

2016-04-19

The Employment of Ex-Military As Teachers: The Military, Masculinity and Moral Regulation

Le Gassick, Peter James

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/4852>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.24382/1312>

Plymouth University

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

Copyright Statement

This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that its copyright rests with its author and that no quotation from the thesis and no information derived from it may be published without the author's prior consent.

The Employment of Ex-Military As Teachers: The Military, Masculinity and Moral Regulation

by

Peter James Le Gassick

**A thesis submitted to Plymouth University in partial fulfillment for
the Degree of Professional Doctorate in Education (EdD)**

Doctor of Education

School of Education - Plymouth University

December 2015

Peter James Le Gassick

The Employment of Ex-Military as Teachers: The Military, Masculinity and Moral Regulation

Abstract

This doctoral research has analyzed the employment of ex-military as teachers from a perspective of identity and culture. Using a single case study approach, including focus groups, interviews and observations, the research has explored a military academy within 'College', a further education institute in the south of England. Focusing particularly on the experiences of four teachers who had recently left the British Armed Forces, the analysis employs Pierre Bourdieu's *habitus*, *field* and *capital* to understand the macro, micro and subject level influences that shape *field* practice.

It is proposed that, at a macro level, moralizing discourse regarding undesirable working class youth has been positioned against an idealized masculine military power identity. This has overlaid existing discourse regarding the feminized nature of teaching and the marketization of education. This can be viewed as an ideological tension between a pervading centre-right perspective of education as a tool of social order and preparing the young for employment, dominating a broader liberal egalitarian ideal of education for comprehensive social reform. At a micro level, the construction of military identities was accomplished through *capital* exchanges regarding military experience and relational processes of differentiation with feminized 'others'. Student identity work used processes of imagination, constructing *imagined social capitals* through storytelling, symbolic interaction and ritualized performance. It is proposed that socialization with idealized military types, providing conceptualized forms of idealized vocational *habitus*, provided access to powerful imagined *capitals* on which students were able to draw in the construction of new identities.

The research indicates that there are both positive and negative outcomes to this identity work. The data shows that the identity work through the differentiation of feminized 'others' can lead to behaviours that could be viewed as aggressive or abusive. The research also argues that this identity work can have a motivating effect on students who want to join the Armed Forces, leading to successful educational attainment where identity narratives supported academic practice. With respect to the ex-military teachers themselves, the research witnessed the most successful transitions being made by the youngest members; the oldest member struggled to change to the new field conditions, his cultured military *habitus* disposing him to military practice, resulting in him positioning himself professionally through the *capitals* of his past.

Key Words: Identity, culture, military, teachers, education, masculinity, Bourdieu.

Contents Table

Copyright Statement	1
Title Page	2
Abstract	3
Contents Table	4
Acknowledgements	6
Author's Declaration	7
Chapter 1 - INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Overview	8
1.2 Context	8
1.3 Purpose	9
1.4 Approach	10
1.5 Importance of Research	11
Chapter 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 The Military and Education Context	13
2.3 Theories of Identity and Culture	16
2.4 Military and Education Identity and Culture	20
2.5 Military and Education Political Discourse	23
2.6 Moral Panics and Moral Regulation	30
2.7 Summary	32
Chapter 3 - METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Introduction	35
3.2 Ontology - Social constructionism	36
3.3 Epistemology - Interpretivism, Abduction	37

3.4	Methodology - Case Study	39
3.5	Theoretical Frame - Bourdieu's <i>Habitus, Field</i> and <i>Capital</i>	41
3.6	Research Method	47
3.7	Research Ethics	53
3.8	Researcher Reflexivity	55
3.9	Analysis of Data	58
3.10	Assumptions, Limitations and Scope	62
3.11	Summary	65
Chapter 4 - FINDINGS/DISCUSSIONS		
4.1	Introduction	67
4.2	<i>Field</i> Culture - Performativity, Management and the Market	68
4.3	Military Discourse and Education Policy	74
4.4	The Arrival of Ex-Military Teachers within <i>College</i>	80
4.5	Positioning of Ex-Military Teachers and <i>College's</i> Staff	84
4.6	Positioning of Ex-Military and <i>College</i> Students	92
4.7	Student Identities and Military Masculinities	98
4.8	Military Identities and Discipline	105
4.9	Masculinities and <i>Field</i> Identities	111
4.10	Military and Middle-Class <i>Cultural Capital</i>	114
4.11	Ex-Military Teachers in Transition	117
4.12	Summary	122
Chapter 5 - CONCLUSIONS		
5.1	Introduction	126
5.2	Response to Research Questions	126
5.3	Theoretical and Policy Implications	135
5.4	Recommendations for Future Research	137
5.5	Evaluation of Research	137
5.6	Final Thoughts	140
	References	142

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to many for their support, interest and commitment without which this research would not have been possible.

Firstly, Dr Nick Pratt, the Director of the Plymouth University Professional Doctorate in Education Programme, for his mentoring and support throughout the whole five-year process.

To my supervisors, Professor Jocey Quinn and Dr Peter Kelly, for their time, energy, patience and wisdom through the thesis stage. I truly believe that the quality of your doctoral supervision defines the quality of the learning experience. They have both made this research a life-defining journey, for which I will be forever grateful.

I must also highlight the invaluable support given to me by Paul Newall, his intellectual input and critical reading of my thesis ideas have provided an excellent sounding board against which to test my arguments.

And finally, I would like to thank my wife, Jean, and children, Hannah and Jake. Thank you for your patience during my moments of absence, for your support and enthusiasm that I saw the process through to completion.

Author's Declaration

At no time during the registration for the degree of Professional Doctorate in Education has the author been registered for any other University award without prior agreement of the Graduate Committee.

Work submitted for this research degree at the Plymouth University has not formed part of any other degree either at Plymouth University or at another establishment.

This study was predominantly self-funded, with the final two years being financed with the aid of a postgraduate education grant from my employer.

The five-year Plymouth University Professional Doctorate in Education programme has been completed, including papers on: *Policy into Practice - An Analysis of the Implementation of Specific Learning Difficulties Policy within a British Military Training Centre; Identity, Discipline and Power Within the British Military* and *An Evaluation of the Troops to Teachers Policy*. This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the programme requirements.

The author presented papers and material from this thesis at Plymouth University postgraduate seminars and attended a seminar on moral regulation at the University of Bath.

Word count of main body of thesis: 51,617.

Signed:

Date:

Chapter 1 - Introduction

1.1 Overview

This research concerns the employment of ex-military as teachers within a state education setting and is the culmination of thinking that spans a large part of my adult life. Using a single case study analysis (Yin, 2009), including focus groups, interviews and observations, the research has explored a military academy within a further education institute in the south of England (known throughout this thesis as *College* to provide anonymity), focusing particularly on the experiences of four ex-military teachers. The research used interpretative methodologies to understand how the ex-military teachers were positioned within the research *field* and how this positioning impacted the educational setting. My writing, as an education researcher, contains observations that run close to my own life story and therefore the importance of reflexive practice was key (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). It was crucial to establish the context to this research within my writing as my life story and professional employment had the possibility to bias the design, analysis and outcome of the process and therefore I wished to expose these factors early on.

1.2 Context

I come from a military family: my grandfather served in the Royal Air Force for 37 years (1921-1958) and my father for 39 years (1956-1995), both reaching the rank of Warrant Officer. After poor performance at comprehensive state school, leaving full time education with few formal qualifications, I joined the Royal Air Force at the age of seventeen in 1985, leaving in 1990 in the rank of Corporal. This period of military service, including eighteen months in a military technical college, was highly transforming. I had joined with low levels of self-esteem and self-confidence and poor interpersonal skills, and left 5 years later determined to return to education and study at university. Following two years' employment in the military aerospace industry and four years as a university undergraduate, I rejoined the Armed Forces in 1996 as a Royal Navy training and education specialist and had served for 19 years.

Throughout the 24 years I had spent within the military I had witnessed the transition many young people go through within military training, immersed in a distinct military culture: a transformation from a previous low educational attainment to one of academic and professional success. This introduced issues of “*interest and proximity*” (James, 2015, p.107) that could impact on the research, as this personal context left me positioned as both an insider with insight into nuanced cultural practices, but with the corresponding risk of familiarity leading to the recycling of dominant cultural military discourse (Crossley & Vulliamy, 2006 cited in Kelly, 2012). However, as a researcher exploring a specific educational setting, I thought of myself as an outsider, who would be able to bring a fresh perspective, but equally may be pre-conditioned to impose his own worldview on the research situation (*ibid*).

