Chapter 18
Teacher Agency and Professional Learning Communities: What Can Learning Rounds in Scotland Teach Us?

Carey Philpott

18.1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been a significant and rapid rise, internationally, in researching and theorising teacher agency. Much of this research has been in the context of exploring teachers' responses to, and room for manoeuvre within, mandated educational reforms or forms of externally imposed accountability (Vongalis-Macrow 2007). Some of the research has considered the relationship between teacher agency and professional learning (Pyhältö et al. 2014) and some has been in the context of growing policy interest in mobilising teacher agency as a resource for school and system reform (Priestley et al. 2012). In each of these foci, reform and learning, both individual and collective, are seen as intertwined and as different facets of the same process.

In all of this literature, sociocultural models of agency are adopted in which agency is theorised as an interaction between personal capacity and disposition and the affordances or resources for agency of the particular sociocultural context. Furthermore, this sociocultural theorisation of teacher agency tends to view personal capacity and disposition as arising from earlier biographical trajectories through differing sociocultural contexts, and in relation to differing resources for agency, rather than in terms of innate or idiosyncratic personal differences. These latter might be a reality and have an influence on agency but they are elusive to theorisation. It is also important not to underplay the role of sociocultural factors in individual development. Emirbayer and Mische's (1998) conceptualisation of agency has been the single most frequently adopted in this work.

Carey Philpott—Deceased

C. Philpott
Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2017

M.A. Peters et al. (eds.), *A Companion to Research in Teacher Education*,
DOI 10.1007/978-981-10-4075-7_18

For Emirbayer and Mische agency involves the interplay of what they term a chordal triad of the iterational element, the projective element and the practical-evaluative element of agency. The iterational element is defined as “the selective reactivation by actors of past patterns of thought and action” (ibid, p. 971); the projective element is defined as “the imaginative generation by actors of possible future trajectories of action” (ibid, p. 971) and the practical-evaluative element is defined as “the capacity of actors to make practical and normative judgments among possible trajectories of action, in response to … presently evolving situations” (ibid, p. 971). Put in other terms these are: the way we have become habituated by past experience and resources to think and act in any given sociocultural context (iterational); whether we can envision possible future alternative ways of thinking and acting and what these are (projective); the capacity, resources or affordances in the current situation (practical-evaluative) that mediate past understanding and actions into future understanding and actions. At the extreme ends of a range of possibilities, we can either reproduce the iterational unchanged or we can think and act in new ways.

It is worth noting that each of these elements of agency could be personal or collective. That is we can consider the iterational, projective and practical-evaluative capacity of particular individual actors within a shared sociocultural context, which might differ depending on personal biographical trajectory; or we can consider the collective iterational, projective and practical-evaluative capacity of the sociocultural context and its members as a community. Emirbayer and Mische (1998, p. 971) note that the practical-evaluative element of agency “has been left strikingly undertheorized”. One question that could be asked in relation to this is “what is it in the present situation (practical-evaluative) that influences how much agency actors exercise?”

In trying to understand what features of the interacting personal and sociocultural aspects of agency influence the likelihood of agentic action, some researchers have focused on identifying personal attributes that seem conducive to agency (van der Heijden et al. 2015) and some have focused on contextual factors (Bridwell-Mitchell 2015). However, both these approaches also recognise the symbiotic and reciprocal nature of the two aspects. Although for the purpose of analysis, it is a defensible strategy to foreground one aspect, this approach can run risks, particularly if we want to consider how we can enable serving teachers’ agency in relation to either learning or reform. A risk of foregrounding the personal aspect is that, in the practical-evaluative present of exercising agency, the personal capacity or disposition for agency might be seen to be a given, already assembled by the past trajectory and, therefore, not amenable to change at this moment. If we want to consider how we foster and develop teacher agency in the present, we might feel there is not much we can do about the past. However, some research has taken on this agenda by considering how early teacher education can better develop the capacity and disposition for agency so that at present (practical-evaluative) moments in the future, future serving teachers will have pasts (the iterative aspect) that are more conducive to exercising agency (Lipponen and Kumpulainen 2011).

