broad metaphors for teaching. In each metaphor the student becomes a responsive audience participant, a "cared for" family member or friend, or a skilled member (crew, actor, musician, player) in a creative team.

Performing, Caring and Directing, the Teachers' Pledge, and the Move to Online Facilitation

In the light of my analyses of performing/caring/directing, I now turn to address the second of my research questions which asked how lecturers, in the transition to online facilitation, might maintain their responsibility to their students, via the lenses of their teaching metaphors. My interpretative analysis in chapters 5, 6, and 7 of each teaching metaphor

(performing, caring and directing) has shown that the move to online facilitation was uneasy for the participants in this study. In this section I will review the difficulties associated with response and responsibility online, from the perspective of each of the metaphor types, and consider some of the contextual, discursive factors that contribute to this breakdown. It is my contention that the discursive institutional context (that emphasises efficiency, calculability, and monitoring) has created the conditions of moral, pedagogical decline for lecturers and their students in online facilitation. In fact, those very same "issues" that were reported in the literature on academic identity and online teaching - increased workload, scrutiny and reflexivity, and the transparency and archivability of teaching for potential judgement by management – appear to be some of the factors (or neo-liberal "technologies") that hamper the maintenance of responsive and responsible pedagogical relations online.

The performer online.

Looking at university teaching and learning through the lens of performing highlighted the pleasures (and dangers) of thrill and risk in learning and teaching. The responsiveness that the performer anticipated could not be achieved in text-based, online CMC (discussion threads, email) which hindered the to-and-fro, reading and responding to communication cues, that overtly performance-oriented participants regarded as being essential to the performance. Four discursive constraints that have already been identified in the literature are implicated in the breakdown of responsiveness when the performer makes the move online. The facilitator is aware that the online teaching materials and communications may be scrutinised, and this makes communication a more self-aware, laboured process. The lens of the performer highlights the absence of the embodied, proximate other in online CMC, and it also draws attention to the disorienting tempo of asysnchronous (delayed) text-based communication. On behalf of all metaphorical perspectives on teaching, it is the performer who is best able to compare and articulate the increased workload associated with online preparation and on-going facilitation.

The carer online.

The carer underscores the difficulty of *caring for* students online. The experience of the carer as facilitator in this study shows that online CMC (discussion threads, email) appeared to reduce empathy in teacher-student relations, and limit the communication of emotions online. Using Noddings' (2003) ideas on care, I was able to show how, online, the students didn't reply or respond in familiar ways to the teacher's summons for sociality. While Aurea asserted that she could feel empathically her students' anxieties online, she also admitted these could have been her own anxieties. What was frustrating for her too was not being able to communicate to her students her awareness of their anxiety, as she might have done in the face-to-face classroom. In another case, Hilary revealed she was sometimes uncertain and distrustful about students' reasons and excuses in email, and the veracity of the private stories that one or two students revealed to her. In one of her blended subjects, some of the students ran amok online sending provocative and "childish" messages in class discussion lists. The carer perspective also reveals the delicate matter of teacher-student doubt and (dis)trust in online text-based communication.

The director online.

Online, the creative director ceases to direct and lead teams of students towards re-producing "the big picture". The director-lecturers were unsure of when and how to intervene and address key points, and indeed they found it impossible to deal with the sensitive issues that individuals raised in an online discussion that would be read by the whole group. When discussing delicate, controversial subject matter, it was much easier to help students "save face" by being present to them in a physical classroom, rather than attempting to do this carefully in text online. As was the case with the performing and the caring orientations, the director's students went ahead with whatever had to be done, and ignored the director-facilitator, who really became a bystander on the sidelines, with little immediate opportunity for intervening, coaching, or advising. The directing perspective also revealed some insights into director's relations with the Academy: colleagues'

wariness about and attention to the negative features of online teaching. The preparation and on-going workload of online teaching were also less visible to one's colleagues. Finally, the experiences of the director online in this study drew attention to the impacts of the move online on the hard-working, enterprising facilitator: heightened reflexivity and anxiety, and a loss of control and responsibility for (student-centred) learning.

The Online Performer, Carer, Director Online: Broken Promises

But, according to other commentators, no one is responsible any more. Well, in fact, each individual, every enterprising student and facilitator, is now expected to assume responsibility for the self, a self-governing autonomy which online education as a strategy or technology of the self seems to structure very smoothly. Lash and Urry (1994, pp. 4-5; authors' italics) explain that, in the new information society, "there is an ongoing process of *de*-traditionalization in which social agents are increasingly 'set free' from the heteronomous control or monitoring of social structures in order to be self-monitoring or self-reflexive". In institutions such as the enterprise university, the discursive control of management works actively to align the self-reflexivity of its staff and students with institutional goals, by installing an array of "technologies of the self". In effect the university becomes a reflexive institution peopled by reflexive workers who share the common goals and mission of the university. "The autonomy of the self is… not the eternal antithesis of political power, but one of the objectives and instruments of modern mentalities and strategies for the conduct of conduct" (Rose, 1996, p. 154).

In the DE subject she facilitated, Aurea felt sidelined, unsure how to respond, and the impression she gave was of being a hostess, or indeed a distant facilitator, who watches on and thanks individuals for their substantial efforts.

> Aurea: Online - yeah, yeah. My thinking is, I wonder…. how these students are reacting and interacting with each other? I wonder how they are interacting with the materials that they have? I just want to see. I want to see. And so you go there and read. And whenever I

read something, because I enjoy it - there's that anticipation that I'll enjoy it. And I enjoy finding out what they are doing and how they are interacting and how they are relating to the materials that they're reflecting on, that they're reading. So I think that's where the pleasure comes. Yeah, yeah. I suppose ahm, ah, I am at that point where you are just on the background and watching, reading, looking. (Aurea, C3)

Aurea: How much feedback then do you give to the students or how much discussion do you need to engage [in] yourself or, you know..? Do you respond to each student who posted individually, or do you make a total resp- a response to everybody? You know, once. So that kind of thing. And then… And then I had these thoughts about, "Gosh! This going to be unmanageable. [*breaks into loud laughter*]

Kim: What was..? Why that? [Aurea: Why?] Why did you think that?

Aurea: It's because… Say for example I have these four students sending me this looong discourse on so many things, that I just felt, gosh, I couldn't keep up with everything. [*laughing*]

Kim: So they were really long email messages?

Aurea: Yeah. Long disc- yeah , in WebCT. Discussions.

Kim: Were they addressed to you?

Aurea: Addressed to everyone else, and that is the responses on the discussion questions that you post. So it's addressed to everybody, so I didn't have the… Oh I suppose the question for me are, you know: How much do I respond? Should I respond to this? This is obvious. She's.. you know, this student is communicating her understanding of the readings. Yes, she's right. She has a point. You know, what else could I say? That kind of thing. [*chuckling*] What else could I say?

Kim: She has really got it; she's understood..?

Aurea: Yes that's right, that's right. And ahm… sometimes in some of those discussions I felt, she's said it all. Well, what can I say?

Kim: What did you say?

> Aurea: Well I ended up thanking them for their contributions, and thanking them for their insights – for their very substantial contribution. It was really very substantial. So that's what I do, you know - to thank them. (Aurea, C2)

Of course, Aurea went on to describe herself perving on students' learning online, in the manner of a voyeur. Campbell-Gibson (2000) refers to this passive, watchful experience too.

> Perhaps the greatest struggle for us all occurred in the area of responsibility for learning and, as Mezirow might add, our personal habits of expectation. I have struggled with my changing role. Initially trained as a physical scientist, I am quite at home lecturing and writing on the board, certainly more so than sitting on my hands reading learners' perspectives on the research articles of the week and their applicability to their world at large. (Campbell-Gibson, 2000. p. 141)

The online facilitator no longer has pedagogical control over the curriculum and learning, nor responsibility to/for the learner. Zhang really captures this de-responsibilisation[10] of the teacher while talking about his role as an online facilitator. In his view, computer-based and online learning:

> …just provide more challenge and more room for development…. That is very important; students have to be independent. And we have to tell them: they just use us, use the teachers to get their own way of learning. Not rely on teachers to know the skills, so the teacher should just give them many ways, not one way to go. So, once students know all the different options, they know the options, they will on their own to choose the one that suits, or choose several. So, I think the best teacher is to give more options to students rather than concentrate on one or two areas. That's my belief. (Zhang)

---

[10] Following Lash and Urry's (1994) notion of "d*e*-traditionalization".

In asynchronous online pedagogies, the teacher's promise to respond to her students cannot be kept. The Lévinasian notions of the summons, and the moral obligation and commitment to the other, are neutralised, as burgeoning workloads, inwardly-focussed anxiety and reflexivity threaten to overwhelm the individual – and these phenomena appear to be the experience of the facilitator/s and the student/s alike online. The absence of embodied, affective beings reduces the sense of the urgency to respond to the other online. The teacher/s and the students know, too, that curriculum, teaching and assessment are approved and monitored by authorities other than the academic facilitator. Responsibility is dispersed, learners struggle to take responsibility for their learning, and facilitators struggle to respond to them in a timely, expert and caring fashion. The lens of the directing metaphor focuses attention on discursive effects that have produced a breakdown in facilitator responsibility for the student (and indeed, vice-versa): loss of control, reflexivity and anxiety. These are stressful conditions that exacerbate those very "fears" of academics that were noted in the literature that discusses the introduction of flexible and online learning. Higher education policy and literature seems notably unconcerned about academics' fears and, in fact, as I showed in my analysis, ignores the lecturer and her work in higher education, focussing its rhetoric instead on the student, and on the "solutions" that new technologies offer higher education teaching and learning.

The factors that have been revealed through the lenses of the performing, caring and directing metaphors, can be viewed very differently of course from the perspective of the enterprise university and its management. In the next section, such an analysis will establish a profile of the online facilitator and blended pedagogy in the enterprise university.

The Facilitator and Accountability to Management

The third research question to frame my study asked: In the conduct of their blended teaching, how do academics remain *accountable* to university management in respect of their teaching and teacher identity? The de-traditionalisation and de-responsibilisation of

higher education learning (and teaching) require the lecturer to shift attention and responsibility from the student to self-management, thereby establishing the conditions for new academic identities.

Responsible and Accountable for Oneself to University Management

In my analysis I have sought to show that, with the shift online, the performer/carer/director lecturer becomes a facilitator. My analysis has shown how, with reduced or very little immediacy and reciprocity between teachers and students online, the performer/carer/director lecturer becomes a bystander or voyeur to student learning. However, the *facilitator* delivers what must be delivered, monitors learning, and reports results to university via new information systems and databases. Indeed the role is also a managerial role, not unlike that of a "middle manager, and ICT is implicated in this shift. As Clegg and her colleagues (2003) noted, the technology "fix" solution of online education reshapes the work of teaching into acts of mediation (Clegg et al., 2003) between two constituents: the flexible learner and university management.

While some academics in the study may have felt they had become superfluous to student learning, most had reduced the time previously devoted to other duties like research. Academics are required now to manage flows of performance-related knowledge that are generated for quality and auditing purposes (McWilliam, 2004). Aurea's final comments to me in our last conversation were about management's oppressive control of academic work.

> Aurea: I think the institution's become more repressive. Yeah, and the way we are repressed is.. workload. It's like, "Well I will give you more, more and more work, so you don't have time to think". Yeah. "I'll give you more paper, paper, paper, paper, paper, so you don't have the time to think and reflect." It's… To me that's a form of oppression. [*giggles uncomfortably*]
> Kim: Understandable.. given where your history, your story is..

> Aurea; Yeah, so.. and then ahm, all the rules.. I think in some ways, you know all these ethical guidelines - they are OK. But I think they have oppressive qualities as well, because … there's the behaviour in terms of what you can name and what you cannot name. Whereas, if you exist in a context where there is freedom of the press, it doesn't matter who you name. You know? So it's all this - what do you call this? - in the name of "niceness", in the name of ethical practice I suppose. In the name of …[*long pause*] Behind it is control. (Aurea, C3)

Aurea's comments here about "paper, paper, paper" draw attention to the highly visible documentation required of all academic work, and she mentions too the ethical rules that govern "the conduct of conduct" (Rose, 1996). Whereas once one's preparation for teaching was hidden, now all planning and design for learning must be documented clearly on subject outline templates and rendered visible to peers and management. The enterprising academic connects into, and uses, the university's information systems, online information flow, virtual information storage systems, and databases. In fact, rather than being so much engaged in supporting student learning, the academic is now more likely to undertake clerical work and bureaucratic administration (Barcan, 1996, p.130).

The Move Online as Risk Management

> Risk is the modern approach to foresee and control the future consequences of human action, the various unintended consequences of radicalized modernization. It is an (institutionalised) attempt, a cognitive map, to colonise the future. (Beck, 1999, p. 3)

Reflecting on my findings, I am led to conclude that one effective way to accomplish the de-traditionalisation (Lash & Urry, 1994) of university teaching and the de-responsibilisation of university lecturers (for others) is to introduce flexible, online learning. The effects on the lecturer *qua* facilitator have been outlined and discussed: increasing workload, new teaching tempos, disembodied online contexts, the restriction of emotional expression, loss of teacher control, and heightened reflexivity and anxiety in

teachers. From the perspective of management however, new human relations in the arena of learning and teaching are being engineered, so as to ensure productivity.

> Enterprise… can be given a "technological" form by experts of organisational life, engineering human relations through architecture, timetabling, supervisory systems, payment schemes, curricula, and the like to achieve economy, efficiency, excellence, and competitiveness. (Rose, 1996, p. 154)

Within the university, every deliberation and decision must now be weighed up in terms of risk, and the vice-chancellor, the deputy vice-chancellors, acting assistant pro-vice-chancellors, provosts, deans, departmental heads and managers are now required to bring the future into the present, weigh up the risks, and render them calculable. Attention is paid to the potential opportunities and dangers of "bads", rather than the opportunities of "goods" (Beck, 1999, p. 8). This documentation produces lots of "paper, paper, paper"! Following the ideas of Beck (1999) and Lash and Urry (1994) about risk cultures and societies, McWilliam (2004) discusses the fact that all contemporary institutions, including universities, are risk organizations. In the face of allegations of waste (of resources), of failure (of students), of declining standards (intellectual, ethical and moral), universities now move quickly to advertise their internal risk response activities. So within the university, forestalling the future uncertain threat of risk, we find "particular sorts of activity – administrative, relational, policy-driven, pedagogical, technological – directed towards minimizing danger" (McWilliam, 2004, p. 154). Education is now a serious business. We can no longer have fun in education, so that, for example, the performer's enactments of the "carnivalesque" are becoming highly risky. (I am reminded of Evan Preacher's "gospel tent" undergraduate lectures). Garrison (1997, as cited in McWilliam, 1999, p. 183) has pointed out the prejudice in education against (risky) emotion and (risky) imagination. Referring to traditional, intense, *in camera* postgraduate pedagogical practices, McWilliam and Palmer (1995, p. 32) comment that "this is not to presume transgression, but to understand that such pedagogy is dangerously untranslatable as

rational enquiry made public". It is in this climate of highly reflexive, audit culture that the self-managing academic makes the move online, and makes her work more visible to herself and others who need to know she is engaging in pedagogical innovation that is improving student learning. However, the hidden curriculum of "student-centred", flexible online learning, that reinscribes the student as customer, also has implications for the identity of the facilitator.

In the enterprise university, teachers and learners are expected equally to attend to their personal fulfillment, excellence and achievement – "to conduct themselves with boldness and vigor, to calculate for their own advantage, to drive themselves hard, and to accept risks in the pursuit of goals" (Rose, 1996, p. 154) - the university's goals of course. With the advent of online learning, students too are being subjected to the technologies of workload, new tempos of study, care-less online learning, reflexivity, and surveillance, so their behaviour is also being controlled and manipulated, by the bureaucratic regime of the university via the mediation of the (online) facilitator (a "line manager", in effect). In this new pedagogical culture, students are being managed and expected to self-manage. From the point of view of an enterprising university management, it is not just the lecturer, but also the student/customer who is perceived as a risk (McWilliam, 2004) and who must be watched carefully, and whose personal goals, desires and ambition need to be groomed into alignment with those of the institution.