Through my intellectual journey on the Plymouth University Professional Doctorate in Education programme, I became interested in researching military influence within education, with my initial research design being a case study analysis of the Government’s *Troops to Teachers* policy. This research, and its corresponding data collection, never achieved the necessary Ministry of Defence and Department for Education research approval. Therefore, an alternative research setting had to be established and, through a former work acquaintance, I identified *College* in the South of England, which had just formed a Military Academy, staffed solely by ex-military teachers. *College* had an open management culture and welcomed my research to contribute towards the continuous improvement of their education provision. Between November 2013 and July 2014, I was given access to the ex-military teachers, *College* management, students and other staff to conduct my data capture.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of the research was to understand the issues surrounding the employment of ex-military as teachers within a further education setting. The research intent was met by answering the following research question:

Research Question: How are the ex-military teachers positioned within the research *field* and how does this positioning influence the education setting?

Research Sub-Questions were:

Research Sub-Question 1: What macro level discourses position the research participants and the education setting?

Research Sub-Question 2: How are research participants constructing others within the research *field*?

Research Sub-Question 3: What are the *capital* exchanges that take place between research participants within the research *field*?

1.4 Approach

Through a case study analysis (Cohen *et al*, 2011) the research has contributed to addressing the gap in knowledge regarding the employment of ex-military as teachers that has led to polarized views within academic and socio-political arenas. The research case study was *College*, with its embedded Military Academy, staffed exclusively by ex-military teachers, positioned within the context of *College* and wider socio-political discourse. By adopting an in-depth interpretative approach, the research was able to develop a deeper, contextualized understanding of the complex social interactions to understand the positioning of the teachers within their new employment setting (Schwandt, 2003). The case study approach (Yin, 2009) drew on the narrative experience of four ex-military personnel who had recently made the transition from the military into teaching.

Additional primary research data was collected by interviewing students on course within the military academy, interviewing other college staff, conducting focus groups, and through teaching observations to understand the positioning of subject individuals and the cultural context in which they are situated. The justification for the use of the stories and narratives (Goodson & Sikes, 2001) of the research participants within the research setting was the belief that humans are storytelling beings (Clandinin & Connolly, 1990) and therefore by using their stories we can understand how they make sense of the world and create understanding within it (Polkinghorne, 1998). By using theories and concepts that allow the researcher to explore the construction and reconstruction of identities and culture, the research has

developed a deeper understanding of the underlying dynamics that define behaviours and professional practice within the research setting (Gee, 2000).

Data sampling was by convenience, the four key participants being those that were available to take part in the research. Other research participants were chosen for the convenience of *College* to ensure minimum impact on the professional lives of those involved. The data was captured via audio recording equipment and then transcribed into text format through a professional transcription service. The process of analysis used Bourdieu's concepts of *habitus*, *field* and *capital* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1984; 1990) as the theoretical frame for the research using a mix of discourse (Graham, 2011) and narrative analysis (Clandinin & Connolly, 1990) to develop a rich, contextual and interpretative understanding of the research setting and to make an analysis of research participants.

1.5 Importance of Research

This research is important because the employment of ex-military as teachers has become highly politicized and deeply divided (Burkard, 2008; Dermott, 2011, Tipping, 2013), but with opinions being based on a paucity of credible knowledge or detailed understanding. My reading of this subject area was one of polarized opinion within education and political discourse. Moral panics (Cohen, 1972; Hunt, 1999; Hier, 2002; Critcher, 2009) regarding problematic inner-city working class youth (Barker, 2005; Deuchar, 2010; Young, 2012) and the under achievement of working class boys in state education (Martino & Meyen, 2001; Ofsted, 2008) have influenced politicians to implement policies to embed military values within schools such as *Troops to Teachers* (Laws & Hammond, 2013), whereby ex-military personnel will be given accelerated routes through teacher training. There were also political moves to open free schools and academies employing all ex-military teaching staff (Burki and Burkard, 2011), to widen the presence of Combined Cadet Force units (Wood, 2014), and to increase the Skills Force initiative (Hallam & Rogers, 2014) and other military ethos projects through alternative provision funding within state education (Clay & Thomas, 2014). This activity envisaged using military values to inspire higher levels of educational attainment and inculcate personal discipline in pupils. This research will contribute to closing the gap in knowledge that exists within this contested subject area and will provide clearer understanding of the issues that arise in

employing ex-military as teachers in order to inform and influence political policy making and also ensure that the ex-military teachers making this transition are properly supported.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Within this chapter I will provide insight into my reading of the key concepts that underpin this research. The chapter starts with a historical review of military influence within education, as the historical context shapes much of the modern day discourse that surrounds the subject area (Foucault, 1989). I will then review theories of identity and culture, which are central to my research, providing an overview of the definitions, models and concepts that I have considered within this subject area. I will then go on to explore the military and education through this lens, providing a reading of these professions before reviewing the wider modern day political discourse that has developed the contested nature of the recent policy development. Broader socio-political discourse surrounding issues of inner city youth indiscipline (Cricher, 2009) and unacceptable working class masculinities (Lewis, 2004) will then be developed through theories of moral panic (Cohen, 1972) and moral regulation (Hunt, 1999) before a final consolidation of the material is made in the summary.

2.2 The Military and Education Context

The history of the relationship between the military and education within England can be traced back to the 18th and 19th Centuries where the dawning of the industrial revolution demanded higher educational standards to meet the requirements of advancing technologies (Ball, 2008). From the introduction of the first Army-sponsored military academy in 1741 (Dickinson, 2007), to the recent debates over the provision of Government funding to support Combined Cadet Forces (Wood, 2014) and the more recent Skills Force (Hallam and Rogers, 2014) and *Troops to Teachers* initiatives (Burkard, 2008; Department for Education White Paper: The Importance of Teaching, 2010; Laws & Hammond, 2013), military influence has been present within the British education system for over 250 years. To analyze the polarized discourse that circulates around this contested area, it is important to understand the historical context (Foucault, 1989) of today's debates to trace the sedimentation of ideas that underpin societal and political thinking.

In 1818, 7% of children (6-10 year-olds) in the UK were in education; by 1870, it was 70% (Ball, 2008). This transformation was driven by social and industrial needs. The 1841 census indicated that Britain had become urbanized and the government feared revolution from the closely populated uneducated masses. There was also an undeniable need for an educated workforce to drive forward the industrial revolution. In 1870, William Forster MP stated, "upon the speedy provision of elementary education depends our industrial prosperity", which heralded the Elementary Education Act (Young & Hancock, 1956). This industrial focus defined the modern system of state schooling with its curriculum priorities and its industrial-trainer ideology (Ernst, 1991). In 1902, the UK Government passed legislation endorsing education as a social right (Ball, 1994).

This transition from agrarian to industrial-technical society also saw the creation of the first military schools as the nature and technicality of warfare demanded a more educated Officer Corps. This period witnessed the creation of the first Army school, the Royal Military Academy Woolwich, which was set up in 1741, near the Royal Artillery Depot (Mallinson, 2009). Its aim, in the words of its first charter, was to produce "good officers of Artillery and perfect Engineers". The parents of the first students had to pay tuition and boarding fees, in the same way as at a public school or university, and also paid for uniforms. After the establishment of the Royal Military Academy, all Officers of artillery and engineers had to attend as gentleman cadets and were only granted their commissions after completing the course. This differed to the rest of the British Army Officer Corps, as at this time no formal education was required and until 1870 most cavalry and infantry Officers obtained their first commissions and subsequent promotion under the purchase system.

In the mid-1800s the first military cadet units were formed within the school and university system within England. In 1859 the Secretary of State for War sent out a circular letter to public schools and universities inviting them to form units of the Volunteer Corps (Wood, 2014). The first school cadet corps was established at Rossall School in February 1860; other corps were very quickly formed in the same time at five further schools: Eton, Harrow, Hurstierpoint, Rugby and Tonbridge. In 1908, the units were re-titled the Officer Training Corps and could have any combination of Royal Navy, Army, Royal Air Force or Royal Marines, although the army section was almost invariably the largest. These school-formed units were

attached to Rifle Volunteer Battalions for Home Defence. Following the end of the Second World War, the Officer Training Corps transitioned into the Combined Cadet Force (CCF) and has been recognized as a voluntary youth organization ever since. The stated modern day aim of the CCF is to provide an opportunity for young people to exercise responsibility and leadership in a disciplined environment.

The original involvement of the military in education was very much related to preparing and recruiting an educated Officer Corps into the Army from the private school and university education systems, a trend that statistically endures today with 46.5% of Officers within the British Army coming from a private education background (Parliamentary Business, 2013) and 84% as university graduates (Blackhurst, 2012). Recent Government research in the area of CCF has focused on the benefits to young people in involvement as a socially positive activity, removed from its Officer-based vocational origins (Glover and Sparks, 2009; Moon *et al*, 2010; Wood, 2014).