On the other hand, a risk of foregrounding features of the sociocultural context that are conducive to the exercise of agency is that we might slip into believing that if we create the right sociocultural context for teacher agency, teachers will utilise its resources and affordances, at least in ways consistent with their own personal disposition and capacity. However, this might not be the case. So what may be needed here is less a description of the "architecture" of a sociocultural context conducive to the exercise of teacher agency and more of a consideration of whether and how teachers collectively make use of the resources or affordances that are available to them.

At the same time as growing interest in teacher agency in relation to professional learning and reform, there has also been interest in professional learning communities as vehicles for both professional learning and school and system reform. Some academic literature has made explicit connections between professional learning communities and teacher agency, seeing professional learning communities as an important affordance for the development and exercise of teacher agency both in terms of learning and in terms of responding to, or driving, reform (Lipponen and Kumpalainen 2011; Riveros et al. 2012). A related approach, which has had some influence, is the idea of relational agency (Edwards 2015; McNicholl 2013) which grows out of cultural and historical activity theory to argue that agency can be best developed and mobilised by making use of others.

However, it has also been argued that evidence for the effectiveness of professional learning communities is scant and there is little detailed empirical evidence of what happens within professional learning communities (Riveros et al. 2012).

18.2 Learning Rounds, Instructional Rounds and the Scottish Context

The research reported here focuses on a form of professional learning community that has been popular in Scotland: Learning Rounds. Learning Rounds is a method for collaborative professional development in which educators come together to observe teaching and learning across a number of classrooms in a single school. In a post-observation debrief, they use notes and other forms of recording, such as diagrams, taken during the observations to build up a detailed evidence-based picture of teaching and learning in the school. The intention is to use this to develop understanding of the teaching and learning practice in the school and make plans for what needs to be done next to develop that practice. The aim of Instructional Rounds is system improvement rather than developing the practice of the particular teachers observed or of the observers.

In order to understand the discussion of data later in this chapter, it will be helpful to have a clearer view of some features of Learning Rounds in theory and practice. Learning Rounds is based on the Instructional Rounds practice developed in the United States of America (City et al. 2009). City et al. (2009) describe Instructional Rounds as a "four step process: identifying a problem of practice,

observing, debriefing, and focusing on the next level of work" (City et al. 2009, p. 6). They state that a problem of practice "is not a whim and does not emerge from thin air. It comes from data, dialogue, and current work. The problem of practice is grounded in some kind of evidence, preferably shareable evidence … [it is] not just … a hunch" (City et al. 2009, p. 102). A "rich problem of practice" (ibid, p. 102):

- Focuses on the instructional core;
- Is directly observable;
- Is actionable (is within the school's or district's control and can be improved in real time);
- Connects to a broader strategy of improvement (school, system);
- Is high-leverage (if acted on, it would make a significant difference for pupil learning)
  (City et al. 2009, p. 102).

City et al., define the instructional core as "the teacher and the student in the presence of content" (ibid, p. 22). Instructional Rounds need to focus on the relationship between these three and how changes to any one of them require or create changes in the other two. Focusing on one without connecting it to the others is not considered to be effective.

The second step, observing, is intimately linked to the debrief step and City et al. (2009) consider most of requirements for observing in relation to debriefing. The debriefing step is subdivided into four stages: description, analysis, prediction and evaluation. City et al. (2009, p. 34) insist that it is always "Description before analysis, analysis before prediction and prediction before evaluation". They are particularly wary of the evaluation stage, stating that "[o]nly after people have developed the disciplines of description, analysis and prediction do we raise the issue of evaluation" (ibid, p. 34).

There are two other requirements for the description stage. The first of these is the "grain size" (ibid, p. 92) of the description. The finer grained the description, the more useful it is. The second requirement is that participants should not describe what they do not see, only what they do see (ibid, p. 94). This is because describing what we do not see is an indication of what we think is important (i.e. evaluative) rather than evidence of what is happening in the room.