Flexible, online learning, supported by facilitators of student learning, appears to offer an effective and efficient technology of control. Online technology - the website, the LMS, the quizzes, discussions and email – establishes a "technology of the self", that domesticates academics, manipulates their teacher identities and their work, and governs their conduct. This disciplining of the lecturer via ICT enables universities to manage the interactions of teachers and learners who, in their traditional proximate contexts – in the privacy of lectures halls, seminar rooms and academics' offices - have represented (if not engaged in) risk and unknown transgressions. With the break-down in the ability to respond

appropriately, the pedagogical role of the facilitator is neutralised, and the student treated as a customer who can be delivered the commodity of knowledge in the most risk-free possible way. Flexible learning becomes a pedagogical "technology" of the enterprise university.

Flexible Delivery of Student-centred Higher Education

Policy commentators such as Coaldrake and Stedman (1998) endorse the "flexible delivery" of education in their vision of the future for universities, with "delivery" being a metaphor that is highly suggestive of the assumptions of enterprise cultures about web-based learning. The metaphor suggests that a delivery person (a facilitator) delivers a packaged commodity (information) on behalf of a company to a customer (a student), at the customer's location. There is little scope for negotiating, or changing, the contents of the parcel in a delivery metaphor of education; indeed negotiable knowledge has become fixed information, a commodity that is handed over to the (lacking, empty) student by the facilitator upon payment. The delivery metaphor is remarkably similar to a view of curriculum as a centrally-authored script to be read and repeated to students by a facilitator (Sawyer, 2004). The delivery metaphor is a fit model for education in times of neo-liberal managerialism in universities. McWilliam (1996) notes too that this "design and delivery" model constructs pedagogy as a one-way flow of information that does not invite the student to become involved in the knowledge production process, as is expected in the humanities and social sciences.

Coaldrake and Stedman (1998, p. 79) suggest that developments in communications technology hold the promise of "enabling better and broader types of interaction", and they are enthusiastic about "computer-based teaching programs, which can act as infinitely patient, if sometimes rigid, tutors. Such programs often come with varying levels of 'interactivity', usually meaning menu choices, to guide a student through simulate problems or question-and-answer steps" (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998, p. 84). The model of learning that is implied here is naïvely behaviourist: repetitive, drill-based, and meaning

and knowledge are fixed and non-negotiable. We might assume from these comments that teachers were never that responsive or patient, and yet the experiences of the lecturers in this study suggest otherwise.

The Facilitator Delivers

The facilitator's role in such visions of the future in education is "maieutic". That is, the teacher acts as midwife to this process of learning as internal unfolding and growth. In their exposé of "faculty experiences with technology enhanced teaching and learning", Naidu and Cunningham (2004) quote Socrates: "'A teacher is a midwife to a student pregnant with ideas.' This is exactly what we mean by facilitation". This facilitator as midwife (looking on or invisible) is the teacher identity that university management and policy writers such as Coaldrake and Stedman (1998, 1999) with little understanding of the complexities of teaching and learning, would have all academics adopt. In reflecting on the ethics of human interaction, Lévinas has critiqued learning as maieusis and teaching as facilitation, arguing that a) Infinity is outside the learner and can never be delivered as pure content (the face, proximity and discourse intervene) and b) the teacher is, through obligation to the face of the other, responsible for the other. Noddings (2003, p. 70) is more literal in her view. "The teacher… is necessarily one-caring if she is to be a teacher and not simply a textbooklike source from which the student may or may not learn". Brookfield explains this further.

> To act as a resource person to adults who are unaware of belief systems, bodies of knowledge or behavioural possibilities other than those that they have uncritically assimilated since childhood is to condemn such adults to remaining within existing paradigms of thought and action. It is misconceived to talk of the self-directedness of learners who are unaware of alternative ways of thinking, perceiving or behaving. (Brookfield, 1986, p. 124)

Learning, like all change processes, can sometimes be painful and difficult. In preparing their students for uncertain futures in a humanist profession, Cora and Rose spoke of necessarily "frightening the life out" of their students.

> Cora: The philosophy of this program is great. It's about critical reflection, and not giving students certainty. Here it's really challenging students. We're not going to teach you a tool box of skills. We frighten the life out of them, make them anxious, and through that anxiety a lot of students want some mastery over what they do, and we're not giving them that. You have to live with that.
>
> Rose: There's a bigger, different picture in society - continuous change and uncertainty. It's all about developing students independence as learners, as well as interdependence.… We don't teach fact. (Cora, Rose & Cora, C2)

Lyotard observed that "all education is inhuman because it does not happen without constraint or terror" (Lyotard, 1991, as cited in Britzman, 2004, p. 259). Todd elaborates.

> Education by its very socializing function and by its mission to change how people think, enacts a violence that is necessary to the subject…. Students wrestle with the otherness and difference that are presented to them through the curriculum and through the bodies of teachers and students they encounter… Such difficulty suggests that there is something profoundly at risk in coming to know, involving renunciations and sacrifices that are sometimes too great to bear. Students often feel that once they struggle to understand something, they can never be quite the same again. And as if this struggle were not enough, the process continually returns… Egos are not formed nor are desires done away with once and for all… This means that the ego is continually vulnerable to the potentiality of violence, to the recurrence of learning to become. (Todd, 2003, p. 20)

In language remarkably similar to that of Lévinas, Readings (1996) also discusses education as comprising sites of "obligation" and "ethical practices". He understands learning as "shock" and offers his own critique of learning as maieusis.

> Shock arises, since it is *the minimal condition of pedagogy*, and it opens a series of incalculable differences, the exploration of which is the business of pedagogy. Education, as *e ducere*, a drawing out, is not a maieutic revelation of the student to him- or herself, a process of clearly remembering what the student in fact already knew. Rather education is this drawing out of the otherness of thought that undoes the pretension to self-presence that always demands further study (Readings, 1996, p. 162; author's italics).

What these and other critiques of consumerist, transactional models of learning (Dall'Alba & Barnacle, 2005; Kirkup, 2001; Land 2005; McWilliam, 1996) suggest, is that the interest, care and responsiveness of a lecturer and tutor can support students in the otherness, difference and risk of learning. Brookfield (1986) argues that the teachers of adults must assist adults to attain self-actualisation by suggesting alternatives, pointing up contradictions, drawing attention to relationships of dependence, and by prompting "painful, critical scrutinies of assumptions, value frameworks, or behaviours" (Brookfield, 1986, p. 124). Grimmett and Dockendorf (1999) came to a similar conclusion when they explored the meaning and processes of facilitation with teacher research groups in a program of classroom-based action research. "One of the important implications of our inquiry is that facilitators must ensure that practitioners also face their 'monsters', their dilemmas of practice, otherwise the possibility exists that change may not be framed around the needs of learning and the learner" (Grimmett & Dockendorf, 1999, p. 106). The delivery metaphor, and the birth, are assumed to be straight-forward and easy, smooth and painless. Difficulty and struggle in university learning are not concepts that risk-conscious managers encourage. In fact, like all key functions of the university, student learning should be easy, "seamless", and the customer should be happy. "Best practice" in teaching and learning is no longer driven by the discipline, but by client satisfaction (McWilliam et al. 1999, p. 63). The experience and wisdom of the lecturer count for little.

The model of online and blended education that is developing as a consequence of one-way, non-responsive delivery could be termed a student-centred "technogogy", a

deliberately ugly term for a safe, anodyne experience that involves the student in gathering knowledge and remembering it. Perhaps he will interact in structured ways with the technological interface and his peers and, if he needs it, he will ask the facilitator for help with difficulties. This does in fact cast the facilitator as someone who makes learning easier. However, according to the academics in my study, and certain key thinkers in the field, such a practice is a technological "fix" (Clegg et al., 2003), rather than a challenging struggle of coming to understand and grow. Some of the academics in my study hinted that they were more responsive and "student-focussed" in their pre-online teaching. When their students were near, they were teachers.

A change-focussed theory of learning, based on self-other interaction, teacher responsibility and the mutual pedagogical promise of response, is becoming irrelevant in the risk-conscious enterprise university. The "technogogy" of flexible, online learning offers the prospect of an innocently straight-forward curriculum, based on reading, comprehending, repetition and regurgitation - a risk-free engagement with knowledge – that is not interrupted by the messy bodies and risky, physical, emotional pedagogies of lecturers. Ultimately the facilitator is de-responsibilised of her students.

Academic Identities in the Enterprise University

Looking through the metaphor lenses of performing, caring and directing has offered a fresh perspective on the complex interactions of university learning and teaching. The teacher's promise to respond to the other (the student) within these teacher identities could not be maintained due to contextual constraints that were nested more within the discursive practices of neo-liberal university management than in the technology and its interfaces. That is, in making the move online, the academics were not so much being transformed by technology as by the managerialist "technogogy" of flexible, online learning that apparently structures and sanitizes learning and teaching in proper ways. As online facilitators, the performer/carer/director feels stripped of familiar responsibilities to her students, and if she held on to these points of attachment, she felt ignored and became a

disappearing act/voyeur/bystander to student learning. The reformed facilitator, however, is expected to deliver learning in a measured, risk-free environment, and in so doing she also becomes a middle manager of student learning. The facilitator scrutinizes student learning on behalf of management and is in turn scrutinized by management. Online learning, performance management processes, and promotions and awards applications, for example, exacerbate the circular reflexivity and anxiety that is produced out of these self-scrutinising technologies and processes. In this process of change, she hides her uncertainty, fear, and bitterness. Like all academic emotions, these feelings are not acknowledged with much sympathy in the literature on ICT in higher education teaching and learning.

Employees of the Enterprise University

Rahime railed against the managerial and institutional changes passionately in a long conversation one May afternoon, when she knew she had a sympathetic listener who might report what was going on around her. Rahime and her departmental colleagues ("us") were particularly cynical about the apparent disinterest of management in the mundane work of academics.

> Rahime: What concerns us far more is the dumbing.. what we call "the dumbing-down process", and that academics feel increasingly less valued by the university itself.. One person commented in a meeting. How was it put? "Oh well, we really are just employees now". And it's hard.. [*long pause*] that's very hard I think, because in some way the university, in fact, the government much more, exploits the fact that academics have a commitment to their intellectual pursuits. Nobody would pay for the hours that a productive academic actually works - nobody…. So in a sense I started off talking about "Well, what kind of rewards are there?" And the university makes a rod for it's own back, in a sense by.. Because, in the end, if you haven't got all those compensatory factors, the only one you've got is money and they just get more and more wages demands I think, because.. But it's a very sad thing that it's been reduced to that - It doesn't mean they wouldn't get the wage demands - but, you have a disenchanted workforce, whereas once

> you had a quite committed workforce, and I think that's sad. I think we all feel that. (Rahime, C3)

Rahime summed up a common academic perspective on some of the significant contextual, institutional changes that have impacted on academic identities in Australian universities over the past fifteen years. The status, rewards and salaries for being a good academic have diminished, leaving in their wake a disenchanted workforce of people who follow the guidelines and control of a distant management, many of whom she suspects might be "poor (failed) academics". Jane and Evan reported similar sentiments of bitterness and anger on the part of their colleagues. Ron was cynical about recognition for academic work: "I mean it's that personal satisfaction that's sort of more important…. But I mean, but y'know, you don't expect it". The status that once came with being an academic had evaporated and, for some participants, the rewards were meaningless. As Ron and Rahime noted, the satisfactions of university teaching were "personal" and not public (such as university teaching excellence awards). Salaries were higher in the external corporate sector, and nowadays academics were reduced to being "just employees" of the university, as Rahime's colleagues had noted.

The fears of Rahime and her colleagues may well be justified, for Frank's story reveals just how flexible the facilitator is, when management decides to enact change.

Frank the Facilitator

Almost all of Frank's teaching was conducted online, where he described his teaching role as a facilitator. He worked with a small team in a distance education unit at an off-campus site, which was very comfortable, quiet and orderly when I visited. On the wall there was a map of the world, the coloured pins spread across it indicating where their students, who enrolled in different courses they ran, were located. Asycnhronous online CMC was normative pedagogy for Frank, and there he felt safe from the unpredictability and risk that he said he was aware of in face-to-face teaching. In his online DE subjects, he could take

his time replying to posts and queries, bringing in content experts to engage with his students directly.

Late in 2005 Frank replied to my follow-up and farewell email with a thoughtful message that signalled, at least from his point of view, that his usual pedagogical tempos and relationships were being disturbed.

> My involvement in online teaching has changed within the last year, largely due to circumstances beyond my control. *I now have less involvement.* My feelings about this are mixed. The Faculty of [name] decreed that all coursework masters courses should follow a similar format. So the whole course is being rewritten in line with the new requirements. We also have a new member of staff, brought on board to develop the new materials and revamp the course. There is a lot more structure in the course now - too much to my mind, and so it is a lot less flexible than it used to be. Students must complete certain tasks on a weekly basis, which many find hard if work or family life gets suddenly busy. An advantage of the new structure is that we can bring in content experts on a weekly basis, which suits them better as it reduces their involvement with the course. We used to ask them to commit to logging on and talking with the students for at least 3 weeks, usually more, and this was not popular. So now we have more content experts but appearing for shorter times. I can't decide if this is a good thing or not. *There is little time to build up any sort of relationship between students and content experts.* There are now other activities in addition to discussions, such as an online debate. The students enjoyed this but it did detract from the regular discussions we still expected them to join in with. Even though I am still "present" online my role is now much reduced. This does free me to do other things, but *I think it is now much harder for the students to identify a member of staff they can relate to on a day to day basis.* I still can't make up my mind about the new course format, but I do feel uneasy about it. My attempts to retain some of the old structure were seen as "the old guard" being resistant to change, and were overridden. Perhaps I am a conservative at heart, and perhaps I was getting too comfortable? I haven't made any final conclusions yet. (Frank, email communication, December 20, 2005; my italics)

The italicised sections point to changing pedagogical relationships, consistent with those I discussed in respect of the move to flexible online teaching. According to Frank's outline, it appears that teachers and students are being distanced from each other and, at the same time, teaching and learning are being remoulded into templates that will facilitate visibility, comparability and judgement. I dwell on Frank's final reflections, and on how he was made to feel one of "the old guard" – with an implied denigration of how things used to be. His grappling with uncertainty, and his "wait and see" attitude, remind us that there is no certainty in academic work. As Frank has discovered, the online facilitator is not exempt from change. In fact, with increasing regulation, his work will become more susceptible to change. Do we all get too comfortable?

Above all, Frank's changing situation exemplifies how the "human technologies" of the institution can put into effect "the calculated orchestration of the activities of humans under a practical rationality directed toward certain goals" (Rose, 1996, 153). No one is immune from management-led change in the university, and Frank's account highlights the vulnerability of even those who have been apparently proper, but perhaps not sufficiently efficient, in managing their pedagogy. I wonder if Frank would have been less vulnerable, if he had been grounded in some way by face-to-face teaching?

In sum, the so-called facilitator of the enterprise university is an empty cipher ready to take up a range of identities as "points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct" (Hall (2002, p. 19): middle manager, resource, learner, guide, content expert. In this study I have uncovered a series of discursive reversals and shifts in university ~~teaching and learning~~ [sic] learning and teaching, whereby teachers become learners and voyeurs of student learning, and learners must become autodidacts of content that is delivered by technology with the support of a facilitator - when help is needed. Becoming a facilitator of online student learning, neutralises the moral obligation of lecturer-student relations, and erases the identity of the performing, caring directing lecturer. The lecturer, as a unitary performer/carer/director, is no more.

And yet… however much the culture of the enterprise university seeks to reconfigure the lecturer as a facilitator of student learning, there is still some resistance. That resistance, I will now argue, takes the shape of blended teaching.

Blended Learning, and Blended Teachers

In this final section I will consider the implications of my findings in terms of blended learning and teaching, a pedagogical structure and practice that is expanding through university programs currently. Blended learning represents an uncertain space, a point of transition between face-to-face and online pedagogies, where teacher identity is being pulled to-and-fro in the tensions between truly student-centred and duly management-centred teaching. The teacher-facilitator of blended student learning must juggle multiple teacher identities: blending and shifting between being face-to-face lecturing (as a performer/carer/director, etc.) and online facilitation – an uncertain, signified-free role. As I will now reveal, the blended lecturer is a curious hybrid - a Janus-faced teacher-facilitator who struggles with feeling responsible to students and with having to be accountable to senior managers.