Today the Cadet Forces are one of the largest youth organizations in the UK aimed at young people between the ages of 10 and 20 (Moon *et al*, 2010). Their stated purpose is to help young people achieve active involvement in community life through a broad range of challenging, life changing activities, in which using the military ethos aims to foster confidence, initiative, self-reliance and a sense of service to others. Cadets learn self-discipline, resilience and leadership skills, but also develop a sense of community and teamwork. CCFs are based within, and funded by, schools with initial funding support from the Ministry of Defence and Department for Education, with 61 CCF contingents based in state schools and colleges and 176 in independent schools (Wood, 2014). This historical focus of CCF being positioned within independent education has become a political issue during the period of the research, with media and political commentators calling for a change in the focus of the scheme from the private sector to state education (Government Press Release, 2014).

If the military and education professions are compared in the modern day context in terms of gender and class, it is my reading that teaching is statistically a feminized profession (Smith, 1999 cited in Skelton, 2002) and the British Army a masculine institution (Woodward, 1998). A profile of teachers in England from 2010 (School

Workforce Census, 2011) showed that 75% of classroom teachers were female, of whom 76% with a degree or higher and 11% classed as Black & Minority Ethnicity (BME). With regard to the military, Defence Personnel Statistics (Berman & Rutherford, 2012) identify that 88.4% of Officers and 92.2% of Other Ranks in the British Army are male with 10% of serving personnel classed as BME. With regard to education standards, the NIACE Armed Forces Basic Skills Longitudinal Study (2012) identified that between 2008-2011 50% of Army recruits to the ranks joined the Service with literacy or numeracy skills at or below Level 1 (literacy or numeracy ability expected of an 11-year-old or below), in contrast to the British Army Officer Corps being 46% privately educated with 84% as university graduates (Blackhurst, 2012). From this quantitative perspective of gender and socio-economic background, the teaching profession within the state sector could be positioned as predominantly white female middle-class, the British Army Officer Corps white male middle-class and the British Army other ranks as predominantly white male working-class. In modern day cultural terms, the military Other Ranks (the focus of the *Troops to Teachers* policy) and teaching professions are positioned as polar opposites within macro societal discourse within the country being centred on class and gender.

2.3 Theories of Identity and Culture

Identity and culture have become important analytics with which to consider the social dynamics of education settings within a modern research context (Gee, 2000; Fullan, 2007). Within education research, notions of character, personality and nature have lost favour due to the connotations they have as given biological determinants, compared to identity and culture, which are understood as phenomena that are created and recreated through the social interplay between individuals within a social setting (Holland & Lave, 2001; Roth, 2004). Identity allows us to consider the social dynamics surrounding teacher practice or student development (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009) and recognize how collective discourses shape the worlds of social actors. In the words of Dianne Hoffman, "Identity has become the bread and butter of our educational diet" (1998, p.324). Cultural considerations allow us to better understand the dynamics of change within a particular social setting and illuminate the beliefs and values that shape the way a particular educational institution operates (Fullan, 2007).

There are many different ways of understanding and defining identity and this poses a problem to the researcher who wishes to adopt this as their analytical lens. Some of the issues regarding definition relate to: identity and the self; the role of emotion; the influence of narratives and discourse; and dynamics of agency (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009). A fundamental issue is the fact that a clear definition is not easily reached. Discourses are abundant with alternative descriptors such as 'character' and 'personality' in addition to prescribed identities via cultural labeling such as 'father', 'teacher', 'student', 'soldier', 'chav'; all are used and interchanged when talking of and describing aspects of identity (Bruce, 1999). The term 'subjectivity' can also be used when talking of identity, although it can be argued that it cannot be used as an interchangeable descriptor; but, as a powerful alternative, it is a concept that conveys a far more fluid nature of the self that is continuously shaped and reshaped through social processes (Quinn, 2010).

Academic literature talks of and defines identity in a variety of ways providing objectified definitions, principles, models, concepts of narrative, institutional and nature-driven formations and identity concepts of self. However, as an underpinning aspect to discussions of identity, it can be assumed that a person cannot have an identity of any sort without some interpretative system underwriting the recognition of that identity (Gee, 2000). Another common theme of identity is that it is dynamic and negotiated through social interaction:

I view identity as a label, really, for the collection of influences and effects from immediate contexts, prior constructs of self, social positioning, and meaning systems (each itself a fluid influence and all together an ever-changing construct) that become intertwined inside the flow of activity as a teacher simultaneously reacts to and negotiates given contexts and human relationships at given moments. (Olsen, 2008, p. 139)

Gee (2000) defines identity as a 'kind of person' (p.99) located within a particular context, that may have a core identity but multiple others as the individual operates over a variety of different contexts. He defines a model of four perceptions of identity: nature-identity (attributes of one's biological state), institutional-identity (formed from one's socialized position within an institution), discourse-identity (resulting from the dynamics of micro and macro level discourse) and affinity-identity (determined by being a member of a social organization or group). My understanding of identity does not align with this conceptualization as I believe this positions identity into objectified categories and therefore has limited utility within this research, which holds a more

nanced relational understanding. The concept of discourse-identity is, however, worthy of consideration as it is recognized by others as a powerful dynamic in identity formation (Sfard & Prusak, 2005).

The influence of discourse on identity, and in particular, discourses surrounding concepts of professional identity are important. Macro level discourse, societal narratives regarding the professions of teaching and the military, and micro level discourse, formed in staff rooms and work spaces, are influential social mechanisms in the formation of identity, and how “collective discourses shape the personal worlds and how individual voices combine into the voice of a community” (*ibid*, p.15). In fact, Sfard and Prusak (2005) go as far to propose that identities *are* the stories that people tell,

Lengthy deliberations led us to the decision to equate identities with stories about persons. No, no mistake here: We did not say that identities were finding their expression in stories — we said they were stories. (p.14)

In attempting to understand shifts in identity within the context of education and teaching, Lauriala and Kukkonen (2005) recognize identity and self as the same concept, proposing that traditionally ideas of identity have been linked to teachers and ideas of self linked to students. They make no such differentiation and propose a model defined through three components: the actual self (dominant and prevailing self-identity), the ought self (recognized through societal discourse as the goal) and the ideal self (the idealized future self recognized by the individual themselves). They describe a dynamic interaction between the three selves, which varies dependent on context. Another useful conception within the literature is the linking of identity to concepts of embodiment, the full adoption and expression of identity through the person or self (Alsup, 2006), which becomes important during the conduct of empirical research and trying to capture and analyze the markers of this illusive phenomenon.

A key conceptualization of the interplay between identity and culture is Pierre Bourdieu’s *theory of practice*, which is described later, in detail, within the methodology chapter, but demands introducing now as a key concept that underpins the following exploration of the literature. Bourdieu introduced metaphorical tools of analysis that conceptualized individual actors competing for dominance through the exchange of *capitals* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1990; 1998). Bourdieu expanded the

materialist notion of economic *capital* to include symbolic forms such as *cultural*, *social* and *symbolic* (Bourdieu, 1977). He proposed that the distribution of *capitals* amongst agents determined the chance of success for practices. Bourdieu proposed two other key terms, those of *habitus* and *field* (*ibid*). *Habitus* represented the internalized system of dispositions that shaped an individual's practice, a complex interplay between past and present, a socialized schema that developed from lived experience. *Field* related to the social setting within which the actor was located (*ibid*), *field* structures determining which *capitals* were valued and which were not. The power in Bourdieu's concepts was the complex interplay between *habitus*, *field* and *capital* that provided the subtle linkages between the relational construction of identities and culture. The fundamental dynamic within *field theory* was the interplay between *field* and *habitus* - *field* structured *habitus*, but *habitus* contributed to constituting the *field* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

We can therefore envisage that the cultural dynamic of a particular social setting that an individual actor is located in will have an impact on the shaping of identity. Within educational literature there has been writing on the impact of culture on the formation of new teacher identity (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009); the culture within a particular teaching discipline (Coldron & Smith, 1999; Waldron & Mcleskey, 2010); the concept of *organizational habitus* (Reay, 2006, p. 1110), where the summation of individual *habitus* forms the organization's cultural values and norms; and macro level culture, or ideologies, that shape entire educational systems (Reay, 2006; 2012). There are again many definitions of culture, but Fullon (2007) describes it as the guiding beliefs and values that underlie the way a school operates. Culture, like identity, is not a static phenomenon but is constantly shaped and constructed through the interactions of those within the social space of that particular institution and macro level discourse (*ibid*). The interrelation of macro level socio-political education discourse with micro level cultural considerations is important, as these national level discourses will influence individual school culture at a local level. An example of this has been identified by Reay (2006), who highlights that issues surrounding class still dominate England's education system, in which "the economic ends of education are transcendent and competitive individualism is seen to be a virtue" (*ibid*, p.4). This culture of stressful, task-driven, target-led competition, which is positioned to support 'Social justice', 'choice' and 'diversity' "whilst sounding progressive, positive and beneficial, have worked discursively to sanction and exacerbate inequalities and

have been part of a growing trend in the privatization and marketization of education” (*ibid*, p.3). These forms of macro discourse will be explored in the next section.