Another element claimed to be necessary for the effective use of Instructional Rounds is a "theory of action" (City et al. 2009). A theory of action needs to be a "*statement of a causal relationship* between what I do … and what constitutes a good result in the classroom … [i]t must be *empirically falsifiable* [and] [i]t must be *open ended*" (City et al. 2009, italics in original). The open-ended requirement means that it must be able to be amended as more is discovered about the situation (s) being observed. In fact having a finished theory of action, according to City et al. (2009) is not the goal and once it is viewed as finished it "ceases to function as a learning tool and it becomes a symbolic artefact, useful primarily as a tool for legitimising … authority" (ibid, p. 53).

Although they claim to be based on Instructional Rounds, guidance for teachers in Scotland on Learning Rounds (National CPD Team 2011) differs in some respects from the practice outlined above. *The Learning Rounds Toolkit* (National CPD Team 2011) includes references to the importance of a "plan of action" (National CPD Team 2011, p. 9) emerging from the post-observation stage that relates to Instructional Rounds emphasis on a theory of action. However, it is worth noting that this is a *plan* and not a *theory*, so it could become a set of actions to be carried out rather than a developed understanding of the cause and effect of particular actions.

Most of the guidance on the practice of Learning Rounds focuses on the observation and the debrief (National CPD Team 2011). Perhaps the most conspicuous absence in comparison to Instructional Rounds is the lack of attention given to developing a "rich problem of practice". This is treated more briefly in Learning Rounds as "the theme of the observation is agreed by the group" (ibid, p. 9). The relative lack of attention given to this area, and to the importance of connection to a theory of action, could result in Learning Rounds practice in Scotland that focuses on observation and debrief at the expense of other equally important parts of the process.

Learning Rounds has been more than just a preferred method of professional development in Scotland. It has also been a part of the Scottish Government's declared intention to leave the details of curriculum development to teachers. The recently introduced curriculum, Curriculum for Excellence is intended to be less prescriptive than earlier Scottish curricula and this lack of prescription is intended to provide space for practitioners to develop practice through the exercise of their own agency. In 2006 the Scottish Executive (forerunner of the current Scottish Government) stated that Curriculum for Excellence

> aims to engage teachers in thinking from first principles about their educational aims and values and their classroom practice. The process is based upon evidence of how change can be brought about successfully – through a climate in which practitioners share and develop ideas. (Scottish Executive 2006, p. 4)

As such Learning Rounds can be seen, in potential at least, as an important affordance for teacher agency.

Despite the fact that Instructional Rounds has been sufficiently influential internationally to inform official teacher development and curriculum development policy and practice in Scotland, there is little peer-reviewed academic literature on the practice. The research reported here focuses on the ways in which Learning Rounds do (or do not) provide a practical-evaluative affordance for teacher agency and the extent to which that affordance is actually utilised for the exercise of teacher agency. This research seeks to make a contribution in three ways:

- Adding to an empirical understanding of what happens in professional learning communities
- Understanding how the practical-evaluative element of agency is (or is not) exercised in practice
- Considering what factors might affect the utilisation (or otherwise) of affordances for teacher agency.

18.3 Data Gathering and Method

Table 18.1 shows the four schools involved in the data gathering, their experience and training with Learning Rounds and the nature of the participants in the data. Each school was in a different local authority and they were chosen as both a convenience sample and a purposive sample. A convenience sample because they were known to be carrying out Learning Rounds at the time that we wanted to gather the data and a purposive sample because they represented four different Local Authorities and were, therefore, more likely to present a wider picture of practice than might have been found in a single Local Authority where experiences and training were more likely to be shared. Post-observation debriefing meetings were audio recorded and then transcribed. Each of these meetings was about an hour long. This is shorter than is typical for Instructional Rounds in the US and this is probably because the Learning Rounds model has been adapted to fit into the pattern of an average school day in Scotland without causing too much disruption by taking teachers away from their other work.