By 2003, I realized and wrote about the fact that each of the five SRU participants in this study (all technology enthusiasts) had retained face-to-face teaching or lecturing at the core of their curriculum design (McShane, 2004). That is, their teaching subjects comprised varying mixes or blends of online CMC and traditional face-to-face teaching and learning practices. The face-to-face components were central to learning and teaching, and the other modes and practices were designed to follow and support them. The momentum and sequencing of the subject/s depended on the face-to-face lectures. In the next phase of the study, I noticed that, with the exception of Frank, the NMU participants too had blended online and face-to-face teaching in their curriculum design and teaching. Those participants who continued to teach during and after the study retained the same modal blends with which they had begun and, while Aurea designed and taught a wholly online

subject as part of a cross-institutional project, she also planned and continued to teach blended subjects for her local undergraduate and postgraduate students. Even if some were dissatisfied with, or suspicious of, online teaching, all participants retained some element/s of online CMC - be that simply email and a subject website. How to explain this?

Face-to-face teaching: Resistance and probity.

By selectively taking up particular online practices, the participants in this study could be seen to be introducing some innovation and flexibility in their teaching, and they could claim some student-centredness for that practice. Becoming an online facilitator is a very proper way to teach – even if it is only for part of the curriculum.

However, it also seemed that the (SRU) lecturers in my study were holding onto the cherished, risky, and private face-to-face pedagogies at the heart of the learning and teaching experience (McShane, 2004, 2006). In my research conversations and communications with the eleven participants who engaged with blended teaching (ie. with the exception of Frank), all of them invariably discussed their perceptions of online teaching in the light of their experiences of face-to-face teaching. The three teaching metaphors (performing, caring and directing) encapsulate particular, moral/ethical teacher-student relations, and it would seem that the participants missed the spontaneous riskiness of performing, the nurturing and intimacy of caring, and/or the creativity of directing in online CMC. It would be easy to argue that face-to-face teaching practices in the blended curriculum might represent points of *stable* attachment (to paraphrase Hall, 2002) to older teacher identities. In blended learning, face-to-face situations provide a relatively safe site that is invisible to, and immeasurable by, management scrutiny (unless of course the lectures are taped). In lecture theatres and seminar rooms some lecturers will feel in control again, for an hour or two at least, and here they can enjoy the risks and pleasures of being "in-the-moment" with students, and slough off the past- and future-focused reflexivity that beleaguers them in their asynchronous teacher identities. For it is asynchronicity that can, and does, rupture the moral relation between teacher and student, bringing with it

reflexivity and anxiety for the individual. Therefore, it appears straightforward to advance that, by engaging with blending face-to-face and online practices, the participants found ways to hold onto and express some of the pleasures of traditional teaching, while remaining voyeurs to, and middle managers of, online student learning.

In the move to integrate some online teaching with face-to-face teaching, it was face-to-face teaching that was a normative reference point for thinking about and judging online teaching and learning, and this remained true of all participants (except Frank), even those who were experienced in online teaching, such as the SRU participants: Seb, Hilary, Paul, Zhang, and Ron. Of course, as the literature reports, and as my participants reported, lecturers feel they lose control in their online teaching, where they reported that the loss of reciprocity and responsiveness undercut their communication, their ability to intervene in learning, and their authority as lecturers. In the next section I will examine through a deconstructive analysis these common perceptions regarding authority and control in face-to-face and online learning.

Blended learning – Who/what is supplementing who/what?

How else to explain the nature and structure of blended teaching and a blended curriculum? It appears relatively easy to appreciate blended learning (and teaching), through some core face-to-face mode or practice. Yet the face-to-face elements of a blended program must call into question the online elements, and we are challenged to consider whether online might not be the core pedagogical mode or practice. Indeed, what is the significance, and the function of, the online components in the blended curriculum, and what are the implications for lecturer identities?

There are other insights to be gained from a deconstruction of the hybrid teacher-facilitator. Blended teachers represent multiple and hybrid teacher identities, that must shift and adjust to embodied and virtual institutional and educational contexts. Hayles (1999) discusses the prospect of the blended, hybrid teacher who, by becoming *posthuman*, does not leave the

body behind, but rather extends her embodied awareness and capabilities via electronic prostheses. This description of the posthuman teacher appears to describe the performer/carer/director-lecturer who supplements her face-to-face teaching with the pedagogical "prostheses" of online CMC, online notes and readings. This was the model that the SRU participants in this study seemed to be endorsing with the retention of face-to-face practices in their subjects (McShane, 2004, 2006).

Yet this conception of the teacher addresses only one conception of teacher identity – that which is responsible to the student – and as I have discussed, the hybrid facilitator has been stripped of this responsibility. The facilitator must also engage with management. I believe we are seeing the emergence of a different pattern of supplementation and directionality in the hybrid, blended university curriculum. That is, given management control of the work of learning (and teaching), we must also face the possibility of the facilitator as a prosthesis that supplements the controlled, scrutinised curriculum that is delivered flexibly, online. Seb, for example, feared this prospect and he was adamant that his students had to come to his lectures where he could see them, and where they (as his audience, his spectators) could see him perform. But then he made an interesting reversal away from this proposition to defend the integrity of his face-to-face lectures.

> So I still want them to feel that they're missing out on something by not coming to a lecture, because when… The notes augment the textbook, OK - and the notes are on the web - and a lecture augments both of those, because I neither talk directly from the notes or the textbook when I'm giving a lecture. (Seb)

The "already complete" (Seb, the face-to-face teaching/teacher), would be rendered inadequate and incomplete by having a "supplement" (the online notes and materials). These musings about the notion of supplementation call to mind Derrida's (1991) destabilizing concept of "the dangerous supplement" - a supplement, which by its addition

or insertion, necessarily challenges the wholeness of the original (that had to be supplemented).

> That dangerous supplement… breaks into the very thing that would have like to do without it yet lets itself at once be breached, roughed up, fulfilled, and replaced, completed by the very trace through which the present increases itself in the act of disappearing. (Derrida, 1991, p. 135)

With the introduction of the supplement (online contexts? or face-to-face contexts?) the supplemented (the face-to-face context? the online context?) is rendered partial and incomplete. As I showed, the ICT-enhanced, flexible, student learning literature implies that traditional methods of teaching and learning are by implication inadequate and inappropriate. The introduction of the supplement – flexible, online learning - has challenged the integrity and wholeness of the original practice – teaching as performing, caring, and directing. Viewed this way, the online curriculum calls into question the centrality and integrity of face-to-face teaching, and may even render it a supportive, remedial practice, much along the lines of Coaldrake and Stedman's (1998) proposition, in which those learners who will "need more help" (the authors mention those not innately more able, motivated and better educated) will receive extra support by means of "close interaction from a teacher" (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998, p. 107). Thus the spectre of inadequacy haunts the models of flexible, blended learning. Online supplementation renders traditional pedagogical models inadequate. The performer/carer/director lecturer is inadequate to the task of face-to-face and online teaching in the blended curriculum. The possible blends of originary and supplement in blended pedagogies guarantee only instability and change. Dangerous supplement indeed. Wicked irony.

What lies in these dire straits (between Scylla and Carybdis, between responsibility to the student and accountability to management) are the competing currents (discourses) of control and power in blended learning. The move online represents a surrender of

responsibility, pedagogical power and identity. The ontological implications for the university lecturer are expressed thus: by becoming supplemental to flexible student learning technologies, by letting go of the moral responsibility to the student, and by responding instead to the accountability technologies of management, the facilitator is stripped of her former familiar lecturer identity, scoured of moral humanist characteristics, and reduced to a state of reflexive, scrutinising, helplessness – a voyeur - or a soulless cadaver indeed. ("Just an another employee of the university" is easier to stomach). We are witnessing the passing of a pedagogical tradition, of a generation of university lecturers.

Blended learning - A new moral order?

Around me and between us, there is a space. (Irigaray, 2001, p. 115)

It would be facile at this point to dismiss the ageing university teacher as "always-already corrupt, lazy" (Davies, 2005b), a victim (McWilliam, 1999) of indifferent, corporate technologies. Others have expressed regrets and grief (Martin, 1999; Taylor, 1999). There may be another way to conceive of blended learning, as a transition that establishes the moral conditions for lecturers (and students) to learn and practise new ways of pedagogical being. Here I will sketch an outline of a new, possible moral order to emerge from the uncertain, multiple spaces of blended learning (and teaching).

Originally, the theoretical ideas of Lévinas enabled me to construct a particular conception of the pedagogical relation, of self-and-other, of "being-for-the-Other" – a readiness to respond to the other and to be responsible to the other. Lévinas' (1987, p.16) observation, that "contact is tenderness and responsibility", is a touching image that has sustained me and reassured me in the process of this research study. Tucked away in his obscure writings, Lévinas' describes this self-other contact as being like a hand that caresses, grasps and closes. The grasp is the symbolic response, and signal of responsibility to the other.

> Being is *bestowed* and this bestowal is to be understood in the literal sense of the word. The Bestowal is completed by the *hand that takes (la main qui prend*). It is therefore in this taking of possession (*mainmise*) that presence is "presence proper"… presence is produced as a *hand-holding-now (maintenant*)… The hand verifies the eye, for in it are performed the acts of grasping and assuming as one's own, which are irreducible to tactile sensation… it is an appropriation. (Lévinas, 2002b, p. 530)

The moral approach and appropriation of Lévinas' grasp (although most apt and expressive of the teacher-student relations of performing, caring and directing) in fact is a potentially risky and frightening gesture – a movement toward the other that is not possible in the silent, text-based, electronic spaces of online learning. The Belgian feminist linguist and philosopher Luce Irigaray (2000, p. 131) has pointed out that men (and masculinist epistemological perspectives) privilege the past tense and a metaphorical use of language. This observation underscores the grasping, othering effect of teacher and student in the metaphors of performing, caring and directing. While Irigaray is better known for theorising gendered, sexual difference (2001), her writings are nonetheless very relevant to reflecting on the ethical, self-other relationships of educational contexts. In dialogic passages in *To be two* she addresses Lévinas, and challenges his grasping gesture, this image of responsibility for the other. She accuses him of colonization and appropriation of the (female) other, and of attempting to install a (masculine) morality of the self in the other, through what she argues is in reality a risky grab for the body and soul of the other.

> In their male desire for the other, male philosophers generally evoke sight and touch. Thus like their hand, their gaze grasps, denudes and captures. The transcendence of the other, however, requires that the invisible in him be respected, including when he is perceived with the senses. (Irigaray, 2001, p. 20)

In place of the voyeur with desiring ("perving") eyes, Irigary proposes an alternative being with the other, a loving *to* you that could be practised and learnt in online CMC, and enacted mindfully in the warm, embodied spaces of blended learning. Irigaray's symbolic

gesture is the open caress of the palm of the hand, a light touch, the gentle pat on the arm or shoulder (as Hilary liked to do), a caress that does not close and grip the other. Let us reflect on this in terms of the pedagogical relation.

> The caress is an invitation to rest, to relax, to perceive, to think and to be in a different way: one which is more quiet, more contemplative, less utilitarian. The caress is a gift of safety, a call to return to yourself…. The caress makes a gesture which gives the other to himself, to herself, thanks to an attentive witness, thanks to a guardian of incarnate subjectivity. (Irigaray, 2001, p. 27)

The implications for teacher identity are significant. It is in the silent, asynchronous spaces of online CMC that we might learn and enact new relations with the other. Whether I am a facilitator or a student, I learn online to attend to you (I read you, listen to you). There I am alone, and witness (y)our otherness, and contemplate (y)our being. "Listening to you thus requires that I make myself available, that I be once more and always capable of silence" (Irigaray, 1996, p. 118). Extending from online CMC, we might begin to imagine a university curriculum that allows each and all to appreciate the silence and reflection of online space, free of mirroring, reflexive judgements. Taking up Irigaray's images and ideas, I imagine a blended university curriculum that allows the lecturer (and the student) to find peace and solitude in

> a silent online space
> a space free of mirrored, reflexive judgements,
> a space for reading, listening and contemplation,
> a space that I can quit with a click, and swap for
> another warmer, noisier space, where we are together
> a space where we are present to the other,
> without grasping and appropriation,
> the space of the safe, symbolic touch that listens and witnesses.

This is the moral, ethical lesson and possibility of online learning that participants in flexible, blended education contexts might learn, practise and apply - a new pedagogical relation for new (enterprising) times in higher education.

> To leave the other to be, not to possess him in any way, to contemplate him as an irreducible presence, to relish him as an inappropriable good, to see him, to listen to him, to touch him, knowing that what I perceive is not mine. Sensed by me, yet remaining other, never reduced to an object. (Irigaray, 2001, p. 46)

Archiving the Facilitator

> The archive has always been a pledge, and like every pledge, a token of the future. (Derrida, 1998, p. 18)

As I have discussed, the lecturer is presently erased in much of the research literature and in Australian higher education policy on teaching and learning. She is ignored online by shy and diligent students. As Rahime pointed out, managers don't drop by for a chat ("Just send on the paperwork – or, better still, put it online"!). What the teacher actually does is of declining interest, McWilliam (2000) writes. De-responsibilised of her students, the teacher must take responsibility instead for herself, making sure she works hard, documents all of her work and self-development, and identifies her excellence for others to scrutinise and judge. The teacher's pledge, or promise, to respond to the student is no longer relevant or possible. However, a new facilitator pledge of (future) accountability to management is made via the archive that is created of documents that record one's efforts and leave evidence of one's excellence for future scrutiny. The facilitator's response as a posting to a threaded online discussion disappears and reappears for someone to recognise tomorrow, later, perhaps never. When all is read and done, the facilitator will have been archived along with the WebCT resources and discussions that she set up and facilitated. In fact, the

remains of the online “subjects” mentioned in this study are archived always-already on servers (for a fore*see*able future) in several universities in south-eastern Australia.

“The archive should *call into question* the coming of the future”, declares Derrida (1998, pp. 33-34; author’s italics), as he leaves a footprint impression in the soft volcanic ash on the rim of Mt Vesuvius. The archive is “a troubled and troubling notion”, inhabited by our emotions and fear, for it brings us face-to-face with our future and our mortality, Derrida observes. Traces of the compliant, faceless online facilitator are archived on servers for the future, scrutable, potentially repeatable, and loyal to the memory of forestalling the uncertainties of the future.

> It is a question of the future, the question of the future itself, the question of a response, of a promise and of a responsibility for tomorrow. The archive: if we want to know what that will have meant, we will only know in times to come. Perhaps. Not tomorrow but in times to come, later on or perhaps never. (Derrida, 1998, p. 36)

Infinity. Derrida might be addressing Lévinas, but is he also reassuring an anxious risk manager, impatient like a child, who wants tomorrow to come now - with all its (as yet unknown) surprises and dangers? Perhaps. The prospect of the archive is unsettling, for its permanence calls to mind unbidden thoughts of time passing, impermanence and death. The archive of an online LMS preserves visible traces of the facilitator who is no more - visible traces that can be viewed, measured and judged by university managers and others. But the archive is not just preserved in the form of online teaching. Indeed it extends to all inscription, impression, writing and electronic documentation of excellence in the enterprise university. The *curriculum vitae*, the e-portfolio, the teaching excellence awards application and, indeed, setting and pledging to one’s teaching performance management goals for the next twelve months, are all acts and texts of the archive. In being archived, the facilitator has fulfilled a responsibility to management and a promise to the future. The archive is also an affirmation of the future, in a time of uncertainty. A response from the

future, or in the future, is an undecidable, and so we document our selves in uncertainty. “So here is what we *believe we know* at least, here is the appearance; the other will never again respond…. [But] a phantom speaks…. perhaps he does not respond, but he speaks” (Derrida, 1998, p. 62; author’s italics). I hear a voice of reflexive doubt and wonder.

Confronted by the uncertainty and undecidability of the archive, by unknown voices, and by the potential scrutiny of one’s teacher self, preserved in this manner, it is not difficult to appreciate how at least blended learning (and teaching) might remain attractive to the performer/carer/director-lecturer, if not the least for its face-to-face moments. And it is in the delayed listening and silence of online posts and messages, that lecturers might learn the conditions of a new university pedagogy.

Significance of the Study

This empirical study of academic identities will make a distinctive contribution to the field of academic development and flexible, online learning. The thesis has questioned assumptions around the discourse of “student learning”, and it invites academics, developers, educational designers and researchers in the field of ICT and flexible learning to think more deeply about the identity and role of the lecturer in the enterprise university. I have illuminated some of the effects on lecturers of the shift in relational ethics and values that are occurring in university teaching and learning, and shown how the impacts on teachers (and learners) are not merely attributable to new technologies or online learning *per se*, but are in fact “technologies” for monitoring and governing the pedagogical work of lecturers’ (and students) in the enterprise university. These insights are intended to generate discussion, critical debate and further research in the field of online teaching and learning more broadly, and a useful starting point, clearly, is the ideologically-driven inevitability of ICT in university teaching and learning.