My personal understanding of identity is aligned to Olsen’s (2008) view, which holds that it is historically constituted, socially positioned, contextually influenced and relationally constructed. This implies a self that is constructed and reconstructed through macro level cultural discourse and the micro level narratives and symbolic interaction within social settings, as well as through the stories we tell of ourselves and of others. Identity is a complex bricolage of meanings and understandings that influence our behaviours and embodied being, that make us the kind of person we are at any given moment in time. When I consider the culture of an organization or social group, I conceive it through Reay’s *organizational habitus* (2006, p.1110), the summation of the actors’ collective *habitus*, defining and maintaining the value system and norms of the group. This conceptualization of identity and culture leads to my choice of theoretical frame, the theories of Pierre Bourdieu, and specifically his *theory of practice* (1977). The power of Bourdieu’s theories is that he created his own neutral language with which to explore a more fluid concept of identity and culture and provides us with analytical tools that capture the subtleties of the dynamic social interplay that occur in social settings. A more detailed description of these tools will be given in Chapter 3 - Methodology.

2.4 The Military and Education: Identity and Culture

In considering the military from a perspective of identity and culture, I propose that we have to go back in history to position the modern day context (Foucault, 1989), such that today’s values and social norms have sedimented over time from the earlier tactics, traditions and rituals, which are now taken as fundamentals to military service life. British military values were formed out of historical necessity and have been shaped by the tactics and drill required for the battlefield as well as the sheer physical capability of being able to fight and win (Mallinson, 2009). An illuminating example of this is the British Army’s battlefield tactics of the mid-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century. In opposition to the French tactic of the column, the British adopted the battlefield formation of the line. This maximized firepower, which could be brought to bear with muskets but required qualities of exemplary drill, discipline, teamwork, leadership and resolute courage (Howard, 2001; Holmes, 2002). These

qualities, alongside physical prowess, are still highly prized in regiments today, and remain the fundamental values of the Army, rigorously inculcated within modern day initial military training.

Blond (2010) has argued that since the end of the Second World War there has been a major socio-cultural shift with a breakdown in traditional family and community values. This has led commentators to suggest that there has been a decline in the general standards of behaviour and morality amongst the British population and a “transition from collectivism to individualism” (Reid, 1997, p.31). Despite these societal changes, the military has maintained values based around traditions of discipline, courage and teamwork. Military ritual, through drill practice, parades, regimental dinners and acts of remembrance (Bell, 1992; Dacin *et al*, 2010), coupled with the external artifacts, or *symbolic capital*, of the uniforms, rank, medals, honours, and badges of specialization, are vitally important for institutional maintenance because they have a powerful effect on individuals within the organization. I propose that it is through these powerful acts of ritual, and by bestowing this externalized *symbolic*, or military *cultural capital*, upon its personnel, that the military provides them with individual purpose and maintains a better established military *habitus*.

The maintenance of these rituals and external artifacts has enabled the military to resist the pressures of the changing societal norms as military values and standards have been buffeted over the past sixty years (Smith, 2008, see also Moskos & Butler, 1996). However, since the advent of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts, I argue that there has been a shift in the positioning of the military within wider society and this has seen a surge in support for the Armed Forces within Great Britain. Policy artifacts of this have included government initiatives such as ‘Armed Forces Day’ (BBC, 2009), which was initiated in order to raise awareness of the contribution made by the British Armed Forces to the nation, and the 2011 introduction by the coalition government of ‘The Armed Forces Covenant’ to formally set out the relationship between the state and the Armed Forces. Recent conflicts have produced heroic narratives at macro and micro levels, with the military supported through many cultural forms such as photography, press and movies. Societal involvement in military rituals such as Remembrance Sunday and the wearing of poppies, parades such as Trooping the Colour, and Royal Weddings, all support a national level discourse centred on principles of courage, discipline, loyalty and commitment. In a

government press release, David Laws MP talked of the inspirational qualities of members of the Armed Forces and highlighted the transferable skills of leadership, discipline, motivation and teamwork (Laws & Hammond, 2013) that could be bought to bear within an educational setting. He stated that, “Every child can benefit from having these instilled in them” (*ibid*).

If we instead consider the recent history of teacher identity then the period during the 1970s and 1980s was strongly aligned with the Government ideology of the day, with education and academic discourse being epitomized in the Plowden Report (Central Advisory Council for Education in England 1967 cited in Woods and Jeffrey, 2002):

Those teaching in the 1970s had a strong sense of ‘ontological security’ and an almost taken for granted cocoon which stands guard over the self in its dealings with everyday reality. (Woods and Jeffrey, 2002, p.91-92)

The Plowden Report centered teacher identity on a liberal and progressive philosophy (Ernst, 1991) of education. It championed a child-centred concept of education that valued attributes such as: emotional connection with learning; warm, caring, holism; interpersonal skills, mutual respect and communication; the importance of dealing with people; and the growth of children and a heartfelt commitment (Woods and Jeffrey, 2002). With the introduction of the 1986 Education Act, the 1989 Audit Commission’s report (Evans & Penney, 1994) and the introduction of the inspection regime of Ofsted, Ball (1990; 2008) argues that teaching as a profession has been refocused on the market, reducing teaching to measurable criteria. It has ushered in an era of management and performativity, which has fundamentally impacted on teacher identity and subverted personal agency. This period can be seen to have been an ideological battle over the nature and purpose of education, where in today’s teaching field the pervading centre-right perspective of education as a tool of social order and preparing young people for employment dominates the liberal egalitarian ideas of comprehensive reform (Passy, 2013). At the time of the research the coalition government appeared keen on moving initial teacher training away from universities and into schools (*ibid*). This has led many to see a shift in professional identity from teacher to technician (Sleeter, 2008 cited in Passy, 2013).

As the individual enters a teacher-training programme, trainees undergo a role-shift from being a non-teacher to being a teacher. Malderez *et al* (2007) suggest that

student teachers tend to hold one or other of two positions regarding what the process of becoming a teacher might involve: actualizing an already identified potential; or going through a transformation of self in order to 'change into' a teacher.

Past relationships can have a significant impact on the development of self as teacher (*ibid*). These can include relationships with children and young people, teachers, past and present; with teacher colleagues in schools; and with family members and peers (Claxton, 1990).

Firstly, relationships with children or young people are reported by large numbers of student teachers as having had an important influence on their decisions to become a teacher. (Malderez *et al*, 2007, p.232)

Finally, relationships with family members or friends can be influential in relation to a number of aspects of becoming a teacher, including, for some, their initial decisions to enter the profession.

At a macro and micro level, within society and educational workplace settings, the dominant professional discourse that defines teacher identity is centred around narratives related to pedagogic expertise, experience of youth interaction and intrinsic motivation for the profession of teaching. If this is contrasted to the military, it is proposed that the construction of military identities is conducted primarily through symbolic interaction via explicit and visible forms of military and physical *symbolic capital*, opposed to the educational *field* where positioning happens through implicit, or narrative processes. The research will use these theoretical concepts to explore the transition of the ex-military personnel into their new work place, primarily through the analysis of *capital* exchanges between research *field* participants.

2.5 Military and Education: Political Discourse

In order to set the context to this research I will use the *Troops to Teachers* policy (Burkard, 2008; Department for Education White Paper: The Importance of Teaching, 2010; Laws & Hammond, 2013) as a starting point to set the broader context to the subject as the policy embodies the debates and discourse that surround this contested area. The intended policy (Ball & Bowe, 1992) is articulated within the *Troops to Teachers* Centre for Policy Studies paper, which is set within a discourse of youth crime, indiscipline and academic underachievement. It starts with a foreword

by General Sir Charles Guthrie (Baron Guthrie of Craigiebank), the former Chief of Defence Staff (head of the British Armed Forces - 1994 to 1997) and influential member of the House of Lords. He sets out the context that underpins the rest of the paper:

Nearly every day we read about problems of knife crime, drugs and violence in our inner cities. Our first reactions are, naturally enough, horror at the crime and sympathy for the victim and his or her family. And then we ask: "what can be done about this?" And here, in this excellent pamphlet, is a possible answer. One that has been shown to work in the US. (Burkard, 2008, Introduction)

Baron Guthrie saw the employment of 'ex-servicemen' as a partial solution to the perceived epidemic of knife crime and violence:

This will not, of course, solve all the problems of the inner city. But it will help. It will provide youths with role models who understand discipline and self-restraint at the time in their lives when they need it most. (Burkard, 2008, Introduction)

Adoption of the US *Troops to Teachers* scheme was seen as a way of tackling the issue of youth indiscipline, and by focusing the ex-servicemen in high-poverty, typically violent inner-city schools, *Troops to Teachers* UK could address the similar problems the UK had to those of the USA. The US *Troops to Teachers* initiative was seen to have had a profound impact on discipline and learning, the effect being generated from the moral authority of the ex-soldiers, acting as role models for inner-city children with the outcome of improved behaviour (Burkard, 2008).