18.4 Findings

All four schools were making use of agreed foci for observations (see Table 18.1) and it is worth remembering that the *Learning Rounds Toolkit* emphasises agreeing a focus for observation rather than developing a problem of practice. The observation foci of the four schools overlapped and some foci recurred in all schools. Most of the recurring foci grouped around techniques associated with “assessment for learning” and this probably reflects teaching and learning techniques that have been considered to be good practice recently in Scottish education. The foci for all schools were multiple with some having a long list of different foci for the same observation.

Limitations of space mean findings from the data will only be summarised here. A more detailed presentation and discussion of this data can be found in Philpott and Oates (2015).

In three of the four schools studied (Schools B, C and D), there was scant evidence in the transcripts that Learning Rounds were being utilised as an affordance for teacher agency. This lack of agency seems to be attributable to several features in the data. None of the groups of teachers explicitly articulated a theory of action during the discussion (that is, articulated what their assumptions were about cause and effect in the classroom in relation to particular “problems of practice”). This resulted in an implicit theory of action that accepted externally produced models of good practice. For example, if peer assessment was used by the teacher this was taken as evidence of good practice. In places this seemed to slip into “audit” in which teachers seemed to be most concerned with “ticking off” whether they had seen certain strategies currently prescribed by the local authority or the

Table 18.1 Schools and participants represented in the data

Type of school	Experience with Learning Rounds	Preparation for Learning Rounds	Nature of participants	Coding in transcript	Focus of Learning Round observation
School A: primary school	None	Guidance from national CPD coordinator; information accessed on education Scotland website	Teachers including Head Teacher plus 3 Local Authority representatives	AA-depute head teacher (facilitator); AB-head teacher; AC-class teacher; AD-LA representative; AE-LA representative; AF-LA representative; AG-class teacher; AH-class teacher Transcript line numbers 1–370	Pupils' awareness of learning intentions and success criteria; differentiation; challenge and pace; independent learning
School B: secondary school with feeder primary school	Second time	Guidance from national CPD coordinator	Teachers including CPD coordinator	BA-teacher (facilitator) BB-teacher BC-teacher BD-teacher BE-teacher BF-teacher Transcript line numbers 1–312	Learning intentions Plenaries Formative assessment
School C: community secondary school	Third or fourth time for different participants	Some support at local authority level	Teachers including CPD coordinator	CA-teacher (facilitator) CB-teacher CC-teacher CD-teacher CE-teacher Transcript line numbers 1–312	Learning intentions Target setting Opportunity to work at increased pace Questioning

(continued)

Table 18.1 (continued)

Type of school	Experience with Learning Rounds	Preparation for Learning Rounds	Nature of participants	Coding in transcript	Focus of Learning Round observation
School D: community campus school (nursery, primary, secondary)	Fourth time	Visit to another school in another local authority that had experience	Teachers including CPD coordinator	DA-teacher (facilitator) DB-teacher DC-teacher DD-teacher DE-teacher DF-teacher DJ-teacher Transcript line numbers 1–285	Development of skills Pupil participation Questioning Behaviour management Group work Use of ICT Active learning Challenge and extension/differentiation Uniform Use of learning intentions

school. Arguably the implicit nature of this theory of action mean that it could not be challenged and, therefore became a finished theory of action which in the words of City et al. (2009, p. 53) is “useful primarily as a tool for legitimising … authority”. In this case, the authority of whoever had mandated the practices.

These limitations in the teachers’ discussions were sustained by: observing what the teacher was doing more than what pupils were doing (that is, not focusing on the instructional core in City et al’s (2009) terms); observing and recording in molar units, e.g. “peer assessment happened” rather than more fine grained observations; the large number of observation foci in some schools that led to an “audit” approach rather than sustained and detailed consideration of a single focus.

In contrast, in the fourth school, school A, there were emerging examples of teachers observing the effects of teachers’ actions by focusing on pupils and making relatively fine grained distinctions about exactly how teachers carried out actions rather than just using molar categories. This led to the possibility that mandated views of good practice could be challenged or refined. However, in school A, these insights did not feed back into challenging or refining a theory of action as a theory of action was never explicitly articulated. As a result the nascent insights tended to peter out and return to an audit approach.