This thesis offers a timely, inventive perspective on academics' experiences of flexible, and online learning. It acknowledges critical, theoretical work that already exists on new or changing academic identities and the move online (Clegg et al., 2003; Davies, 2005b; Evans & Nation, 2000; McWilliam, 1999, 2002, 2004; McWilliam & Palmer, 1995; McWilliam et al., 1999; McWilliam & Taylor, 1996; Taylor et al., 1996), but most importantly adds academics' voiced experience in support to this theoretical body of knowledge. The fact that I have elicited and analysed lecturers' own metaphors, to draw out their articulation of the issues and uncertainties of changing pedagogical contexts in higher education, distinguishes my research from the previously cited studies. The contextual descriptions of the teaching metaphors, and my interpretation of these case studies, are novel approaches elsewhere too.

I am stirred, if a little apprehensively, by the prospect of disseminating the findings of this study in the broader, less critical field of ICT in higher education, and indeed in the fields of academic development as well as that on higher education teaching and learning. The critical perspectives of the previously cited authors are rarely heard in the research communities of ICT in higher education, and I face a challenge in finding ways to engage mindfully and thoughtfully with those peers who zealously endorse the practices of student-centred e-learning.

However, the thesis will be significant if it fosters further research into, for example, academics' perceptions of what it is to teach in a student-centred manner (online, blended, face-to-face). On this point, Boud (2005, p. 32) has called for "a wider appreciation of what learner-centred might mean". This study suggests the possibility, too, for looking closely at the discourses and agents that determine curriculum within and across the disciplines; what assumptions about learning are being realised in the move to a less responsive, less risky technogogy (or, online "technology of the self"; see chapter 8). In these times of self-managing, enterprising teacher and learners, we also need to know more about the emotional work of online teaching and learning. The approach and processes, as

described in this chapter, that were used to gather, analyse and interpret the data (the conversational approach, metaphor elicitation, metaphor-based case studies, analysis of metaphor using writings of Lévinas, review of findings in light of post-structuralist identity theory regarding the enterprising individual) may be adaptable to other issues and contexts in higher education. As well, there is scope for a similar study to this that utilises Actor Network Theory (ANT) as its theoretical framework. Above all, there is a need for more mindful, sympathetic discussion about the changing role of the academic who uses ICT.

The findings may merit dissemination beyond research and academia, into the media and the public sphere. The communicative challenge will be to acknowledge antipathy towards university academics and lecturers in particular, and at the same time stimulate interest and reflection on the need for, and the role of, the university lecturer in these "student-centred" times in universities. Such discussions will likely move to a consideration of values about adult education, learning and knowledge in the contemporary university. I believe the thesis will have made a useful contribution, too, if others, less familiar with this methodology and the issues with which I have grappled, find it engaging and thought-provoking. While some readers will turn to the metaphor case studies and enjoy scrutinising some of the participants' quotes (this I know from sharing my work previously with relatives, fellow researchers and at public presentations), I hope that others will be tempted to read more deeply into other chapters and sections.

Finally, in all of these research communities and forums, I would like, above all, to draw attention to university lecturers and the work that they do. Years ago, a developer colleague asked me, "Why is it important to know how academics think about themselves?" I have pondered the assumptions of this question, as well as my response to it, at length, but I struggle to find a confident reply. Why is this? As my literature review demonstrated, there is little sympathy for the fears and anxieties of so-called "resistant" academics who make the move online. Much as I would like to encourage more reflection about, and appreciation, for university lecturers and their performing, caring, directing

identities, I know now that the lecturer role is changing and these identities are fading, as enterprise cultures tighten their grip on university teaching and learning.

Chapter 9

Responding to Change

> Oftentimes those who come forward to speak, to speak publicly, thereby interrupting the animated whispering, the secret or intimate exchange that always links one deep down inside to the dead friend or master, those who can be heard in a cemetery, end up addressing *directly, straight on*, the one who, as we say is no longer, is no longer living, no longer there, who will no longer respond; with tears in their voice, they sometimes speak familiarly to the other who keeps silent, calling upon him without detour or mediation, apostrophizing him, greeting him or confiding in him.
>
> (Derrida, 1996, pp. 1-2; author's italics)

As a survivor (of a national DE project and faculty restructuring), I have taken up my "entrusted responsibility" (Derrida, 1996, p. 5; Lévinas, 2002b) to write this archive, this thesis. I have wanted to come forward, and speak publicly, and address my colleagues, the fading, disappearing lecturers who still linger sometimes in the half-light of empty, cold lecture halls and wood-lined faculty corridors of the university.

An Entrusted Responsibility

In the thesis introduction, I drew attention to matters in academic development that concerned me in terms of how we developers promote, manage, and cope with institutional change in learning and teaching, and how we help academics to do so. As this study developed, I started to understand better the practices of judgementalism and *othering* in academic development work, in changing institutional contexts where our developer allegiance is questioned and challenged by those with whom we work. My thesis has helped me to appreciate how academics are experiencing change in their teaching, and my research has revealed the ethical, moral impacts of that change on lecturer identities as expressed through their relationships with their students. I have examined the de-

traditionalisation and de-responsibilisation of university teaching via the lens of teachers metaphors focussed on face-to-face and online teaching, to show how becoming an online facilitator also means that the university lecturer and student/s experience a loss of ability to respond spontaneously and with care. The lecturer no longer has a direct sense of responsibility for student learning, and this shift is supported further by institutional control over curriculum. Now I understand more about this moral, pedagogical and indeed ideological shift, how am I to act? (How) can I define my agency and my *responsibility* when my role involves supporting the expansion of flexible, online and blended learning? In this closing piece I will explore a range of responses to the changing human, moral context of higher education learning and teaching that has provoked this thesis.

While I have an entrusted responsibility to speak up, it is not essentially my intention to elicit sympathy for (white, middle class) academics (McWilliam, 1999, p. 159). However, I do believe that the research literature is remiss, and that higher education policy on academics' and ICT is calculating, by ignoring the importance of university teaching, and in not fully acknowledging the fears of academics under pressure of change. As my analysis of their teacher identities, (through the metaphors of performing, caring, and directing) revealed, their teaching was scarcely indifferent or lacking in student-centredness. Lecturers are aware that their teaching is being overlooked and undervalued by the university and its management, and their declining sense of pedagogical worth is reinforced by the fact that they may feel less central and less responsible in terms of online student learning. Yet the participants in this study were not all victims, and they have responded – or reacted - bravely to their circumstances, in resourceful or necessary ways.

Grief and Mourning

Some writers in the field have suggested that academics need to acknowledge and mourn the passing of "how things used to be". Writers such as Martin (1999), Taylor (1999) and Trowler (1998) have identified and engaged with notions of loss, grief and mourning as a consequence of changing academic work and academic life. Martin reflects on the grief-

change process in terms of an adapted chronology: the letting go of the past and the present, moving through an uncertain transition, and a recognition of new beginnings (adapted from Bridges (1991), as cited in Martin, 1999, p. 130). Taylor considers change, grief and mourning in academic life from a variety of perspectives that all demand more energy, and "effortful thinking" on the part of academics.

> Academics are under increasing pressure to align their thinking with purposes that reflect universities' commercial interests and the imperative to increase efficiency and flexibility…. Academics should extend their capacity for thinking to include all aspects of their work, especially their teaching. The capacities for thinking, for scepticism and doubt, need to be applied equally to traditional practices, as to those that are emergent. (Taylor, 1999, p. 156)

> But this refocusing is no simple matter. It will require the development of new expertise, new capacities – new learning. While learning is a risky business, it remains the best bet for ensuring personal satisfaction and a continuing role for academics into the future. (Taylor, 1999, p. 158)

When I consider these suggestions I find myself saying (and sighing), "Not more thinking, more self-scrutiny, more learning!" The refrains of letting go (such as Martin discusses), and acknowledging transitions and new beginnings, can sound like empty platitudes at times. Yet here Taylor advocates the practice of critical reflection, not merely as a self-scrutinising tool of enterprise culture, but also as a remedy for coping with loss and grief in times of institutional change. How we contemplate and analyse change becomes important to our future role and "personal satisfaction", and to being able to move on. As a first response to change, one can escape and make a new beginning.

Moving On

In this study, those who identified most strongly with the performing orientation of university teaching were also moving on. Seb is contemplating retirement. Paul has now resigned his university post to work in a government department, where he identifies risk, develops risk plans and prepares emergency management manuals – all with the opportunity to indulge in risky, outdoor adventures from time to time! Evan chose to pursue his disciplinary research via a prestigious national research grant he was awarded and, in so doing, he made the move away from his teaching responsibilities at a time when the "winds of change" were sweeping through his departmental context. Ron accepted a redundancy package from his university, and at his university farewell in November 2005 he launched some acerbic parting shots at capitalist, enterprise culture in universities. He closed his farewell PowerPoint presentation with some "Lathamesque retirement reflections". Next to an image of the Australian Prime Minister, he concluded:

- So it's not surprising I was offered a redundancy package by the University.
- Clearly it's cheaper to employ younger, lower paid, contract workers than old academics with tenure (and attitude) like me!
- In keeping with John Howard's brave new world of IR "flexibility" and "Fair pay" commissions! (Ron, Farewell Presentation (.pdf file), November 23, 2005)

Ron continues to find ways to operate strategically with/in enterprise culture. The last I heard, he was enjoying his retirement.

> Ironically, [the] University has now made me an "Adjunct Senior Research Fellow". That way they can claim my articles but don't have to pay a salary! In return I get library access (which is useful)! I'm still getting stuck into issues via IT… (Ron, email communication, February 22, 2006)

Critical Agency

Ron draws my attention to the importance of agency - for both academics and academic developers. That is, if I/we decide to stay within the enterprise institution, are there new ways of working within the enterprise that also allow you to get "stuck into issues"? Like Ron, I recognise that I am implicated as a neo-liberal subject (Davies, 2005b; Rose, 1996) who has exerted, and who experiences, the "technologies" of enterprise and excellence in education contexts. However, it would be all too easy to render myself as a helpless subject of corporate institutional structures, and sit passively in my office waiting for the next directive and performative exercise from on high. I am part of the enterprise system, and not virtuously separate from it. If academics are being implicated as middle managers and facilitators in new curricular models of student learning, if there is now "limited time for personal relationships to develop with students" and "the traditional attractions and pleasures of academic life [are] felt to be waning" (Trowler, 1998, p. 133), then I wonder about how I might perhaps help create the conditions for new relationships, new attractions and new pleasures in academic life.

Perhaps in academic development I can make new spaces and find new opportunities for fostering individual and collective agency. There is a need for "critical companionship" (Walker, 2004), for new ways of getting together and discussing and challenging the identities, visions and values of higher education. Anderson (2004, p. 198) writes that academics need to work together to make their case heard, "in order to develop a more coherent strategy and co-operative approach" to the problems they face. Cranton and Carusetta (2002) point out the lack of opportunity for collaboration and discussion about teaching and they call for the creation of new contexts where teaching is valued, such as cross-disciplinary foundational courses which would allow faculty who are interested in teaching and student learning to get together, discuss their teaching. Taylor and colleagues (1996) also write of fostering community and conversations, and clearly there may be solidarity in numbers. In fact I work less with individuals these days (unlike when I began) and more with groups and teams. "Although some writers advocate the importance of

faculty developing relationships with each other, talking about teaching, and working together, this does not, in practice, occur very often" (Cranton & Carusetta, 2002, p. 172)

Reassuringly, in the literature on academic development and university, there are calls to teach university students (and academics) ideology critique and critical literacy (Clegg et al., 2003; Davies, 2005a; Kreber, 2005; Rowland, 2000). This is a project to which I am already committed in terms of my responsibilities and teaching in my unit's postgraduate programs for university lecturers. In my view, Walker (2004) best summarises the challenge of all university teaching.

> The teaching question becomes something like: How do I/we teach in ways which foster the ethical and democratic political imagination of our students so that they are able to see the world from other points of view, understand themselves in relation to the world, and grasp their own agency in relation to knowledge and action in an uncertain world? (Walker, 2004, p. 145)

Walker (2004), p. 145) writes that paralysis (eg. sitting passively in my office) in the face of unpropitious institutional culture is pointless, and that moments of transformation point to hopefulness. She proposes that lecturers ought to work rigorously and creatively at opening up critical, counter-cultural pathways, or "pedagogies of beginning". In a similar fashion, Kreber (2005) describes a critical scholarship of teaching that is based on the intellectual, practical and critical work to be done by university teachers so as to facilitate (that word again) student development towards particular "life-long" educational goals: self-management, personal autonomy and social responsibility. In particular, academics need to consider the extent to which teaching practices are aimed at the empowerment and emancipation of students. The first two goals are familiar and resonate with Rose's (1996) analysis of the enterprising individual. The third goal – that of social responsibility – is laudable, possible, appropriate. Yet, taking into account the findings of this thesis

regarding the loss of response and sociality in online communication, I can't help but wonder whether this third goal is being undermined by the expansion of ICT.

And so I intend to advocate blended teaching and learning, and to model and advocate the retention of face-to-face development opportunities and learning pedagogies. The findings of this thesis, have confirmed what for me was previously intuitive advice: that face-to-face pedagogies offer possibilities for interaction, response and responsibility, and they remain important sites for fostering the critical dialogue and collective engagement that are necessary for reading and challenging the hierarchies, elitism, and power structures that seek to control the lives and souls in universities and throughout society. Ron's reference to "getting stuck into issues" continues to bother me, push me, challenge me as a neoliberal subject.

Moving Sideways, Betwixt and Between

In this study, Jane and Seb made the move sideways to management by becoming Heads of School. Both claimed to miss their students, and appeared to be ambivalent about their lessened teaching loads, yet they expressed a commitment to improving circumstances for their teaching colleagues. The possibility of insider agency is discussed in the literature on universities, academics and change (Anderson, 2004; Blackmore, 2001; Blackmore & Sachs, 2000; Gale & Kitto, 2003; Harris, 2005; Walker, 2002). According to Gale and Kitto (2003, p. 510), what is required is for academics to "get into the prevailing game and transform it", while acknowledging that it is unrealistic and "inflexible" to adopt a position of pure critique. They advocate using existing panoptic technologies such as e-mail to re-direct the flow of disciplinary power and open pathways of resistance. "The precariousness of surveillance networks in educational institution[s] can actually serve to facilitate the strategic appropriation and performance of informal and formal positions, in tandem with a critical stance" (Gale & Kitto, 2003, p. 513).

I feel more inclined to Judyth Sachs' (2004) writings about managing change mindfully through leadership and "deliberative democracy". The liminal status of middle management, (and I would argue academic development) locate one "betwixt and between" power structures, with access to different networks and individuals in the institution. This has been true certainly of those who have pursued policy and development roles related to ICT and flexible online learning, where progression through promotion has been recognisably rapid. In this field we sometimes find ourselves like Sachs, "sitting uneasily at the table", taking risks and enacting what she terms "collegial, activist professionalism" which require us to work strategically in ways that are negotiated, collaborative, socially critical, future oriented, strategic and transparent (Sachs, 2004, p. 114). I remain committed to collegial, activist professionalism as a strategy for ensuring that academics' experiences of change and ICT are heard and acknowledged in university policy and planning. Before I began this thesis I believe I was more inclined towards an ideologically naïve, "eco-romantic" (Land, 2001) orientation or stance on academic development – an orientation that places importance on individual development and on the personal growth and well-being of the individual (academic) within the institution. The thesis has transformed me too, towards what Land (2004) now terms a liberating, "collegial" orientation.

Collegial Activities

In terms of collegial strategies that might foster critical conversations, I have been thinking of establishing a reading group at my university on ethics in teaching and learning, where we might read short essays and scholarly papers, as suggested by group members, and discuss how these might connect with matters of change in higher education teaching and learning. The reading group is designed first of all to foster imaginative reading/s and critical conversation/s in a field that is still prone to phenomenographic certitude, and an up-shot may well be collaborative research (such as journal and conference papers, in particular). Another strategy that I have been considering is the establishment of an international mailing list on Spirituality in Higher Education (SHEd). This interest stems

largely from the reading and reflection on the ethics and morality of university teaching (and teachers, and learners) with which I have engaged in the creation of this doctoral thesis. While there exist such special interest groups (SIG) for schools (and there is a "Spirituality in Education" SIG in the American Education Research Association), there are none I know of that address matters of the heart and soul in higher education. As an active member of the CAD Collective[11], I contribute to online discussions, conference papers and collaborative journal articles. The CAD Collective engages with the scholarship of academic development via discussion and collaboration around counter-narratives, transgressive topics and non-canonical perspectives on academic development. This group nurtures my thinking, and establishes a model of collective reflection and dialogue that can be adapted to other agendas, such as spirituality and ethics of higher education teaching and learning.