In his policy paper, Burkard starts by describing his visit to Detroit, and giving an example of a school that had the *Troops to Teachers* scheme in place:

When I entered one of the fifth grade classrooms, the pupils all stood up and said "Good afternoon, Mr Burkard". The teacher, a short middle-age black man with the unmistakable bearing and physique of an ex-soldier, made them do it two more times, until they were perfectly synchronized. (*ibid*, p.1)

Burkard continues,

The strange thing about this performance is that the kids were smiling: they were obviously proud of their performance... It is one of those rare programmes which has proved such a resounding success as to excite almost universal approbation. (*ibid*, p.1)

Burkard argued that there was no reason why a similar measure could not work in the UK, particularly as the seeds of such a programme have already been planted. The Skills Force British charity, which originated in the Army in 2000, had 40 teams of retired Officers and Non-Commissioned Officers working with hard to reach pupils in co-operation with secondary schools in England and Scotland. The kind of activities they taught (life skills, first aid, orienteering and camping) were not new, but the unique ability of ex-soldiers to motivate young people was judged to have changed the lives of many of the children. It was suggested, in the *Troops to Teachers* policy paper, that independent evaluations reported that school exclusions reduced by 80% in those schools with Skills Force instructors.

The Centre for Policy Studies paper also argued that ex-soldiers were needed in order to physically defend teachers, stating the policy, “would benefit teachers (who are often defenceless in the face of classroom chaos)” (Burkard, 2008, p.2). It quoted the *Daily Telegraph*, from an article ‘One teacher attacked everyday’ (2 Feb 2007), which reported,

Last year, 221 teachers were injured following a serious assault, requiring at least three days off work, according to statistics published by the Department for Education and Skills. The number of attacks has soared by 21% in the last five years, prompting calls for a fresh crackdown on pupils who are out-of-control. (*ibid*, p.6)

The paper concluded the reports showed chilling figures that were evidence of shocking levels of violence in UK schools.

The paper then focused on the safety of children within schools, stating “teachers aren’t the only victims of the discipline crisis. Children are no longer safe in most of our state schools”. It was suggested that *Troops to Teachers* would “benefit the many children in our increasingly violent and unsafe schools who lack suitable male role models” (p.7). It stated that children from more deprived inner-city neighbourhoods were more likely to respond to raw physical power (p.8) and that, in the words of the exponents of the US scheme, ex-military would be able to “show their students that there was a better life outside of street gangs and crack dens” (p.3). It went on to suggest that in the most needy schools the pressure on fragile teachers led to high teacher absenteeism, exacerbating the problem:

And the school where the need is greatest... They often have problems filling teacher vacancies, and suffer from the combination of high levels of illiteracy and violence. (p.15)

The report concluded with a summary of the needy groups that will benefit from the *Troops to Teachers* policy: “For teachers, it would help to restore discipline in both the school and the classroom”; for the children, it would provide “role models... legitimate authority at the time in their lives when it is needed most”; and for parents, “it would alleviate some of their all too justifiable fears”. For the ordinary citizen, “it would offer something all too rare: hope” (p.16).

The actual policy (Ball & Bowe, 1992) that has been articulated was published in the 2010 Schools White Paper: The Importance of Teaching. In its foreword by the then Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove MP, it stated that, “Education reform is the great progressive cause of our times” (Department for Education, 2010, p.6). The White Paper’s key themes were centred around access, social mobility, injustice, attainment, improving teacher quality, modernizing curricula and accountability to communities. Drawing heavily on evidence from the world’s best education systems, it outlined how the country would raise the prestige of the teaching profession, and would transform the quality of initial training and continuing professional development. It committed the Government to cutting away unnecessary duties, processes, guidance and requirements. The White Paper also set out increased powers for teachers to improve discipline, and trialling a new approach to exclusions. The specific reference to the *Troops to Teachers* initiative was given in paragraph 2.15:

We will also encourage Armed Forces leavers to become teachers, by developing a *Troops to Teachers* programme which will sponsor service leavers to train as teachers. We will pay tuition fees for PGCEs for eligible graduates leaving the Armed Forces and work with universities to explore the possibility of establishing a bespoke compressed undergraduate route into teaching targeted at Armed Forces leavers who have the relevant experience and skills but may lack degree-level qualifications. We will encourage Teach First to work with the services as they develop Teach Next, so that service leavers are able to take advantage of new opportunities to move into education. Service leavers also have a great deal to offer young people as mentors and we will be looking to increase opportunities for this. The charity Skill Force does fantastic work in this area enabling more former Armed Forces personnel to work alongside the children who benefit most from their support. (Department for Education, 2010, p.22)

The Department for Education policy statement did not explicitly engage in the discipline discourse, but merely stated the aim of providing young people with mentors who would most benefit from their support.

A critic of the policy (Dermott, 2011) focused on tensions regarding gender and class, highlighting the “competing and confused ideas about acceptable adult masculinity” (p.237). It has been suggested in other research on working class masculinities (Quinn *et al*, 2006) that “aggression and selfconfidence are desirable attributes in Parliament but not a sink estate. Indeed, politicians address the problem of masculinity with macho threats” (p.739). Dermott argues that the *Troops to Teachers* policy, “attempts a rapprochement between ‘reputation’ and ‘respectability’ by presenting ‘military masculinity’ as the solution to problematic ‘protest masculinity’” (p.223). She also highlights that the policy paper conflates masculine attributes with men, “suitable male role models” (Burkard, 2008, p.2) and portrays a hegemonic masculinity that is associated with “hardness, both physically and mentally” (Dermott, 2011, p. 236). Dermott proposes that by offering this solution to the problem of working-class masculinity, “working-class boys are not being offered a route to a high level of educational achievement but by diverting them towards the ‘respectable’ working-class masculinity of an authoritarian, disciplinarian, hyper-masculine armed forces” (cf. Barrett, 2001, in Dermott, 2011, p. 237). However, Smith (2012) identifies that Dermott acknowledges in her own analysis that the traditional concept of military masculinity may be outmoded as the modern operational context demands that members of the Armed Forces have high emotional literacy.

Another critic Tipping (2013) focuses his analysis on three tensions within *Troops to Teachers*, arguing that the policy is based on discredited pedagogical philosophies that fail to address what the educational community believes a “good” education is, the fact that the policy discourse and rhetoric devalues teaching as a profession, and finally that the policy ignores the socio-economic factors that he argues are the primary drivers that determine academic performance. Tipping predominantly references the media to support his arguments, beginning with the *BBC Panorama* documentary broadcast on *Troops to Teachers* in February 2011. He quotes Michael Gove from the documentary, who states, “The current generation of soldiers have many of the virtues that many parents feel have ebbed away from schools and would like to see restored” (*BBC*, 2011). Tipping highlights the fact that Mr Gove felt no

need to elaborate on what those virtues might be as his implicit meaning was all too clear within the broader societal discourse (p.469). Tipping argues that this perspective is presented by the government in such a way that denigrates the teaching profession by suggesting that the government need to call in the military to solve the discipline crisis in England's schools.

Tipping also points to the legitimization of a view that there is a pervasive underclass responsible for a discipline and academic crisis in state schools and urban communities, which he contrasts to the evidence from Ofsted which highlights that the majority of schools are graded Good or Outstanding within their inspections (p.471). He also references another *BBC* source to question the perspective of the crime epidemic, quoting Sir Hugh Orde, head of the Association of Chief Police Officers, stating that recent figures from the independent British Crime Survey show an "underlying drop in violent crime" with a downward trend "since 1995 of forty-nine percent" (*BBC*, 2010). He goes on to engage in the pedagogical debate surrounding the policy, highlighting its focus on traditional values and skills, arguing that it privileges a utilitarian and narrow conception of education, going against educational thinking of what is fit for our 21st century schools. He concludes by reflecting that this represents an ideological perspective that the present government's belief is that teaching is a practical, mechanistic trade, rather than a profession with intellectual and moral foundations. He argues that this diverts attention away from a more comprehensive reform agenda focusing on the class divide and factors of social reproduction. These factors could attempt to reduce material and class inequalities by championing traditional values, teaching and content as the preferred way to raise educational standards (p.477), rather than focusing on a discourse of behavioural deficit.