18.5 Discussion

This section will consider how the findings from the data on Learning Rounds in practice from the four schools relate to affordances for teacher agency.

Teachers did not explicitly articulate assumptions about cause and effect in the classroom so they had no falsifiable theory to test. This meant, in practice, that they were left with an implicit theory of action. The implicit nature of this theory of action meant that it was never the object of scrutiny and, therefore, potential challenge or revision. As a result it became a “finished” theory of action which in the words of City et al. (2009, p. 53) “ceases to function as a learning tool and … becomes a symbolic artefact, useful primarily as a tool for legitimising … authority”. In this case, the authority of whoever had mandated the practices, whether this was government, local authority or school management. Explicitly articulating a theory of action would have made it available to scrutiny, which would have provided an affordance for teacher agency through evaluation of that theory.

The other constraint linked to the absence of an explicitly articulated theory of action is the lack of attention in the teacher observations to the effects of teacher actions on pupils’ learning. This meant that the teachers had no evidence by which to judge the claims of mandated good practice. This led to accepting evidence of the use of mandated good practice as, by default, the same thing as good practice. The relative lack of fine grained data had a similar effect. Describing in molar units (e.g. pupils carried out peer assessment) rather than attending to the specific details of pupils’ actions and interactions meant that teachers could not clearly discriminate

the effects of procedures in the classroom. The point here is that robust empirical classroom evidence is an affordance for teacher agency as it enables teachers to authoritatively evaluate mandated practices.

McNicholl (2013) writes about the ways in which practitioner research can provide an affordance for agency as it gives teachers an authoritative basis for their views. This is related to Pyhältö et al. (2014) distinction between teachers who see themselves as objects or subjects of change. Teachers engaged in practitioner enquiry are the subjects of educational change not its objects. Vongalis-Macrow (2007) writes about the authority of teacher expertise being underutilised in educational change. Faced with apparently authoritative prescriptions from outside the classroom teachers may feel that their views lack authority. Robust empirical evidence can provide this authority. van der Heijden et al. (2015) also identify "mastery" or expertise as an important personal factor in the exercise of agency. Teachers' (and others) sense of their own expertise can be underpinned by robust empirical data. This links to Lipponen and Kumpulainen's (2011) argument about the importance of social capital for agency. Social capital comes from being recognised within a community as someone whose ideas have value. One form of this is epistemic agency, which is the recognition of an ability to generate valid knowledge.

If not explicitly articulating a theory of action is a constraint on teacher agency, so is the lack of alternative discourses to explain what was happening in the classroom. The only discourse that was apparent was policy discourse or policy discourse mediated through local authority or school mandates. Biesta et al. (2015) report a similar experience in their research on teacher agency. In one sense, explicitly articulating a theory of action would have opened up the possibility of alternative discourses once the initial discourse had been explicitly surfaced rather than being invisible and, therefore, possibly normalised. However, there remains a question of where alternative discourses would come from. Biesta et al. (2015) report that the Scottish teachers in their research had a very similar set of views about teaching, learning and education more broadly, even though they were from diverse locations and sectors. This was the same in the research reported here. This reduces the chances that alternative discourses will come from within the group; a condition that Bridwell-Mitchell (2015) identifies as an important affordance for practical-evaluative agency. City et al. (2009) suggest the use of external sources of understanding in Instructional Rounds such as academic readings and models. However, guidance on Learning Rounds (National CPD Team 2011) makes no reference to the value of these and they were not apparent in the examples of Learning Rounds recorded in this research. Similarly, Bridwell-Mitchell (2015) argues that, as well as diversity within the group, others' research can provide alternative repertoires.

An issue similar to the lack of alternative discourses from external sources (for example, educational research or theory) is the lack of alternative professional voices in the group. As previously reported, Biesta et al. (2015) found a relatively diverse group of Scottish teachers shared a very similar discourse with its origins in policy. This was also found to be the case here. Bridwell-Mitchell (2015) argues

that the right balance of cohesion and, importantly, *diversity* in a community is necessary for practical-evaluative agency to be exercised. Diversity, in terms of discourse at least, seemed to be lacking here. One interesting similarity here is with some research into medical rounds where it is argued that the dominance of doctors in the process leads to a conceptualisations of patients' conditions and needs which are too narrow. It is suggested that the inclusion of other medical professionals in the process would give alternative and broader conceptualisations of patients' needs. A similar case could be made for Learning Rounds and professional learning communities more generally if they are to be resources for teacher agency. The careful and considered inclusion of people who are likely to have alternative experiences and perspectives could enhance the possibilities for agency.