With energy and resilience, perhaps I/we can embrace enterprise culture, and find ways to create new opportunities and new selves. I seek to maintain a critically reflexive ethical awareness, and share that awareness and those skills with others, and so I expect to continue modelling blended teaching and learning practices in my own teaching, with necessary opportunities for critical debriefing and reflection on the impact and insights gained from being online and being face-to-face, and the implications of this for how we blend and integrate these experiences in the contemporary curriculum. I run workshops, seminars and lunchtime get-togethers on blended and online teaching for academic staff where I have already, and where I will continue to speak of insights from my research. This is also a prime site for developing that new, institutionally sanctioned Affinity-identity (Gee, 2001), the facilitator. According to Gee, the power of the Affinity–identity is traced to participation and sharing within a collective. And so a lunchtime gatherings, in formal and informal seminar interactions, online and face-to-face, I can create opportunities for "facilitators of blended learning" to probe, negotiate and critique their teacher responsibility.

[11] Challenging Academic Development (CAD) Collective mailing list - archives and subscription details available at: http://mailman.ucc.usyd.edu.au/mailman/listinfo/itl-cad

The colleagues who turn up to such events pursue their online teaching with interest and are keen to share what they have been doing. I expect to continue to welcome and communicate with colleagues like Zhang, Rose, Cora and Aurea. Things continue to run smoothly and properly for Zhang. Like Rose, Cora and Aurea in this study, he continues to teach online and blend in, literally and figuratively. Adapting to change appears to be easier for newer academics like Rose and Cora, who had never known "how things used to be". They continue to explore ways of blending student-centred learning, and in so doing they were (and are) being seen to conform in a proper, performative manner, their efforts aligning well with the requirements for teaching excellence. Aurea (who was fascinated watching her students learn online) is reporting problems in some of her blended undergraduate classes, where students have accused her, via the teaching evaluations process, of lightening her teaching workload while increasing theirs. Why am I not surprised? These are serious allegations that will have to be brought to the attention of Aurea's colleagues and faculty management. These are the sorts of matters to be discussed at another staff lunchtime gathering too maybe. I also hope to continue to engage with those who remain wary of online learning, like Rahime and Hilary in this study. Rahime remained wary of online learning, arguing that it was inappropriate to the discipline she taught. ("It is a discipline about people"). She was mindful too, that any move to extend her online teaching would put her teaching colleagues under pressure. When I last heard from Hilary in August 2004, she was "doing nothing online: not teaching Communication", but she expressed her concern and care for students in the face of pragmatic managerialism. "I think that most students who enrol at SRU expect and want f2f teaching, with the result that they resent video, videoconferencing and online" (Hilary, email communication, August 5, 2003).

Academic Dispositions

I listen and take these concerns seriously. There has been some discussion in the literature of the qualities and attributes of academics and developers in the enterprise university.

Blackmore and Sachs (2000) recommend irreverence and inventiveness, along with the qualities of irony, instantaneity and intuition. Erica McWilliam (1999) maintains that education nowadays lack enchantment and fun (as comedy, clowning, the carnivalesque, and as risk). There is an irony deficiency in education.

> Irony is a seductive means to *underline and undermine* those ways of speaking and thinking and being that have come to characterize the good teacher – all those formulas and visions and truths and knowledge objects that we use to make ourselves into quality professionals, or nurturing caregivers, or ethical workers or reflective practitioners or critical feminists or facilitators of learning. (McWilliam, 1999, p. 185; author's italics)

Others, too, are trying to "lighten up". Walker (2001) advocates fun and enjoyment, along with "honesty, courage and self-knowledge" (Walker, 2002). She adds to these attributes Coffield's (1999, as cited in Walker, 2001, p. 200) suggested remedies, "love, work, music, humour, friends, doubt and good red wine", so as to set in train "a 'strictly ballrooom' journey of fellow travelers, dancing our own steps and rolling out our maps together as we work to reinvent our professional identities" (Walker, 2001, p. 200). In my view these are but momentary, and ultimately empty, distractions from what is a serious business, and even as we indulge in them, they are not satisfying in the longer term. And whereas McWilliam (1999, p. 167) might be more inclined to hedonism (the carnivalesque, the grotesque), I find peace, new energy, and creativity in quieter moments where I watch my mind, and other minds, continually drawn into the turbulence of new words, new metaphors, and new discourses. This is about "the struggle over the teacher's soul" (Ball, 2003), "the psychic schism" (Mackenzie, McShane, Wilcox, 2005; 2006) that emerges in the process of performative fabrication, as neoliberal technologies fine-tune the "government of the modern soul" (Rose, 1996, p. 79). This is sad and serious work too. Uncertainty and the demands of performative culture make us all prey to damaging dualist thinking. The more we feel divided in our individual selves, the more easily we lapse into self-other frames of thinking, and create schisms between our selves and others. "To

decide to live divided no more is less a strategy for attacking other people's beliefs than an uprising of the elemental need for one's own beliefs to govern and guide one's life" (Palmer, 1998, p. 168).

Under the banner of CAD Collective conference symposium in 2005, I collaborated with two Canadian colleagues (whom I have not yet met face-to-face) on a paper that depicted some actual dilemmas of development work in times of enterprise and change in academic life. With my co-authors Heather and Susan (see Mackenzie, McShane & Wilcox, 2005, 2006), I proposed we might begin to conceive of, and talk about academic identity work, in terms of "dispositions". In discussing the notion of "a pedagogy for uncertainty", Barnett (2004) proposes a set of "dispositions" that in his view students need in order to cope with an uncertain future.

> Among such dispositions are carefulness, thoughtfulness, humility, criticality, receptiveness, resilience, courage, and stillness. It is, perhaps strangely, dispositions such as these that will yield the "adaptability", "flexibility" and "self-reliance" that the corporate sector so often declares it looks for among its graduate employees. So these dispositions will have economic and performative value (Barnett, 2004, pp 258, 259).

These dispositions offer real strategies for establishing and building connection, coherence and relevance in the life-worlds of, and interactions between, academic developers and lecturers, as they cope with the performative demands of enterprise management and culture in universities. They are fortifying qualities that I have started to embody mindfully in my professional practice and collegial interactions. These dispositions also align readily with the moral and ethical thought of Lévinas, although I also connect them to key ethical principles of Buddhism, in particular to Bentz and Shapiro's (1998) writings on scholarly "mindful inquiry" and Irigaray's (1996) Buddhist-influenced work on spiritual breath and "inspiration". Her writing on listening and witnessing in particular offer a personal response for how to live and respond to the dilemmas and violence of neoliberal

management, in an era when self-management and self-responsibility are privileged over responsibility to/for the other.

> I am listening to you, as to another who transcends me, requires a transition to a new dimension. I am listening to you: I perceive what you are saying, I am attentive to it, I am attempting to understand and hear your intention. Which does not mean: I comprehend you, I know you, so I do not need to listen to you and I can even plan a future for you. No I am listening to you as someone and something I do not know yet, on the basis of a freedom and an openness put aside for this moment. (Irigaray, 1996, pp. 116-117)

In the spirit of Irigaray, I continue to witness and listen to my colleagues' stories and circumstances, without blame or judgment. I need - we need - to learn to attend to the other. Inner and outer dividedness are part of the human condition and, as Parker Palmer (1998, p.167) points out, "there are extremes of dividedness that become intolerable when one can no longer live without bringing one's actions into harmony with one's inner life". Drawing on Levinas' (1991) ideas of proximity and approach to the other, Todd (2003) puts the case for the significance of listening and attending to the other in pedagogical relations.

> My relation to the other through listening is first and foremost a quality of relationality to difference that opens me up for change…. Listening… as an approach to the other that signifies "I can change", is a responsible mode of relationality in that it is a nonviolent and unpredictable response to alterity, even when my passivity results in my own discomfort. The one who listens risks nothing less than an alteration of the self in responding to another's speech, and it is within this context of risk and alteration that listening is required for learning to take place. (Todd, 2003, p. 136)

At this point I am reminded of a colleague's advice to me one evening after a difficult day with difficult personalities. "Kim", she said matter-of-factly, "You can't change other people. You can only change yourself." As an academic developer, and as a Buddhist,

always-already aware of fear, othering, and uncertainty in my life-worlds, I take undivided comfort and mindful guidance from Barnett's (2004) dispositions of carefulness, thoughtfulness, humility, criticality, receptiveness, resilience, courage, and stillness, and Irigaray's (1996) invocations to listening, and silence.

> I am listening to you: I encourage something unexpected to emerge, some becoming, some growth, some new dawn, perhaps. I am listening to you prepares the way for the not-yet-coded, for silence, for a space for existence, initiative, free intentionality, and support for your becoming. I am listening to you… as the revelation of a truth that has yet to manifest itself – yours and that of the world revealed through and by you. I give you a silence in which your future - and perhaps my own, but with you and not as you and without you – may emerge and lay its foundation. (Irigaray, 1996, p. 117)

Appendix A

Expression of Interest Form (NMU)

From: Kim McShane - PhD Research Study:

Technology Transforming Academics:
A Study of Academics Adapting to Online Teaching

Seeking Expression of Interest - Information Sheet for Lecturers

Dear colleague,

I am currently seeking expressions of interest from academic colleagues who might be willing and interested in participating in my PhD research study. I am investigating what happens to academics' identities and teaching relationships when they embark on web-based teaching. The research is qualitative and interpretative, and will be organised around case studies of 10 lecturers who engage in online and face-to-face teaching. I have commenced researching this topic with 5 academics in a Victorian university. I work in academic staff development (Flexible and Online Learning) in the Institute for Teaching and Learning at the University of Sydney.

As a participant in this PhD research study you would be required to:

1. complete a teaching profile sheet, giving your contact details, teaching history, current and projected online unit/s and online teaching activities
2. participate in 3 one-hour (taped) conversations, plus other informal conversations, before,
   during and after a period of online teaching, spanning 2 - 3 semesters
3. select and share with me 2 - 4 online teaching materials and/or extracts (eg. unit outline, staff pages, web pages, e-mails with students, discussion list thread/s)
4. communicate with me via e-mail once every fortnight/3 weeks about your online teaching
5. write one short, informal reflective piece about your experience of online teaching (optional)
6. comment on and verify conversation transcripts and interpretative material (optional).

This is not an action research project (and therefore there is no expectation that you will engage in any action-reflection-evaluation cycle). I aim to record and interpret your self-perceptions of the challenges and changes which may occur (as a result of your online teaching) to your online and face-to-face teaching. You are welcome to participate in the interpretative process as far as your interest and time allow.

I'm seeking lecturer participants who have been teaching face-to-face classes at university level for a minimum of 3 years, and who have varying degrees of online teaching experience. You should be available to participate in the study over 2-3 semesters from January 2002, and be intending to teach some online unit components during Semesters 1 and/or 2 2002).

The study has full Ethics Approval from my institution of candidature, The University of Technology, Sydney, (UTS HREC 00/40A, 31.07.00) and from [university name, approval number]

My PhD supervisors at The University of Technology, Sydney are:

- Professor Lyn Yates, Faculty of Education, (Kuring-gai Campus), Tel.:02-9514 5230,
  e-mail: lyn.yates@uts.edu.au, and
- Professor David Boud, Faculty of Education (Haymarket Campus), Tel.: 9514 3945, e-mail: david.boud@uts.edu.au .

If you are interested in becoming a participant in this research study, please contact me and I can discuss my project further with you, and provide you with more information and a consent form.

With thanks in anticipation,

Kim McShane

Appendix B

Participant Information Sheet (SRU)

'Technology Transforming Academics': Participant Information Sheet

Name: _______________________ Pseudonym: ________________

Fac./Dep't: ____

Campus: _____________ Tel.: ______________________

e-mail: ____

Date & time of interview: ___________ __________________

Location: ____

---

1. How long have you been teaching at university level? (other levels?)

2. What subjects (and levels) have you taught at university level?

3. a. Have you had any experience in teaching distance education subjects? Y N

   b. Year & subject/s:

4. a. How long have you been using computers generally in your teaching role?

b. How long have you been using email? __________
(& mail lists bulletin boards chat rooms)?

c. How have you used computers in teaching: preparation, presentation, assessment….?

5A. **(Past online teaching)** Please list the subject/s (and levels) with which you have been involved that had an online component.

Subject & level	**Semester & year**	**Online component:**	**Comments:** **(eg. assessment?)**

5B. **(Current online teaching)** Please list the subject/s (and levels) which you are currently teaching that have an online component.

Subject & level	**Semester & year**	**Online component:**	**Comments:** **(eg. assessment?)**

6. a. Have you taught any of the students in this subject before? Y N
b. Details (subject, level):

7. a. Do you intend offering and teaching this (or another) subject with an online component in the next 12 - 18 months? Y N

b. Details (subject title, likely semester/year):

8. a. Have you taught this subject in the past? Y N

b. How often?

c. What were its previous (traditional delivery) components?

9. Why have you introduced an online component into your teaching?

10 a. What online activities/areas have you planned?

b. What are these replacing in the previous version of the subject/s?

10a. Planned online activities	**10b. …replacing:**

11. What sorts of things are your students actually doing online?
(How often/ time involved?)

Online activites:	**Time & frequency commitments:**

12. How does the online component fit into the overall subject description and assessment? [copy of subject and assessment outline/s?]

13. In your view, what is the ratio of online to face-to-face (and other) teaching modes?

14. Please describe the other opportunities students have to contact you outside of teaching hours (mode, times):

Mode:	**Availability (where, when?)**

15. For reasons of confidentiality you will be identified in this research by a pseudonym.

Please suggest a name you'd like to take. ____________________

Appendix C

Participant Information Record (NMU)

'Technology Transforming Academics': Participant Information Record

This Information Record will be used to gather factual information about your teaching background and your online subject. The information you provide will facilitate our conversations. It will also document factual details about your teaching background and your online teaching intentions to assist me in my on-going research writing.

Your Name: ________________________ Pseudonym: _______________ (see p. 3)

Faculty: ____

School/Dep't: ____

Campus: ________________________ Tel.: _______________________

e-mail: ____

1. Your teaching background

   a. How long have you been teaching at university level? _________ years

   b. What subjects (and levels) have you taught at university level? Specific titles and codes are not necessary; please give a broad disciplinary description.

c. Have you had any experience in teaching distance education subjects?
N Y → If yes, please indicate:
year/s, subject/s, delivery modes:

2. Your use of computers

a. Approximately how long have you been using computers (personally, professionally)?
__________ years

b. How long have you been using:

e-mail?	____ years	mailing lists?	____ years
bulletin boards?	____ years	chatrooms?	____ years

c. If relevant, please indicate how you have used computers to support your teaching. (eg. preparation, presentation, assessment).

3. Your planned online teaching

a. Please provide details about the subject (ie. Unit of Study) you intend teaching which will have an online component: *(if more than one subject, print details on back of the opposite page)*

Subject title: ____

to be offered _____________ (year) ____________(semester).

b. Have you taught this planned subject in the past?
N Y If yes, when? ____________

c. How was the subject taught previously, in terms of delivery modes? (eg. lectures, tutorials, intensive blocks, readings, etc.)

d. With its planned online components, how will the subject be organised, in terms of delivery modes?

4. What are your reasons for 'making the move' to teaching (this subject) online?

5. What has made you interested in participating in this research study?

6. Your pseudonym:

For reasons of confidentiality, you will be identified in this research by a pseudonym. Please select a name you'd like to take, and write it into your details on page 1 of this Information Report.

Thank you for taking time to provide this information.

Kim McShane
February 2002

Appendix D

Topic Information Sheet (SRU)

Technology Transforming Academics: Possible topics…

1. Getting started: Talking about Teaching
- How have you learnt to teach, do you think?
- In your view the best thing about teaching is…?
- Can you recall any particular instances or moments when you felt your teaching was particularly successful?
- What about times when you felt your teaching was unsuccessful?