Within my previous doctoral research I have encountered the dichotomy of the discourse surrounding the *Troops to Teachers* policy. In a former paper (Le Gassick, 2012) I interviewed a number of ex-military teachers who were now teaching in state education settings. One interview in particular is worth highlighting as it captures the contradictions within the discourse. The interview was with 'Bob', an ex-Officer, commissioned from the ranks, who had served 24 years in the Army:

Well, I completed all my academics whilst I was in the Army. Three degrees, one postgrad and two bachelors. I served in the Light Infantry and then in the

Royal Military Police. Whilst I was still in the ranks I completed a post-16 PGCE, and after that got commissioned.

Bob was a highly motivated and experienced professional who was set on a second career after leaving the Army as a schoolteacher:

I was very fortunate to be taken on by a school who were happy to take me, as long as I taught extra subjects, law. Because that was one of my degrees. I started two-and-a-half days to begin with and then when we reached September I went full time in 2009. In 2010 I was made Director of Learning.

Bob's entry into his new career was highly successful, transitioning from part-time teacher to Director of Learning within a 2-year period. His post was within a large Secondary State School in the South-East of England. His performance on his teacher-training course was graded outstanding and he won a national award as best student teacher and was invited to an awards ceremony at 10 Downing Street:

In fact I won an award as best student teacher and went to Downing Street last week and met David Cameron. I actually spoke to him about *Troops to Teachers*. He asked me. He asked me what profession I was before and I told him Army and we talked about it.

What interested me within the interview was Bob's narrative regarding classroom discipline, specifically linked to the politicized discourse surrounding the *Troops to Teachers* policy:

I do not believe that the military will address behaviour in the classroom. There are some great people in the military, but it is easier to discipline in the military because you have rank. It is harder in schools. I believe there is one thing you can make a direct link to regarding discipline. Outstanding teachers don't have discipline issues; it's the, their ability to build rapport and their knowledge of their subject. It's about their strength of personality in the classroom. The big issue in behaviour management is bad teaching. I have seen a child that is violent in one lesson, and a lamb in another. I've seen big ex-military types last 4 months and leave teaching, whilst a slight young 22-year-old female has the class eating out of her hand. It's not about your profession before teaching, it's about the person.

Bob's personal achievements could be used as an exemplar in support of *Troops to Teachers* policy as it appears to support the arguments that are proposed; however, Bob's own insight as both ex-military and teacher indicates a differing subjective perspective regarding the nature of the objectified discourse that surrounds this contested area.

2.6 Moral Panics and Moral Regulation

The *Troops to Teachers* initiative and wider discourse surrounding military discipline within education has been driven by the societal discourse regarding inner-city youth indiscipline; within this thesis I will review the broader societal discourse through the theories of moral panic (Cohen, 1972) and moral regulation (Hunt, 1999). Media coverage of mods and rockers fighting in 1964 sparked a moral panic about British youth, but Cohen (1972) argued that these fights were no different to the evening brawls that occurred between youths throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, both at seaside resorts and after football games. He claims that the UK media turned the mod subculture into a negative symbol of delinquent and deviant status. Since he first published his work, moral panic has been criticized for being prone to conspiracy theories, implying negative normative judgments, being intrinsically conservative and lacking in theoretical grounding (Hunt, 1999), but there has been a resurgence in the sociology of moralization (Hier, 2002) placing moral panic as an extreme form of moral regulation (Cricher, 2009).

It has been argued that the post-industrial landscape has left working-class identity and masculinity in flux as the traditional working-class roles within heavy industry have disappeared and their role as the patriarchal bread winner has shifted with the change in working practices and the gendered division of labour (Nayak, 2006). The loss of 'hard' heavy industry to the expanding service sector economy has shifted employment requirements to a differing set of skills, but in the working-class towns and cities "the masculine body as a historical marker to physical prowess and industrial potential ... continues to hold contemporary value on the street" (p.828). Displays of masculinity within urbanized settings have seen working-class men particularly demonized (Barker, 2005; Deuchar, 2010; Young, 2012) with this undesirable working-class masculinity being objectified within modern social discourse (Jones, 2011; Lewis, 2004):

As class location becomes judged through practices of consumption, cultural forms such as alcohol, football, violence, aggressive sexualities become emblematic of a (lack of) self-management of working-class young men (Mac an Ghail & Haywood, 2011, p.736).

This generalized fear of the 'dangerous classes' has now shifted to inner-city youth (Critchler, 2009).

Hunt (1999) argues that moral regulation projects are interesting forms of politics in which some people act to problematize the conduct, values or culture of others and seek to impose regulation on them. Conceptions of acceptable social norms predominantly come from a middle-class perspective whereas inner-city youth social norms are situated in the social networks and social space, which they inhabit (Young, 2012). Formalization of this was set within legislation such as 'Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour' (Home Office, 2006), which was intended to regulate youth behaviour within public spaces. This was an example of the moral regulation agenda in which those with low socio-economic *capital* were excluded from public space and targeted as a troublesome segment of the population.

This moral regulation was seen to be failing in the period 2005-2010, in the lead up to the publication of the 2010 Education White Paper, and the key socio-political debate of this period surrounded media scrutiny of the Labour Government's ability to tackle youth violence, which pushed a perceived inner-city knife crime epidemic issue into both the political and public arena as a moral panic:

Brown toughens controls on knives after spate of fatal stabbings. (*Guardian*, 2008)

Brown says young people carrying knives must be prosecuted. (*London Evening Standard*, 2008)

Knife crime doubles and Labour fails on pledge. (*The Daily Express*, 2008)

Knife crime, and addressing this nationally-accepted social ill, became a moral panic and cause célèbre within parliament, newspapers and communities alike.

But not everyone agreed with the Government's interventionist approach. Dennis Hayes joined the debate, arguing that statistically there had not been a rise in knife crime in general terms and therefore questioned why knife crime had become such a significant national issue (quoted in Richardson, 2008). Hayes argued that people who are anxious about youth indiscipline are likely to exaggerate the reported problems and that there is a general tendency to relocate all social problems into

schools before trying to tackle them through education. Ministry of Justice figures reported in 2011 a 16% fall in the number of people cautioned or sentenced for carrying a knife or offensive weapon since 2009 (Press Association, 2011). Rebecca Woods in her detailed meta-analysis on the 2008 knife crime epidemic titled 'UK: the reality behind the knife crime debate', stated,

Recent media portrayal of, and government response to, the 'knife crime epidemic' has created a distorted image of the reality on the ground... is, at best, only a snapshot of the grim reality for a very small minority. At worst, this kind of imagery, replicated unchallenged and unqualified on our screens and from the dispatch box, leads to a punitive and misguided political climate which may ultimately fail the very teenagers it aims to reach. (Wood, 2010, p.97)

Therefore, it can be argued that the moralizing discourse surrounding inner-city undisciplined youth, overlaid with the moral panic over inner-city knife crime, provided the political conditions to enact moral regulating political solutions. Layered on top of this, the discourse with respect to military and teaching provided socio-political conditions that supported the introduction of the *Troops to Teachers* policy. The policy was the political residue of the moral panic, supported by a national discourse of support for the Armed Forces that could not be questioned without accusation of being unpatriotic. Now that this moral emergency has faded into obscurity, questions over the validity of focusing a privileged entry into the teaching profession for the military seems at odds with other Government policies regarding teaching qualification standards, with many commentators from within education voicing a critical opinion.

2.7 Summary

Consideration of the historical context of military influence within education is important as the literature indicates that there have been long and well established links, starting in 1860, with the formation of the military Volunteer Corps within private schools and universities (Wood, 2014). This involvement was focused on the preparation and recruitment of an Officer Corps for service within the British Army until the end of the Second World War. This use of government resources to support a section of society that could be deemed upper-middle class and privileged has become a modern day political issue, such that analysis of social mobility and education's role in perpetuating a class divide within our country (Reay, 2012) has

become a focus of academic research and government policy setting (Department for Education, 2010). The additional discourse surrounding declining societal morals and problematic working-class masculinities has positioned military values as a palliative to the problem leading the Government to implement policies that increase military involvement in the state education system (Glover & Sparkes, 2009; Moon *et al*, 2010, Wood, 2014). This has created an ideological conflict within the teaching profession, statistically feminized and middle-class (Schools Workforce Census, 2011), in contrast to the military values of the Army Other Ranks, statistically masculine and working-class (Berman & Rutherford, 2012; NIACE, 2012), but a masculine working-class that exhibit acceptable norms and behaviours as defined by middle-class discourse (Dermott, 2011).