The narrowness of shared professional perspectives is also linked to the ways in which teachers' agency can be limited in terms of scope. Pyhältö et al. (2014, p. 309) argue that a "central challenge" for teachers is to broaden the scope of their perceived educational expertise beyond the technical details of classroom interactions to include larger issues such as the goals and purposes of education. Likewise Biesta et al. (2015) point to a lack of discourses among teachers that construct education in terms other than the technical-rational concerns of "efficiency" to include questions of purpose and value. Vongalis-Macrow (2007, p. 436) similarly writes about the "diminution" of the aspects of teacher agency related to authority and autonomy and the increase of obligations which restricts teachers' agency narrowly to decisions about techniques for teaching and learning in the classroom.

The data discussed here suggests that, in their current form, Learning Rounds (and possibly by extension many professional learning communities) are technical-rationalist in that, at best, they focus on "what works" in technical terms rather than asking broader questions about the nature and purpose of education and the identities of those involved. As Edwards (2015) cautions, they may only be affordances for weak evaluation. This is evaluation only of the effectiveness of certain means to achieve ends given by others.

A related point is the persistence and influence of accountability. Priestley et al. (2012) argue that accountability is more of a constraint on teacher agency than the prescription of means. As long as the goals and measure of success are set by others and teachers are held to account in relation to these, the scope for teacher agency will be limited. So although Learning Rounds look to be a valuable affordance for teacher agency, as long as they are used in the service of achieving goals set and "measured" by others that agency will be constrained.

The limited scope of current Learning Rounds practice can also open up questions about who owns the process and how this relates to the exercise of agency. Vongalis-Macrow (2007) writes about teachers being given "professional makeovers" as new forms of professional development are imposed on them with little ownership. The Learning Rounds researched here were largely set up by the teachers involved. However, the nature and purpose of the Learning Rounds process can be seen as subject to definition by policy and by Local Authority and school management given the official endorsement and fostering of the process. As a result questions can be raised about the extent to which teachers own definitions

of the process and its purposes even if they participate voluntarily. If teachers do not own Learning Rounds this may have a constraining effect on its ability to be an affordance for teacher agency with scope beyond the technical-rational. Philpott and Oates (2015) found that teachers participating in Learning Rounds often thought about them in terms of the procedures they had been taught rather than the underlying purposes of those procedures. This lack of ownership of purpose, which among its effects reduces the ability to evaluate the success of the practice and make informed revisions to it, is itself an constraint on agency.

Ownership of purposes and perceptions of the scope of those purposes is also connected to how understanding of Learning Rounds is developed in teachers. Philpott and Oates (2015) identify that in the USA teachers' use of Instructional Rounds was developed through long engagement with the academics who developed the process. In contrast, in Scotland most teachers were given a single training event or accessed online materials with no training. This can result in Learning Rounds practice being assimilated into existing school cultures (what City et al. (2009, p. 90A) call the "pull to the black hole") rather than reconstructing cultures with enhanced teacher agency. Philpott and Oates (2015) conclude that Learning Rounds could be enhanced through longer engagement between teachers and proponents of Learning Rounds as an affordance for teacher agency. A similar situation was found by Pyhältö et al. (2014) whose research suggests that agency could be developed through sustained collaborative engagement between teachers and academics.