2. Prior Experience in Computers and Distance Education (ref. Profile sheet)
- How have you used computers in your teaching to date?
- Do you think the way/s you've used computers in your teaching has changed the way you interact with your students? Have you got any examples?
- E-mail? what you think of e-mail in teaching and learning?
- Distance education teaching?

3. Prior Experience in Online Teaching/Learning (ref. Profile sheet)
- You have used *X (& Y & Z)* in online teaching…
- How do you think your online teaching has changed over time (in terms of what you have designed/developed for the medium)?
- Do you think your online teaching role has changed over time? (How?)

4. Current Online Teaching
- Can you tell me a little more about how you conduct your online teaching…I'm wondering if you've changed where and when you communicate with your online students?
    - where? when during the week? time/s of the day?
- How does this compare with more traditional modes of contact? How do you feel about this?)
- You mention that your current students are doing A (& B & C) online.. How would you describe your online teaching role in this? What is it to 'teach' online do you think?
- Do you have an image or metaphor to characterise your lecturing/teaching role (online and/or face-to-face)?
- How would you describe your online relationship with your students?

5. Online Teaching and Perceptions about Changing Role & Practices
- Knowing what you know now, what do you think you can do, or are more likely to do, 'offline' as a tutor that can't be done online?
- And what do you think can be done online that you can't do otherwise?
- Do you think the way/s you've used the online components in your teaching has/have changed the way you interact with your students when you work with them face-to-face? (How so?)
- Do you think the experience of online teaching has changed the ways you see yourself in your teaching role, whether in online or face-to-face in the tutorial/ classroom/ lecture theatre?

Appendix E

Topic Information Sheet Conversation 1 (NMU)

Conversation Schedule #1: Talking about your teaching

- Tell me about your teaching….

…in terms of your university role, incl. research and service; or the importance of teaching to who you are and what you do. The best thing about teaching is…? How important is lecturing, tutorials, face-to-face teaching generally? Can you offer an image or metaphor to characterise your lecturing/teaching role (to date)?

- How have you learnt to teach?

- How would you characterise your relationship/s with your undergraduate students?

- Tell me about any particular beliefs or values you hold about teaching.

- Tell me a little about your planned online & face-to-face teaching choices (incl. which online resources and why).

- Anticipating your online teaching this semester:
  How do you think you will teach online (and face-to-face) now? How will you manage and integrate both? Any concerns about 'making the move' online? Things to look forward to?

- Tell me a little about your decision to 'make the move' to online teaching at this point in time… Your motives or reasons?

Appendix F

Topic Information Sheet Conversation 2 (NMU)

Conversation Schedule #2: Teaching Online in Semester 1

- Tell me about your online teaching this past semester…

…have you enjoyed your teaching, esp. in the unit [*unit title*]? (which aspects?) any 'interesting moments' for you, esp. in the online area components…? How did you organise your time (days & times?) and space (places?) for the online teaching? Have you had to develop or draw on any special skills or talents to help you **be** an online teacher? What distinguishes you from other users in the online space? (Do you have an online persona in fact?)

- Relationships with your students

How do you think your students have seen you as an online teacher in this unit? Do you think you've developed (a) distinctive online relationship/s with your students? Do you think the way/s you used the online components this semester changed the way that you would normally see / understand / relate to your students? Has having the online component/s changed the way that you interacted with your students when you worked with them face-to-face? (How so? Are there new assumptions at work?) Any student evaluation and feedback for Semester 1? (that you might want to mention!)

- Role Labels

What do you think of these labels? Do you see yourself in any of them while teaching this unit?
- 'instructor', 'designer' (in WebCT); filter, firefighter, facilitator, designer, editor, manager, discussion leader, content expert, helper, and marketer (Berge & Collins, 2000)

- Reflecting on 'Blended' Teaching…

What do you think you can you do/teach online that you can't do f2f? What can you do f2f that you can't do/teach online? How central or important was the f2f lecturing in this unit?

Appendix G

Topic Information Sheet Conversation 3 (NMU)

Conversation 3: Schedule of suggested topics

** Any queries about your involvement in this research…?*

1. Academic Identity and Teaching

What does' academic autonomy' mean to you?

Do you think your personality influences your teaching presence? (How is this expressed face-to-face and online?)

How have your colleagues reacted to your online teaching?

Why do academics value face-to-face teaching so? Why is it so important?

2. Revisiting your Teaching Metaphor

In our first chat you discussed your teacher/teaching metaphor. (*I pasted an extract of that discussion into the email message I sent you when organising this meeting*).

In light of the online teaching you've been doing, do you think this image or metaphor has changed in anyway?

3. Online teaching extracts…?

(With students' consent forms…?)

4. Other writing about your online teaching?

Are you willing to share **any other writing** you've done where you mention your online teaching? (committee reports, papers, admin e-mails..?) If so, please let me know at our meeting.

Appendix H

Log of Research Conversations

Note: In the body of the thesis, “Frank, C1b” means Conversation 1b with Frank; “Jane, C3” means Conversation 3 with Jane, and so on.

Southern Regional University

Seb:	1 November 1999
Paul:	1 November 1999
Zhang:	1 November 1999
Hilary:	15 November 1999
Ron:	3 December 1999

Northern Metropolitan University

Aurea

Conversation 1a	3 April 2002	1.25 - 1.55
Conversation 1b	12 April 2002	10.10 - 12.40
Conversation 2	26 August 2002	2.40 - 4.30
Conversation 3	30 April 2003	3.10 - 4.20

Rahime

Conversation 1	21 March 2002	10.10 - 11.40
Conversation 2	12 July 2002	1.40 - 3.45
Conversation 3	12 May 2003	3.15 - 4.40

Jane

Conversation 1a	11 April 2002	10.25 - 11.00
Conversation 1b	18 April 2002	2.10 - 3.40
Conversation 2	8 August 2002	10.25 - 11.35
Conversation 3	27 May 2003	9.40 - 10.45

Frank

Conversation 1a	9 April 2002	12.35 - 1.45
Conversation 1b	15 April 2002	2.30 - 3.45
Conversation 2	8 August 2002	3.30 - 4.45
Conversation 3	3 June 2003	4.20 - 6.00?

Evan

Conversation 1a:	28 February 2002	9.45 - 10.45
Conversation 1b:	14th March 2002	9.30 - 10.35
Conversation 2:	1st August 2002	10.20 - 11.50
Conversation 3:	19th May 2003	3.45 - 4.45

Rose & Cora

Conversation 1a:	1st March 2002	9.30 - 10.45
Conversation 1b:	14th March 2002	2.30 - 3.30
Conversation 2:	30th August 2002	9.30 - 10.40
Conversation 3:	6th May 2003	10.05 - 11.30

Appendix I

Teaching Metaphors of the Participants

Name	*Discipline, Years of University Teaching*	*Metaphor, Image*
Ron*	Health Sciences, 25 years	performer, model, (pastoral) carer, preacher, “do-gooder”, a resource, an “elder of the tribe”, an entrepreneur of ideas
Zhang*	Business (Chinese language, culture), 8 yrs	team leader, facilitator
Hilary*	Business (Communications), 17 years	mentor, facilitator, performer “Different subjects need different things [metaphors]”. Used to be a splashing fountain.
Seb*	Computer Science, 22 years	performer, hunter, trouble-shooter
Paul*	Health Science, 21 years	guide, mentor, Obi-Wan-Kenobi, facilitator, director, performer
Frank*	Medicine, 5 years (DE / ICT-only)	facilitator, avuncular (uncle-like)
Evan	Arts, 4 yrs	preacher, performer, talk show host, a moving target, hammer
Jane	Arts, 19 years	lamplighter, performer, content expert, leader, interpreter, guide
Aurea	Health Sciences. 23 years	she grows a big ear, big brain, big heart, big eye
Rose	Arts, 3 years	tour guide and social worker, stage manager and juggler, orchestra conductor; facilitator
Cora	Arts, 3 years	sports coach, social worker, facilitator online
Rahime	Arts, 16 years	No metaphor; all metaphors and none; in 3-way a “teacher – students – content” relationship

Note: Research Participants, Discipline, Years of University Teaching, Metaphor or Image. Names are all participant-selected pseudonyms.
*SRU participants (+ Frank), who were “technology enthusiasts” (Thompson & Holt, 1997).

Appendix J

NMU policy extract:

"Guidelines for Good Practice in Teaching & Learning"

Section XX.X Attributes of academic staff

Good practice means that

Academic staff:

- demonstrate a high level of knowledge and understanding of the subject material they teach
- in their teaching, demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how students learn, both generically and in their subject
- use methods for teaching and learning which are appropriate for the subject area and for the level of the academic program;
- use learning technologies which are appropriate to the context of learning
- demonstrate clearly the link between teaching, learning outcomes, and student assessment
- use teaching practices which are inclusive and non-discriminatory, as well as being respectful of, and sensitive to, differences among students
- monitor and evaluate their own teaching activities
- search for new ways to help student learning
- actively share ideas on teaching with other academic staff
- work as members of an educational team with shared goals
- support the application of quality assurance methods to improve the quality of student learning;

(this is to maximise the capacity of academic staff to contribute to student learning)

Section XX.XX Performance of academic staff

Good practice means that

- Each academic staff member has a regular opportunity for a confidential interview with the head, or other designated senior member of the Department, for the purpose of reviewing and documenting career progress and discussing opportunities for further career development
  (this is to maximise the educational development of each staff member)

- The Department actively provides and supports facilities and opportunities for self-assessment and peer review of the educational activities of each staff member
  (this is to maximise the educational development of each staff member, and to demonstrate the value placed on education by the Department)

- Student feedback on teaching (see Section X.X) includes information on the educational contributions of individual staff members, which is passed confidentially to the staff member concerned
  (this is to enable staff members to receive detailed feedback on student perceptions of their performance)

Appendix K

Final email message to the twelve research participants

Dear [name],

I am presently writing-up my PhD, and so first of all I want to say how much I appreciate your contributions to my project which is seeking to reclaim or at least say something critical about university teaching in a climate of university "**learning** and teaching". I expect to submit within the next 6 months.

I have one last favour to ask you, and if you can write back on one or both of these topics that would be terrific. You also have the right not to continue your involvement.

Q 1: Who is a facilitator?
I've noticed that mentioning the term 'facilitation' in higher education contexts can generate different reactions, responses and definitions. What does the term 'facilitating learning' mean to you? Are you a facilitator and/or, when do you become one?

Q. 2: Your final reflections on online teaching (and learning)?
I'd also invite you to please share any final reflections you have about your online teaching over the past 6/7 years. What has happened to your online teaching? Are you still teaching online and why (not)? Any observations about the context of your online teaching would also be appreciated.

Finally, I am happy to share chapters – or even the eventual thesis itself – with you. And you will be thanked in my Acknowledgements, by your pseudonym, of course!

Kind regards and
Many thanks in anticipation,
Kim

Glossary

Technical Terms and Abbreviations

CALL	computer-assisted language learning
chat	synchronous text-based communication
f2f	face-to-face
DE	Distance Education
ICT/s	Information and Communication Technology/technologies
IPod	Compact, personal (digital) music player
LMS	Learning Management Systems, eg. WebCT, BlackBoard, TopClass, FirstClass
MSN	MicroSoft Network: http://www.msn.com/
NMU	"Northern Metropolitan University" (a pseudonym, see chapter 4)
PBL	Problem-based learning
PG	Postgraduate
SRU	"Southern Regional University" (a pseudonym, see chapter 4)
UG:	Undergraduate
VoIP:	Voice over IP – audio-conferencing via the Internet, Internet telephony
WWW	World Wide Web, the web, the Internet, the net: The participants and I tended to use these terms interchangeably.

Definitions

There are a number of terms that the participants and I have used interchangeably or very precisely in this thesis.

Online Teaching and Learning and e-Learning

In the analysis and discussion of this study, **online** meant whatever **online** meant to the participants. **Online** was their understanding of the connected digital environments within which they taught and interacted with their students, whether that was the Internet, online CMC, email, indeed a LMS site). See page 9 of this thesis.

The term **e-learning** (electronic learning) is a more recent and "enterprising" term to denote student learning that is supported with Information and Communications Technologies (ICT). It is pertinent to my thesis that we rarely hear of "e-teaching". The term only assumed wider currency quite a while after I had commenced the study, and all the participants seemed to prefer to talk about **online learning**. For clarity wherever possible, I have avoided using it.

Computer-mediated communication (CMC) is understood as two-way communication and interaction between teachers and students, and between students. In the analysis and discussion chapters of this thesis, online CMC is understood by myself and the participants to include asynchronous email, discussion lists, or synchronous live chat.

Blended teaching and learning is the explicit integration of face-to-face and online teaching modes, contexts, teaching and learning activities, and assessment. Learning that occurs in both face-to-face and online contexts may be assessed in both discrete and integrated ways.

Teachers and Lecturers, Students and Learners

I have tended to use these sets of terms interchangeably in the thesis, and little significance should be attached to one or the other in the set. Where it was clear, I have used **teacher** to imply **university teacher**, or **lecturer.** Sometimes I have also substituted **the academic who teaches**. The term **lecturer** does not designate status (there were senior lecturers and an associate professor in the study); rather I used the terms **lecturer** and **lecturing** to designate the person and function of university teaching in the broadest sense.

Where necessary, I did refer to **tutoring/tutor** and course or subject **co-ordination/co-ordinator**, to distinguish these roles from "lecturer" and "teacher", etc.

Student and **learner** have been used interchangeably.

For the most part I have referred to the online lecturer as a **facilitator** or **(online) facilitator** – the latter acknowledging the fact that facilitators don't always engage with new technologies.

How Teaching and Learning were Organised

Different terms were used at the two university sites. For consistency I have used the following terms in the thesis:

> **Program** (ie. degree program): a series and combination of subjects that together qualify the student for the conferring of a degree award;

Course: generic term for a sequenced university education, made up of either/both "subject" and/or "program" of study;

Subject: a specific discipline-based study, usually one semester in length, sometimes comprising discrete smaller modules; in some universities subjects are known as "units" (of study);

Module: a short theme- or topic-based course of study.

How the Universities were Organised

At the two university sites, the administrative and/or disciplinary units of organisation were designated differently. **College** meant two very different administrative groupings in each of institutions, so instead I chose to refer to the largest organised unit at both universities as **Faculty**. As long as it did not breach confidentiality of identity for the participants, I have retained the term **School** or **Department** to refer to the next level of affiliation. The latter two terms both reflect specific disciplinary groupings and affiliations.

The Academic Developer

is also known in North American contexts as a **faculty developer** (similarly **academic development** is also termed **faculty development)**. In Australia, **instructional designers** tend to have general appointments rather than academic appointments, but this is another area where change is evident, and there is some overlap between the work of academic developers and instructional designers.

Bibliography

Althusser, L. (2002). Ideology interpellates individuals as subjects. In P. du Gay, J. Evans, & P. Redman (Eds.), *Identity: A reader* (pp. 31-38). London: SAGE: Publications Ltd.

Anderson, G. (2004). "Voices from the chalkface": The Senate inquiry into the capacity of public universities to meet Australia's higher education needs. *Studies in Higher Education, 29(2),* 185-200.

Asensio, M., Whatley, J., & Jones, C. (2001). Taking over someone else's design: Implications for the tutor's role in networked learning. *Association for Learning Technology Journal (ALT-J) 9(3),* 65-74.

Aubusson, P. (2002). Using metaphor to make sense and build theory in qualitative analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 7(4).* Retrieved April 26, 2006, from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR7-4aubusson.html

Australian Universities Teaching Committee (AUTC) and the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST). (2003a). *National Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Discussion paper.* Canberra: DEST.

Ball, S. J. (1990). Self-doubt and soft data: Social and technical trajectories in ethnographic fieldwork. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 3(2),* 157–171.

Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Educational Policy, 18(2),* 215-228.

Ballantyne, R., Bain, J., & Packer, J. (1997). *Reflecting on university teaching: Academics' stories.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Barcan, R. (1996). The body of the (Humanities) academic, or, "What is an academic?" *Southern Review, 29(2),* 128-145.

Barnett, R. (2000a). Supercomplexity and the curriculum. *Studies in Higher Education, 25(3),* 255-265.

Barnett, R. (2003). Academics as intellectuals. *Critical Review of International and Social Philosophy, 6(4),* 108-122.

Barnett, R. (2004). Learning for an unknown future. *Higher Education Research and Development, 23(3),* 247-260.

Bashir, T. (1998). Dangerous liaison: Academics' attitude towards open learning in higher education. *Open Learning, 13(1),* 43-45.