In order to explore these issues, this research adopts theories of identity and culture with which to analyze the research setting. These theoretical concepts provide recognized and powerful analytics for the analysis of complex social phenomena, enabling understanding of the social dynamics that define teacher practice, student behaviour and the impact of societal discourse upon individual actors and institutions (Holland & Lave, 2001; Roth, 2004). The literature has shown that there are many ways of defining and describing identity and culture, but the understanding that I align my research with is one based on Bourdieu's *theory of practice* (Bourdieu, 1977), where identity is historically constituted, socially positioned and contextually influenced. A self that is constructed, and reconstructed, relationally through macro level cultural discourse and the micro level narratives and symbolic interaction within social settings, through the stories we tell of ourselves and of others. This theoretical perspective also leads to my perception of culture, an understanding that homogeneity of socialization and lived experience within a particular *field* leads to a normalizing effect on *habitus* (*ibid*), not deterministic but statistically influenced, creating what Reay termed an *organizational habitus* (2006, p.1110).

I have developed ideas regarding teacher identity and culture, arguing that these concepts are sustained within the teaching profession through the micro and macro level discourse regarding emotional connection with children (Woods & Jeffery, 2002). With respect to military identity and culture, I have shown that these have evolved through history from the necessities of warfare and are centred on values relating to discipline, courage, teamwork, leadership and masculine physicality

(Howard, 2001; Malinson, 2009). The strength and enduring nature of military values within the Army and wider society is related to micro and macro level discourse, rituals during formal dinners, parades and acts of remembrance and also the external artifacts, the uniforms, badges of rank, medals, and honours. These are vitally important for institutional maintenance (Bell, 1992; Dacin *et al*, 2010) because of the powerful effect they have on the individual within the organization. It is proposed that it is through these powerful acts of ritual and by bestowing this externalized *symbolic capital* the military sustains its powerful sense of identity and culture and provides its personnel with a sense of purpose, maintaining a fixed military *habitus*.

To explore the socio-political discourse surrounding the issue of military influence within education, I reviewed the then-Government's 2010 policy of *Troops to Teachers* (Department for Education, 2010). I began by identifying that the original premise for the policy was focused around the problem of knife crime and inner city youth violence. The original Burkard paper (2008) painted a picture of chaotic violence in England's inner city schools where both teachers and pupils were unsafe and needed the physical presence and protection of ex-military teachers. Critics of the policy (Dermott, 2011; Tipping, 2013) stated that it denigrated teachers, positioning them as weak and unable to cope, also stating that it represented a regressive educational ideology that positioned teaching as a mechanistic trade and focused on issues of class and acceptable forms of working-class masculinity (Dermott, 2011; Tipping, 2013). Tipping (2013) also argued that reported violent crime figures actually showed a significant decrease within the policy timeframe and that under Ofsted inspections the majority of schools had been graded Good or Outstanding. I concluded this section by reviewing a previous paper I had written within the doctoral programme on *Troops to Teachers*.

I concluded the literature review by considering the discourse underpinning *Troops to Teachers* and military influence within education by using the theories of moral panic and moral regulation. I argued that socio-political discourse regarding undesirable working-class youth (Barker, 2005; Deuchar, 2010; Young, 2012), at the time of the research, had led to political conditions that enabled the formation and acceptance of policies of moral regulation such as the *Troops to Teachers* policy.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the underpinning philosophical assumptions of the research so that the reader can have a clear understanding of the strategy and techniques that have been employed. This is to justify its approach and validate its design against the research objectives. Any examination of social phenomena must start with a clear understanding of the research's ontological, epistemological and methodological foundations (Cohen *et al*, 2011). Taken together, these foundations led to particular methods of data collection that underpin the research. In addition, the research must take into account axiology, or the theory of values held by the individual researcher, which will require scrutiny (*ibid*). An appreciation of the surrounding environmental influences, such as professional, organizational, policy setting, national and political contexts, also deserves consideration (Plowright, 2011). Research requires a firm understanding of these philosophical and cultural aspects if it is to be accepted as credible and trustworthy knowledge creation. Okasha proposes that, "looking at science from a philosophical perspective allows us to probe deeper - to uncover assumptions that are implicit in scientific practice, but which scientists do not explicitly discuss" (2002, p.12).

This chapter provides the detailed description of the research's philosophical approach by presenting my reading of ontological, epistemological and methodological considerations, before providing detail regarding the employment of the theoretical frame, researcher reflexivity and the specific methods employed within the empirical data collection and analysis. Because my professional position and biographical history relate so closely to the subject matter within the research, reflexivity was key to the production of trustworthy knowledge claims and it is to Bourdieu's concept of *epistemic reflexivity* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) that I turn to within my work, highlighting the significance within knowledge claims of the often neglected objectifying relation between subject and object, knower and known (*ibid*). Allied to this, the chapter also explores the ethical dimensions I had to consider within this research, as well as concepts regarding the fitness for purpose of the instruments of analysis for my data and the assumptions, limitations and scope that bound the research.

3.2 Ontology - Social Constructionism

Within social science there are tensions between realist and constructivist ontologies and their related positivist and interpretative epistemologies, the former illuminating the social setting but never answering the how or why, the latter relativistic in nature, unable to provide objective proof, but offering individual interpretive understanding and perspective (Bruce, 1999). Breadth and depth are usually incompatible and the subjective perspective sacrifices the objectivist's ability to generalize for the opportunity to explore in detail (Clandinin & Connolly, 1990).

Where realist ontology assumes a reality that is independent of people, the constructivist believes that social reality is subject to individual representations of particular social phenomena. For the constructivist, analyzing social structures and behaviours is about developing personal understanding and getting at meaning by interpreting it from what people say, which cannot then be checked against an objective reality (Roth and Mehta, 2002). Indeed, theories cannot be directly tested against observations because the very observations themselves can only be understood via theories; that is, observations have to be interpreted before they mean anything (*ibid*).

Social constructionism provides a 'third way' and helps articulate a triad of ontological positions, which had once been considered polarized opposites. Social constructionism conceptualizes a reality in which social actors impose their meanings on the world, rejecting the essentialist view of meaning being in the world (Gergen, 2009). This position views society as both objective and subjective, linking realism and constructivism. It views concepts as constructed yet maintains their correspondence to something real in the world. This is my understanding of the nature of social reality, a reality that is continually negotiated and renegotiated by the actors within a particular social setting, resulting in a concept of the world as constructed through social interaction, a world created in the social (Burr, 1995).

The social constructionist view is therefore a perspective from which there can be no 'God-like' position to analyze social interaction as an objectified spectacle, from where one can sit and make claims of knowledge and truth (*ibid*). This does not, however, lead to a totally relativistic position regarding the nature of reality because

the external world must play a constraining role in its creation. Indeed, once there is an accepted social reality within a particular *field*, it can come to be understood as existing independently of the actors within that particular *field* as objects, artifacts or social norms (Bruce, 1999).

Therefore, it is my reading that social reality is then both made up of and constructed by social actors. It is created through discourse as people interact with their surroundings and with each other and thus exists in two ways: in people's minds as they experience it and in their behaviours as they embody their experiences (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). In fact, the formation of identities and practices are related to, or are a function of, historically sedimented discourse (Foucault, 1989). If the researcher is to achieve understanding of how people construct their social reality, social constructionism provides a philosophical perspective of how that reality is created. Therefore, within this philosophical paradigm the social constructionist researcher understands meaning for social actors not in the world but as constructed in their attempts to understand the world. The researcher then adds their own interpretation in an attempt to construct overall understanding of the research participant's accounts. This research will be conducted within a social constructionist frame. This ontological perspective also implies the core of its epistemological position, that knowledge is created and validated through social processes and provides an interpretative understanding of the world around us (Schwandt, 2003).