18.6 Conclusion and Implications

If we want to enhance the role of Learning Rounds (and by extension other forms of professional learning community) as affordances for practical-evaluative teacher agency, we need to pay attention to a number of aspects:

- Teachers need to explicitly articulate the assumptions that exist about cause and effect in the classroom and use professional learning communities as a way of critically examining these assumptions.
- This requires that teachers generate a fine-grained and nuanced body of data about the effects of differing classroom practices.
- Professional learning communities should be constructed to ensure that a diversity of voices is present.
- Ways should be found to move beyond technical-rationalist foci for observation and discussion to questions about, for example, purposes, values, identities or relationships. Ensuring a diversity of voices could be one way to achieve this.
- "Academic" practices should be used as a resource for agency. This can be in terms of existing research and theory providing alternative discourses for observations, or in terms existing research and theory lending weight to the authority of teachers' interpretations as a counterbalance to the perceived

authority of policy prescriptions. Teachers' authority can also be underpinned through enhanced academic credentials for teachers or by teachers generating robust data. It should be noted that this is in contrast to those who have seen the academy as potentially producing a "rhetoric of conclusions" that can be inimical to teacher agency. It also runs counter to much current thinking about preferred models for professional learning which advocate teachers working with teachers often without a clear role for the academy. While it can be the case that certain forms of academic prescription and perceived authority can constrain teacher agency, properly utilised, academic knowledge, practices and qualifications can be an affordance for teacher agency as a counterbalance to the perceived authority or apparent monologue of policy.

- More time working collaboratively with informed facilitators of collaborative learning practices can enhance teacher agency in the longer term. This is in contrast to believing that handing the process over to teachers from the outset is a guarantee of ownership and teacher agency.
- It may not be possible to change affordances without changing identities. This is obviously a reciprocal relationship but this study suggests that the iterational aspects of identity and practice may prove resistant to changes in practical-evaluative affordances. We need to pay more attention to how we support identity shifts beyond just changing the architecture of present affordances. This might be through longer collaboration between teachers and others, more support of teachers' practitioner enquiry, greater prevalence of continuing academic study for teachers or some other means.

References

Biesta, G., Priestley, M., & Robinson, S. (2015). The role of beliefs in teacher agency. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 21*(7), 624–640.

Bridwell-Mitchell, E. N. (2015). Theorizing teacher agency and reform: How institutionalized instructional practices change and persist. *Sociology of Education, 88*(2), 140–159.

City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education; A network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Edwards, A. (2015). Recognising and realising teachers' professional agency. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 21*(6), 779–784.

Emirbayer, M., & Mische, A. (1998). What is agency? *American Journal of Sociology, 103*(4), 962–1023.

Lipponen, L., & Kumpulainen, K. (2011). Acting as accountable authors: Creating interactional spaces for agency work in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27,* 812–819.

McNicholl, J. (2013). Relational agency and teacher development: A CHAT analysis of a collaborative professional inquiry project with biology teachers. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(2), 218–232.

National CPD Team. (2011). *The learning rounds toolkit; Building a learning community*. Retrieved from http://issuu.com/nationalcpdteam/docs/the_learning_rounds_tool_kit__updated_#download

Philpott, C., & Oates, C. (2015). What do teachers do when they do learning rounds? Scotland's experience of instructional rounds. *European Journal of Educational Research, 4*(1), 22–37.

Priestley, M., Edwards, R., Priestley, A., & Miller, K. (2012). Teacher agency in curriculum making: Agents of change and spaces for manoeuvre. *Curriculum Inquiry, 42*(2), 191–214.

Pyhältö, K., Pietarinen, J., & Soini, T. (2014). Comprehensive school teachers' professional agency in large-scale educational change. *Journal of Educational Change, 15,* 303–325.

Riveros, A., Newton, P., & Burgess, D. (2012). A situated account of teacher agency and learning: Critical reflections on professional learning communities. *Canadian Journal of Education, 35*(1), 202–216.

Scottish Executive. (2006). *A curriculum for excellence: Progress and proposals*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

van der Heijden, H. R. M. A., Geldens, J. J. M., Beijard, D., & Popeijus, H. L. (2015). Characteristics of teachers as change agents. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 21*(6), 681–699.

Vongalis-Macrow, A. (2007). I, Teacher: Re-territorialization of teachers' multi-faceted agency in global education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 28*(4), 425–439.