Bassey, M. (2000). *Case study research in educational settings.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and ambivalence.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (1995). *Life in fragments: Essays in postmodern morality.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Bauman, Z. (1997). Universities: Old, new and different. In A. Smith & F. Webster (Eds.), *Contested visions of higher education in society* (pp. 17-26). Buckingham, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education/Open University Press.

Beck, U. (1999). *World risk society.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Benfield, G. (2000). *Teaching on the web - exploring the meanings of silence.* Retrieved July 18, 2000, from RMIT University, ultiBASE website: http://ultimbase.rmit.edu.au/Articles/online/benfield1.htm
Bentz, V. M., & Shapiro, J. (1998). *Mindful inquiry in social research.* Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications Inc.
Berge, Z. (1995). Facilitating computer conferencing: Recommendations from the field. *Educational Technology, 35(1),* 22-30.
Berge, Z. (1997). Characteristics of online teaching in post-secondary, formal education. *Educational Technology, 37(3),* 35, 38-47.
Berge, Z. (1998). *Concerns of online teachers in higher education* (ISTE 1998 paper). Retrieved October 14, 1999, from http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~mpc3/berge/iste98.html
Berge, Z., & Collins, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Computer mediated communication and the online classroom.* Cresskill, NJ, USA: Hampton Press.
Berge, Z., & Collins, M. (2000). Perceptions of e-moderators about their roles and functions in moderating electronic mailing lists. *Distance Education, 21(1),* 81-100.
Biggs, J. (2003). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does.* Buckingham, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education/Open University Press.
Biggs, J., & Collis, K. (1982). *Evaluating the quality of learning: The SOLO Taxonomy.* New York: Academic Press.
Blackmore, J. (2001). Universities in crisis: Knowledge economies, emancipatory pedagogies, and the critical intellectual. *Educational Theory, 51(3),* 353-371.
Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (1997). Paradoxes of leadership and management in higher education in times of change: Some Australian reflections. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 3(10),* 1-16.
Boddy, G. (1997). Tertiary educators' perceptions of and attitudes toward emerging educational technologies. *Higher Education Research and Development, 16(3),* 343-356.
Boden, D., & Molotch, H. L. (1994). The compulsion of proximity. In R. Friedland & D. Palmer (Eds.). *NowHere: Space, time and modernity* (pp. 257-286). London: University of California Press.
Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA, USA: Allyn & Bacon.
Boud, D. (2005). ‘Aren’t we all learner-centred now?’ The bittersweet flavour of success. In P. Ashwin (Ed.). *Changing Higher Education: The development of learning and teaching* (pp. 19-32). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
Bowden, J., & Walsh, E. (Eds.). (2000). *Phenomenography.* Melbourne: RMIT University Press.
Brabazon, T. (2001). Internet teaching and the administration of knowledge. *First Monday*, 6(6), June 2001. Retrieved July 13, 2001, from http://firstmonday.org/issue6_6/brabazon/index.html
Brabazon, T. (2002). *Digital hemlock: Internet education and the poisoning of teaching.* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
Brew, A. (2001). *The nature of research: Inquiry in academic contexts.* London, Routledge Falmer.

British Educational and Communications Technology Agency. (2004, June). *A review of the research literature on barriers to the uptake of ICT by teachers.* Retrieved May 5, 2006, from http://partners.becta.org.uk/index.php?section=rh&rid=11254
Britzman, D. P. (2004). Monsters in literature. *Changing English, 11(2),* 253-265.
Brookfield, S. D. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning.* San Francisco, CA, USA: Jossey Bass.
Brown, C. (1998, December). *Generic class management strategies for an education lecturer in information technology.* Proceedings of the annual conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE) Conference, Wollongong, Australia.
Bunker, A., & Vardi, I. (2001, December). *Why use the online environment with face-to-face students? Insights from early adopters.* Proceedings of the annual conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE) Conference, Melbourne, Australia.
Callon, M. (1986). Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fisherman of St Brieuc Bay. In J. Law (Ed.) (1987), *Power, action and belief: A new sociology of knowledge?* (pp. 196-229). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Campbell-Gibson, C. (2000). The ultimate disorienting dilemma: The online learning community. In T. Evans & D. Nation (Eds.), *Changing university teaching: Reflections on creating educational technologies* (pp. 133-146). London: Kogan Page Limited.
Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research.* London, UK: Falmer.
Chapman, V.-L. (2002). Teaching as a site of re-presentation. Metaphors, tropes and texts. *Reflective Practice, 3(2),* 191-204.
Churchman, D. (2006). Institutional commitments, individual compromises: Identity-related responses to compromise in an Australian university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 28(1),* 3-15.
Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Clegg, S. (2003). Learning and teaching policies in Higher Education: Mediations and contradictions of practice. *British Educational Research Journal, 29(6),* 803-817.
Clegg, S., Hudson, A., & Steel, J. (2003). The Emperor's New Clothes: Globalisation and e-learning in Higher Education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 24(1),* 39-53.
Coaldrake, P., & Stedman, L. (1998). *On the brink: Australia's universities confronting their future.* St. Lucia, Qld.: University of Queensland Press.
Coaldrake, P., & Stedman, L. (1999). *Academic work in the 21st century: Changing roles and policies* (99H Occasional paper Series). Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, DETYA Higher Education Division.
Commentaries: The Golden Age. (2001). *Australian Universities' Review, 44(1/2),* 2.
Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1999). *Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice* (Eds.). New York: Teachers College Press.
Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2000). *Narrative inquiry.* New York: Pergamon.
Conrad, D. (2004). University instructors' reflections on their first online teaching experiences. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 8(2),* 31-44.

Cousin, G. (2004). Learning from cyberspace. In R. Land & S. Bayne (Eds.), *Education in Cyberspace* (pp.117-129). London, UK: Routledge.
Craig, C. J. (2005). The epistemic role of novel metaphors in teachers' knowledge constructions of school reform. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 11(2),* 195-208.
Cranton, P., & Carusetta, E. (2002). Reflecting on teaching: The influence of context. *International Journal for Academic Development, 7(2),* 167-176.
Crotty, M. (1998). *Foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* St Leonards, Vic.: Allen & Unwin.
Dahlgren, E. (1998). Staff training and the development of distance education courses. *Open Learning, 13(2),* 38-42.
Dall'Alba, G., & Barnacle, R. (2005). Embodied knowing in online environments. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 37(5),* 719-744.
Davies, B. (2005a). The (im)possibility of academic work in neoliberal regimes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26(1),* 1-14.
Davies, B. (2005b). Winning the hearts and minds of academics in the service of neoliberalism. *Academy of the Social Sciences, Dialogue 24,* 26-37.
Davies, B., & Bendix Petersen, E. (2005). Intellectual workers (un)doing neoliberal discourse. *Critical Psychology, 13,* 32-54.
Deem, R., & Brehony, K. (2005). Management as ideology: The case of 'new managerialism' in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education, 31(2),* 217-235.
Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) (2002). *Striving for quality: Learning, teaching and scholarship* (DEST No. 6891.HERCO2A). Canberra: DEST.
Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) (2003). *Online teaching and learning in Higher Education: A case study* (03/11). Canberra: DEST.
Derrida, J. (1991). From "Plato's Pharmacy" (B. Johnson, Trans.). In P. Kamuf (Ed.), *A Derrida reader : Between the blinds* (pp. 114-139). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published in 1972)
Derrida, J. (1996). Adieu (P-A. Brault & M. Naas, Trans.). *Critical Inquiry, 23(1),* 1-10.
Derrida, J. (1998). *Archive fever: A Freudian impression* (E. Prenowitz, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published in 1995)
Derrida, J. (2002). *Who's afraid of philosophy? Right to philosophy 1* (J. Plug, Trans.). Stanford, CA, USA: Stanford University Press.
Derrida, J. (2005). *The politics of friendship* (G. Collins, Trans.). London, UK: Verso. (Original work published in 1994)
Deshler, D. (1991). Metaphor analysis: Exorcising social ghosts. In J. Mezirow and Associates, *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass publishers.
Deutscher, P. (1994). Eating the words of the Other – Ethics, erotics and cannibalism in pedagogy. In J. Julius Matthews (Ed.), *Jane Gallop seminar papers* (pp. 31-45). Canberra: The Humanities Research Centre, The Australian National University.
Dexter, S. L., Anderson, R. E., & Becker, H. J. (1999). Teachers' views of computers as catalysts for changes in their teaching practice. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 31(3),* 221-239.
Dreyfus, H. (2001). *On the Internet.* London: Routledge.

Dreyfus, H. (2002). Anonymity versus commitment: The dangers of education on the Internet. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 34(4),* 369-378.
Duggleby, J. (2000). *How to be an online tutor.* Aldershot, UK: Gower.
Duke, C. (2004). Is there an Australian idea of a university? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 26(3),* 297-314.
Dunkin, M. J. (Ed.). (1991). *Award winning university teachers: Talking about teaching.* Sydney: The Centre for Teaching and Learning, The University of Sydney.
Evans, T., & Nation, D. (Eds.). (2000). *Changing university teaching: Reflections on creating educational technologies*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* London: Allen Lane.
Foucault, M. (1986). *The History of Sexuality. Volume 3: The Care of the Self* (R. Hurley, Trans.). London: Penguin Books. (Original work published in 1984)
Foucault, M. (2002). The Archaeology of Knowledge (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). London, UK: Routledge. (Original work published 1969)
Fox, D. (1983). Personal theories of teaching. *Studies in Higher Education, 8(2),* 151-163.
Fox, R., & Herrmann, A. (2000). Changing media, changing times: Coping with adopting new educational technologies. In T. Evans & D. Nation (Eds.), *Changing university teaching: Reflections on creating educational technologies* (pp. 73-84). London: Kogan Page Limited.
Furedi, F. (2003). Afterword: The downsizing of intellectual authority. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy, 6(4),* 172-178.
Gale, T., & Kitto, S. (2003). Sailing into the wind: New disciplines in Australian higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 24(4),* 501-514.
Gallop, J. (2002). *Anecdotal theory.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.
Galusha, J. M. (2001). *Barriers to learning in distance education.* Retrieved August 23, 2001, from http://www3.ncsu.edu/dox/NBE/galusha.html
Garrison, T. D., & Anderson, D. R. (2003). *E-learning in the 21st century: a framework for research and practice.* London: Routledge Falmer.
Gee, J. P. (1985). The narrativization of experience in the oral style. *Journal of Education, 167(1)*, 9-35.
Gee, J. P. (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education, 25,* 99-125.
Goodyear, P. (2001). *Effective networked learning in higher education: notes and guidelines.* Retrieved May 5, 2006, from http://csalt.lancs.ac.uk/jisc/reports.htm
Goodyear, P. (2002). Teaching Online. In N. Hativa & P. Goodyear (Eds.), *Teacher Thinking, Beliefs and Knowledge in Higher Education* (pp.79-101). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Gosling, D., & D'Andrea, V. (2002). How educational development/learning and teaching centres help higher education institutions manage change. *Educational Developments: The magazine of the Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA), 3.2,* 1-3.
Graham, M., & Scarborough, H. (1999). Computer mediated communication and collaborative learning in an undergraduate distance education environment. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology, 15(1),* 20-46.

Grimmett, P., & Dockendorf, M. (1999). Exploring the labyrinth of researching teaching. In J. Loughran (Ed.), *Researching teaching: Methodologies and practices for understanding pedagogy* (pp. 83-110). London, UK: Routledge.

Gunn, C. (2001, December). *Effective online teaching - how far do the frameworks go?* Proceedings of the annual conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE) Conference, Melbourne, Australia.

Hall, S. (2002). Who needs 'identity'? In P. du Gay, J. Evans, & P. Redman (Eds.), *Identity: A reader* (pp. 15-30). London: SAGE: Publications Ltd.

Hall, J. M., & Stevens, P. E. (1991) Rigour in feminist research. *Advances in Nursing Science, 13(3),* 16–29.

Halsey, A. (1992). *Decline of donnish dominion.* Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Ham, V., & Davey, R. (2005). Our first time: Two higher education tutors reflect on becoming a 'virtual teacher'. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 42(3),* 257-264.

Harasim, L. (1993). *Global networks: Computers and international communication.* Cambridge, MA, USA: The MIT Press.

Harasim, L., Hiltz, R. S., Teles, L., & Turoff, M. (1995). *Learning networks: A field guide to teaching and learning online.* Cambridge, MA, USA: The MIT Press.

Harris, S. (2005). Rethinking academic identities in neo-liberal times. *Teaching in Higher Education, 10(4),* 421-433.

Harrison, J., MacGibbon, L., & Morton, M. (2001). Regimes of trustworthiness in qualitative research: The rigours of reciprocity. *Qualitative Inquiry, 7(3),* 323-345.

Hartman, J., Dziuban, C., & Moskal, P. (2001) Faculty satisfaction in ALNs: A dependent or independent variable? *Asynchronous Learning Networks (ALN).* Retrieved May 6, 2006, from http://www.aln.org/publications/jaln/v4n3/pdf/v4n3_hartman.pdf

Hayes, D. (2003). Intellectuals and education: The role of the university. *Critical Review of International and Social Philosophy, 6(4),* 123-138.

Hayles, K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Heron, J. (1989). *The facilitators' handbook.* London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Hesketh, B., Gosper, M., Andrews, J., & Sabaz, M. (1996) *Computer-mediated communication in university teaching.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Services.

Hiltz, R. S. (1994). *The virtual classroom: Learning without limits via computer networks.* Norwood, NJ, USA: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Hiltz, R. S. (1997). *Impacts of college-level course via asynchronous learning networks: Some preliminary results.* Retrieved October 27, 1999, from New Jersey Institute for Technology, Department of Computer and Information Sciences website: http://eies.njit.edu/~hiltz/workingpapers/philly/philly.htm#m4

Hodgson, V. (1997). Learning from lectures. In F. Marton, D. Hounsell & N. Entwistle (Eds.), *The experience of learning* (pp. 90-102). Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Hoffman, R. (2001, May/June). Technology's impact on the faculty: A perspective. *The Technology Source, Commentary.* Retrieved May 5, 2003, from http://ts.mivu.org/default.asp?show=article&id=853

Irigaray, L. (1996). *I love to you: Sketch of a possible felicity in history* (A. Martin, Trans.). New York: Routledge.

Irigaray, L. (2001). *To be two* (M. M. Rhodes & M. F. Cocito-Monoc, Trans.). New York: Routledge.
Jacobs, N., & Cook, J. (2004). *Students' online learning experiences (SOLE) Discourse analysis: a case study* (Report 1.0). Retrieved May 5, 2006, from http://sole.ilrt.bris.ac.uk
James, R., & Beattie, K. (1995, December). *Expanding options: Delivery technologies and postgraduate coursework (DEETYA 96/2).* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
Johnson, T. S. (2005). The "problem" of bodies and desires in teaching. *Teaching Education.* 16(2), 131-149.
Kemmis, S. (1982). The imagination of the case and the invention of the study. In Deakin University, *Case study methods: Vol. 1: Case study: an overview* (pp. 73-97). Waurn Ponds, Vic.: Deakin University Press.
Kirkpatrick, D. (2001). Staff development for flexible learning. *The International Journal for Academic Development, 6*(2), 168-176.
Kirkup, G. (2001). Teacher or avatar? Identity issues in computer-mediated contexts. In E. J. Burge & M Haughey (Eds.), *Using learning technologies: International perspectives on practice.* London: Routledge Falmer.
Kohler-Riessman, C. (1993). *Narrative analysis.* Newbury Park, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2001). Metaphors as a way to explore qualitative data. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 14(3),* 367-379.
Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2004). Displacing metaphorical analysis: Reading with and against metaphors. *Qualitative Research, 4(3),* 339-360.
Kreber, C. (2005). Charting a critical course on the scholarship of university teaching movement. *Studies in Higher Education, 30(4),* 389-405.
Lacan, J. (2002). The mirror stage. In P. du Gay, J. Evans, & P. Redman (Eds.), *Identity: A reader* (pp. 44-50). London: SAGE: Publications Ltd.
Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Land, R. (2001). Agency, context and change in academic development. *The International Journal for Academic Development, 6*(1), 4-20.
Land, R. (2004). *Educational development: Discourse, identity and practice.* Maidenhead, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education/Open University Press.
Land, R. (2005a). Embodiment and risk in cyberspace education. In R. Land & S. Bayne (Eds.), *Education in Cyberspace* (pp.149-164). London, UK: Routledge.
Land, R. (2005b, February). *Paradigms Lost: Online learning in the age of excellence.* Paper presented at the 2nd Ideas in Cyberspace Education (ICE2) Symposium, Higham Hall, Cockermouth, UK.
Larose, F., David, R., Dorand, J.-M., Karsenti, T., Grenon, V., Lafrance, S., et al. (1999). Information and communication technologies in university teaching and in teacher education: Journey in a major Québec university's reality. *Electronic Journal of Sociology, 4(3).* Retrieved September 3, 1999, from http://www.sociology.org/content/vol004.003/francois.html
Lash, S., & Urry, J. (1994). *Economies of signs and space*. London: SAGE Publications.

Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern* (C. Porter, Trans.). Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published in 1991)

Law, J. (1986). On the methods of long-distance control: Vessels, navigators and the Portuguese route to India. In J. Law (Ed.) (1987), *Power, action and belief: A new sociology of knowledge?* (pp. 234-263). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Law, J. (2003). *Networks, relations, cyborgs: On the social study of technology.* Retrieved May 5, 2006, from Lancaster University, Centre for Science Studies website: http://www.comp.lanc.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Law-Networks-Relations-Cyborgs.pdf

Laurillard, D. (2000). *Rethinking university teaching: A framework for the effective use of educational technologies* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Lee, A., & Green, B. (2004, April). *Mobilising Metaphors: research/supervision/pedagogy.* Paper presented at Quality in Postgraduate Research Conference, Adelaide, Australia.

Levenburg, N., & Major, H. (2000, September/October). Kindling the fire: How to attract faculty to distance education. *The Technology Source, Faculty and Staff Development.* Retrieved October 27, 2000, from http://horizon.unc.edu/TS/development/2000-09.asp

Lévinas. E. (1987). *Collected Philosophical Papers* (A. Lingis, Trans.). The Hague: Marinus Nijhoff.

Lévinas, E. (1991). *Otherwise than being or beyond essence.* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. (Original work published 1974)

Lévinas, E. (2002a). Ethics and the Face (A. Lingis, Trans.). In D. Moran & T. Mooney (Eds.), *The Phenomenology Reader* (pp. 515-528). London: Routledge. (Reprinted from *Totality and Infinity* (A. Lingis, Trans.), pp. 194-212, by E. Lévinas, 1969, Pittsburgh, USA: Dusquesne University Press)

Lévinas, E. (2002b). Beyond intentionality (K. McLaughlin, Trans.). In D. Moran & T. Mooney (Eds.), *The Phenomenology Reader* (pp. 529-539). London: Routledge. (Reprinted from *Philosophy in France today* (K. McLaughlin, Trans.), pp. 100-115, A. Montefiori (Ed.). 1983, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA, USA: SAGE Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1990). Judging the quality of case study reports. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 3(1),* 53-59.

Lowe, I. (1999). *Transactional distance theory as a foundation for developing innovative and reactive instruction.* Paper posted to initiate an online forum discussion, hosted by International Forum of Educational Technology and Society (IFETS). Retrieved October 27, 1999, from http://ifets.ieee.org/discussions/discuss_nov99.html

Lusted, D. (1986). Why pedagogy? *Screen, 21(5),* 2-14.

Lynch, J. & Collins, F. (2001, December). *Academics' concerns about "the push for flexible delivery".* Proceedings of the annual conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE) Conference, Melbourne, Australia.

Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge.* Minneapolis, USA: University of Minnesota Press.

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

Mackenzie, H., McShane, K., & Wilcox, S. (2005, July). *Performative Fabrication and the Work of Academic Development: Reflections on Ethical Authenticity.* Symposium paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA), Sydney.

Mackenzie, H., McShane, K., & Wilcox, S. (in press). Challenging performative fabrication: Seeking authenticity in academic development practice. *International Journal for Academic Development*.

Maclure, M. (1993). Mundane autobiography: Some thoughts on self-talk in research contexts. *British Journal of Sociology in Education, 14(4),* 373-384.

Mandinach, E. B., & Cline, H. F. (1994). *Classroom dynamics: Implementing a technology-based learning environment.* Hillsdale, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Marginson, S. (1997). How free is academic freedom? *Higher Education Research and Development, 16(3),* 359-369.

Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, E. (1999). *Changing academic work: Developing the learning university*. Buckingham, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education/Open University Press.

Martin, E., Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., Lueckenhausen, G., & Ramsden, P. (2001). Using phenomenography and metaphor to explore academics' understanding of subject matter and teaching. In Rust, C. (Ed.), *Improving student learning* (pp. 325-336). Oxford, UK: The Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Marton, F., & Booth, S. (1997). *Learning and Awareness.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Matuga, J. M. (2001). Electronic pedagogical practice: The art and science of teaching and learning online. *Educational Technology & Society, 4 (3).* Retrieved August 21, 2001, from http://ifets.ieee.org/periodical/vol_3_2001/matuga.html

Mautner, G. (2005). The entrepreneurial university: A discursive profile of a higher education buzzword. *Critical Discourse Studies, 2(2),* 95-120.

Mazzarol, T., & Hosie, P. (1997). Long distance teaching: the impact of offshore programs and information technology on academic work. *Australian Universities' Review, 1,* 20-24.

McInnis, C. (1996). Change and diversity in the work patterns of Australian academics. *Higher Education Management, 8,* 105-117.

McKenzie, J. (1999). Teachers' conceptions of responsibility for learning outcomes. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving student learning outcomes.* (pp. 348-358). Oxford, UK: The Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

McLoughlin, C. (2001). Creating partnerships for generative learning and systemic change: Redefining academic roles and relationships in support of learning. *The International Journal for Academic Development, 5(2),* 116-128.

McShane, K. (2004). Integrating face-to-face and online teaching: Academics' role concept and teaching choices. *Teaching in Higher Education, 9(1),* 3-16.

McShane, K. (2006). "Sending messages to a machine": Articulating ethe-real selves in blended teaching (and learning). *E-Learning, 3(1),* 88-99. Retrieved May 25, 2006, from http://www.wwwords.co.uk/elea/content/pdfs/3/issue3_1.asp

McVay-Lynch, M. (2002). Developing faculty: The changed role of online instructors. In M. McVay-Lynch (Ed.), *The online educator: A guide to creating the virtual classroom* (pp. 65-77). London: Routledge Falmer.
McWilliam, E. (1996). Pedagogies, technologies, bodies. In E. McWilliam & P. G. Taylor (Eds.), *Pedagogy, technology, and the body* (pp. 1-22). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
McWilliam, E. (1999). *Pedagogical pleasures.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
McWilliam, E. (2002). Against professional development. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 34(2),* 189-199.
McWilliam, E. (2004). Changing the academic subject. *Studies in Higher Education, 29(2),* 151-163.
McWilliam, E., Hatcher, C., & Meadmore, D. (1999). Developing professional identities: Remaking the academic for corporate times. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 7(1),* 55-72.
McWilliam, E., & Palmer, P. (1995). Teaching tech(no)bodies: Open learning and postgraduate pedagogy. *Australian Universities' Review, 38(2),* 32-34.
McWilliam, E., & Taylor, P. G. (Eds.). (1996). *Pedagogy, technology, and the body.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
Miers, M. (1989, June). Open pedagogy and the Open University: Views of tutorial and counselling staff. *Open Learning*, 48-50.
Miller, L., & Olson, J. (1994). Putting the computer in its place: A study of teaching with technology. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 26(2),* 121-141.
Mischler, E. G. (1991). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative.* Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press.
Morris, M. (2004). Archiving Derrida. In P. Trifonas & M. Peters (Eds.), *Derrida, Deconstruction and Education* (pp. 43-58). Bodman, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
Morrison, J. (1999). Information technology tools and the future of teaching and learning: An interview with Gary Staunch. *Vision.* Retrieved May 4, 1999, from http://horizon.unc.edu/TS/contents/1999-05.asp
Mowrer, D. E. (1996). A content analysis of student/instructor communication via computer conferencing. *Higher Education, 32,* 217-241.
Munby, H. (1986). Metaphor in the thinking of teachers: an exploratory study. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 18(2),* 197-209.
Naidu, S., & Cunnington, D. (2004). Showcasing faculty experiences with technology enhanced teaching and learning. *AACE Journal, 12(2),* 141-154.
Nelson, B. (2002). *Higher education at the crossroads: An overview paper.* Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST).
Nelson, B. (2003). *Our universities: Backing Australia's future (Foreword).* Retrieved March 12, 2004, from http://www.backingaustraliasfuture.gov.au/policy_paper/foreword.htm
Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). Berkeley and Los Angeles, USA: University of California Press.
Oliver, R. (2002, November). *The role of ICT in higher education for the 21st century: ICT as a change agent for education.* Paper presented at the HE21 Conference, Curtin University, Miri, Sarawak.

Oliver, R., & Omari, A. (1999) Using online technologies to support problem based learning: Learners' responses and perceptions. *Australian Journal of Education Technology, 15(1),* 58-79.

Pachnowski, L. M., & Jurczyk, J. (2003). Perceptions of faculty on the effect of distance learning technology on faculty preparation time. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 4(3).* Retrieved September 30, 2003, from http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall63/pachnowski64.html

Perry, C., & Cooper, M. (2001). Metaphors are good mirrors: Reflecting on change for teacher educators. *Reflective Practice, 2(1),* 41-52.

Peseta, T., & McShane, K. (2004, April). *On being reflexive: journal writing and researcher subjectivity in the PhD.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association (AERA), San Diego, USA.

Peters, M. (2002). Dreyfus on the Internet: Platonism, body talk and nihilism. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 34(4),* 403-406.

Preston, D. (2001). Managerialism and the post-Enlightenment crisis of the British university. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 33(3&4),* 343-364.

Prosser, M. (1993). Phenomenography and the principles and practices of learning. *Higher Education Research and Development, 12(1),* 21-31.

Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding learning and teaching: The experience in Higher Education.* Buckingham, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education/Open University Press.

Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education (2nd ed.).* Abingdon, UK: Routledge Falmer.

Readings, W. (1996). *The university in ruins.* Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press.

Reeves, T. (2001). *Evaluating what really matters in computer-based education.* Retrieved February 5, 2001, from http://www.educationau.edu.au/archives/cpl/reeves.htm#ref1

Ricoeur, P. (1978). *The rule of metaphor: Multi-disciplinary studies of the creation of meaning in language* (R. Czerny, K. McLaughlin & J. Costello, Trans.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Original work published in 1975)

Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person: A therapists' view of psychotherapy.* London: Constable.

Rogers, C. (1980). *A way of being.* Boston, USA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Rogers, C. (1990). The interpersonal relationship in the facilitation of learning. In H. Kirschenbaum & V. L. Henderson (Eds.), *The Carl Rogers Reader* (pp. 304-334). London: Constable & Company Limited.

Rogers, D. (2000). A paradigm shift: Technology integration for higher education in the new millennium. *Educational Technology Review, 13,* 19-27, 33.

Rose, N. (1996). *Inventing our selves: Psychology, power, and personhood.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rourke, L., Anderson, T. D., Garrison, D. R., & Archer, W. (2001). Assessing social presence in asynchronous text-based computer conferencing. *Journal of Distance Education/Revue de l'enseignement à distance, 14(2).* Retrieved March 30, 2002, from http://cade.athabascau.ca/vol14.2/rourke_et_al.html

Rowland, S. (2000). *The enquiring university teacher.* Buckingham, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education/Open University Press.
Rust, C. (Ed.). (1999). *Improving student learning outcomes.* Oxford, UK: The Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.
Sachs, J. (2004). Sitting uneasily at the table. In M. Walker & J. Nixon (Eds.). *Reclaiming universities from a runaway world* (pp. 100-113). Maidenhead, Berkshire, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education/Open University Press.
Salmon, G. (2000). *E-moderating: The key to teaching and learning online.* London: Kogan Page.
Salmon, G. (2002). *E-Tivities: The key to active online learning.* London: Kogan Page.
Sarup, M. (1998). *Identity, culture and the post-modern world.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Sawyer, R. K. (2004). Creative teaching: Collaborative discussion as disciplined improvisation. *Educational Researcher, 33(2),* 12-20.
Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies and the entrepreneurial university.* London, UK: John Hopkins University Press.
Smith, K. M. (2000). Higher education culture and the diffusion of technology in classroom instruction. In L. Petrides (Ed.), *Case studies on information technologies in higher education: Implications for policy and practice* (pp. 144-156). Hershey, PA, USA: Idea Group Publishing.
Smith, P. (2000). Culture and charisma: Outline of a theory. *Acta Sociologica, 43,* 101-111.
Stake, R. E. (2003). Case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry (2nd ed.)* (pp. 134-164). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications.
Steeples, C., Unsworth, C., Bryson, M., Goodyear, P., Riding, P., Fowell, S., et al. (1996). Technological support for teaching and learning: Computer-mediated communications in higher education (CMC in HE). *Computers Education, 26(1-3),* 71-80.
Stilwell, F. (2003). Higher education, commercial criteria and economic incentives. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 25(1),* 51-60.
Sumsion, J. (2003). Rereading metaphors as cultural texts: A case study of early childhood teacher attrition. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 30(3),* 67-87.
Sutherland, P., & Badger, R. (2004). Lecturers' perceptions of lectures. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 28(3),* 277-289.
Taylor, P. G. (1996). Pedagogical challenges of open learning: looking to borderline issues. In E. McWilliam & P. G. Taylor (Eds.), *Pedagogy, technology and the body* (pp. 59-77). New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
Taylor, P. G. (1999). *Making sense of academic life: Academics, universities and change.* Buckingham, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education/Open University Press.
Taylor, P. G., Lopez, L., & Quadrelli, C. (1996). *Flexibility, technology and academics' practices: Tantalising tales and muddy maps.* Canberra: Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs.
Terrell, L. (2000, July). Tradition and transformation. *Information Impacts Magazine (iMP).* Retrieved July 28, 2000, from http://www.cisp.org/imp/july_2000/07_00terrell.htm
Thompson, D., & Holt, D. (1996). Tertiary pedagogy encounters the technological imperative. *Distance Education, 17(2),* 335-354.

Tight, M. (1988). *Academic freedom and responsibility.* Milton Keynes, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.
Todd, S. (1997). Desiring desire in rethinking pedagogy. In S. Todd (Ed.), *Learning desire: Perspectives on pedagogy, culture, and the unsaid* (pp. 1-13). New York: Routledge.
Todd, S. (2003). *Learning from the Other: Lévinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education.* New York: State University of New York Press.
Torrisi, G., & Davis, G. (2000). Online learning as a catalyst for reshaping practice: The experiences of some academics developing online learning materials. *The International Journal for Academic Development, 5(2),* 166-176.
Trigwell, K., & Prosser, M. (1996) Changing approaches to teaching: A relational perspective. *Studies in Higher Education, 21(3),* 275-284.
Trowler, P. (1998). *Academics responding to change: New higher education frameworks and academic cultures.* Buckingham, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education/Open University Press.
de Verneil, M., & Berge, Z. (2000). Going online: Guidelines for faculty in higher education. *Educational Technology Review, 13,* 13-18, 32.
Walker, M. (2002). Pedagogy and the politics and purposes of higher education. Arts and *Humanities in Higher Education, 1(1),* 43-58.
Wallace, M. (2002). Managing and developing online education: Issues of change and identity. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 14(5),* 198-208.
Webb, G. (1996). Deconstructing deep and surface: Towards a critique of phenomenography. *Higher Education, 32,*1-8.
Wiesenberg, F. (2000). *Quality online participation: Conceptualising my practice.* Retrieved April 13, 2006, from Deakin University, Faculty of Education website: http://www.deakin.edu.au/education/ripvet/conferences/2000/RIDE/Ch12_Wiesenberg.pdf
Willmot, M., & McLean, M. (1994). Evaluating flexible learning: A case study. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 18(3),* 99–108.
Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
Young, J. R. (2002, May 31). The 24-hour professor: Online teaching redefines faculty members' schedules, duties, and relationships with students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education: Information Technology section,* A31. Retrieved May 31, 2002, from http://chronicle.com.free/v48/i38/38a03101.htm
Youngblood, P., Trede, F., & Di Corpo, S. (2001). Facilitating online learning: A descriptive study. *Distance Education, 2(2),* 264-284.
Zembylas, M., & Vrasidas, C. (2005). Lévinas and the "inter-face": The ethical challenge of online education. *Educational Theory, 55(1),* 61-78.