3.3 Epistemology - Interpretivism, Abductive

The two main epistemological perspectives within empirical social science research are positivism and interpretivism (Cohen *et al*, 2011) with their foundations in the realist and constructivist ontologies as already discussed. The fundamental difference between the two positions is the concept of realism, according to which social phenomena exist independently of observers and actors. Through the positivist approach, the practical success of the natural scientific method has positioned positivism within social science as the dominant approach to enable researchers to infer law-like generalities or truths (Bruce, 1999). When considering the subject of research epistemology, Kuhn (1962) identified that particular 'paradigms' of thought could dominate scientific practice and that it has been recognized that the success of the natural sciences led to a positivist perspective holding primacy within the field:

History, if viewed as a repository for more than anecdote or chronology, could produce a decisive transformation in the image of science by which we are now possessed. That image has previously been drawn, even by scientists themselves, mainly from the study of finished scientific achievements as these are recorded in the classics, and, more recently, in the textbooks from which each new scientific generation learns to practice its trade. Inevitably, however, the aim of such books is persuasive and pedagogic; a concept of science drawn from them is no more likely to fit the enterprise that produced them than an image of a national culture drawn from a tourist brochure or a language text (p.1)

Kuhn suggests that this generalization of science, and the scientific method, does not match actual practice and that the sociologist should be wary of being overly influenced into adopting its approach. It is not argued that the natural science method has failed, but that there has never been a unified approach with which to conduct empirical enquiry within the social world, and therefore other approaches and methods must be considered:

For one of the main perceived shortcomings of the empirical approach to sociology is that it 'failed to live up to its aspiration of providing laws of social life equivalent in scope, certainty and predictive capacity to those offered by natural science (Hughes, 1990, p149).

Hughes' perspective is now a quarter of a century old and social science has started to transition through an paradigmatic shift, driven by the accepted understanding that the positivistic approach to social research had not produced the truths and generalized laws and therefore other approaches and methods had to be developed, which challenged positivism's dominant position within scientific discourse. Hughes (*ibid*) was writing in a historical period where social research was starting to question the dominance of the positivist position, and the philosophical perspective of social constructionism was starting to gain recognition as a powerful lens through which to conduct theoretical and empirical enquiry. However, this debate continues today and divides the academic and political world when it comes to the development of knowledge to support the creation of government social policy.

This research has worked within an interpretative epistemological frame, or the view that there can be no single truth within the social world but only contextually created understanding that is inter-subjectively experienced and negotiated by the agents within a particular field. Peshkin sums up my intent:

When I disclose what I have seen, my results invite other researchers to look where I did and see what I saw. My ideas are candidates for others to

entertain, not necessarily as truth, let alone Truth, but as positions about the nature and meaning of a phenomenon that may fit their sensibility and shape their thinking about their own inquiries (1985, p. 280).

My interpretative perspective also leads me to a position of abductive inference, a 'best explanation' of meaning to the observed social phenomena. Abduction bridges the epistemological gap between deduction and induction. It pairs existing theories, such as Bourdieu's *habitus*, *field* and *capital* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1990; 1998), with the available data, requiring myself as the researcher to make creative interpretative leaps. Interpretivism is abductive because it seeks to explain how and why people create social meaning, with the researcher offering an interpretation, or best explanation, regarding what has been found. Within this process, in expanding any conclusions beyond the immediate social setting, the researcher must balance the contextual nature of the detail within the data with any generalizations regarding the results.

3.4 Methodology - Case Study

My philosophical stance led to data collection methods and tools of analysis that I believed were most appropriate to meet my intent, in order to provide me with a rich interpretative understanding of the social world and phenomena that were encountered, experienced and constructed by the research participants (Cohen *et al*, 2011). The ontological and epistemological perspectives that I adopted led me to prefer a particular methodology: the case study. This methodology provided an approach that is concerned with developing a rich and vivid understanding of events, which focuses on individual actors or groups of actors and seeks to understand their perception of events (Yin, 2009). There are differing definitions of case study research, and the principles that lie behind the approach, but in its simplest form I understand a case study as, "the detailed examination of a single example of a class of phenomena" (Abercrombie *et al*, 1984 cited in Flyvbjerg, 2006, p.2).

This understanding aligns with a view of the research as a unique example of actors being situated within a particular social setting, a study set within a specific context, an approach that can penetrate situations and understand social complexity in a way that numerical analysis cannot (Cohen *et al*, 2011). Within a case study, a holistic approach is important: the researcher must capture the wholeness or integrity of the social space or research *field*, reporting the complexity of the interactions and

relationships within a particular context (Yin, 2009). This approach leads the researcher to be integrally involved in the case, the case being potentially linked to the personal lived experience of the researcher (Verschuren, 2003).

Flyvbjerg (2006) identifies a number of strategies for case study selection, proposing four types: extreme, maximum variation, critical and paradigmatic. He defines the extreme case as an unusual case, which can be problematic and therefore accentuate the phenomena under analysis, enabling the researcher to get, “a point across in a especially dramatic way” (*ibid*, p.14). The maximum variation case would entail the selection of significantly different cases in a particular dimension to highlight phenomena across varying context. The critical case identifies a type that validates or nullifies a particular hypotheses and the paradigmatic case defines a type that may establish a paradigm or domain within which other cases may be defined.

Regarding this research, the type of case was not consciously chosen, it was a consequence of the opportunity to access a particular research setting, *College*. This research could be defined as an extreme case, the particular context of the newly formed Military Academy, located within an established Further Education college, provided conditions that set research participant in contested positions, than if the ex-military staff had been established within the organization for a longer period of time. The formation of a Military Academy within the institutional setting, with students wearing military uniform and taking part in military practices, provided a highly contrasted change within the research *field*. Within the analysis of phenomena this may lead to data that accentuates the social processes between *field* actors providing vivid demonstration of participant practice, but practice that would normalize over time as *field* actors adapted to the new *field* conditions. This is a factor that was considered within the analysis and interpretation of results.

Within the writing up of the case study, the richness and complexity of the social interplay and phenomena is captured in the detailed and descriptive account of the researcher (Dyer, 1995). The applicability of the case study methodology to a particular field of research lies in its ability to penetrate social structures and also establish understanding regarding the cause and effect, or the ‘how’ and ‘why’ within a particular frame of research (Cohen *et al*, 2011). For this research, given that the

objective was to learn about the issues individuals face when they make their transition between a career in the military to one in teaching, understanding the issues from a perspective of identity and culture required an approach that would lead to the collection of rich interpretative data, a position that led me to undertake interviews, observations, focus groups and documentary analysis and then analyze them as a single case study.

Although case studies have been criticized as context-dependent, and therefore not generalizable, not easily cross checked and prone to problems of researcher bias, it is only through context dependent learning that more advanced understanding can be achieved (Flyvbjerg, 2006). Rather than trying to make a broad generalization regarding a particular phenomena, this research is about developing a nuanced understanding of how the ex-military teachers transition and how their presence within the school setting influences the social dynamic of the research *field*. Therefore, the case study approach is particularly well matched to the constructionist ontology and can be employed when the researcher considers context to be particularly relevant to the phenomena being investigated (Yin, 2009).

3.5 Theoretical Frame - Bourdieu's *Habitus*, *Field* and *Capital*

Through my choice of research lens, the idea that I would explore the research setting and analyze the research data through the concepts of identity and culture requires me to adopt a suitable theoretical frame that would enable me to interpret meaning from the data within this framework. My choice was that of Pierre Bourdieu's *habitus*, *field* and *capital* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1990; 1998), as Bourdieu's concepts escape the either/or of the objective/subjective polarized debate and play creatively between them, utilizing both qualitative and quantitative data in a complementary process (Grenfell, 2009). This section will provide my reading of these concepts, although there is risk of trying to define Bourdieu's theories (*ibid*) as these terms defy true definition as stand alone concepts, only having meaning in relation to each other as part of a *theory of practice* emerging from empirical field work (*ibid*). However, I will, for the purposes of clarification, confirm my understanding of these terms.

Habitus provided a new conceptualization of the subject individual within society: a body interacting with society, being shaped by its social surroundings but also

shaping it. For Bourdieu, the body was in the social world, but also the social world was within the body (1977). This was seen as an objectification of social structure at the level of individual subjectivity, or knowledge structures that led to practices within groups, within society, that constrained but did not determine thought. People who possess a particular *habitus* embody it in a particular language, ways of standing, walking and making certain gestures (Bourdieu, 1984), exhibiting behaviour that is expected of groups of 'people like us' (Reay, 2004). Within this research a particularly useful conception of *habitus* is that of 'vocational *habitus*' (Colley *et al*, 2003) which was used to understand student identity work within Further Education. Vocational *habitus* was defined as:

a set of dispositions derived from both idealised and realised identities, and informed by the notions and guiding ideologies of the vocational culture. The concept of vocational *habitus* allows us to think about 'sense' – the sense of one's proper place. It expresses the structural pull that certain occupations have for young people from 'characteristic biographies/trajectories'. (p.493)

Habitus does not mean that behaviour is entirely predictable, but something that shapes practice but does not determine it, something that defines one's relation to the world. Bourdieu also saw *habitus* as referring to something historical, linked with individual history, the accretion over time of ways of being that become internalized and naturalized (Quinn, 2010) through experience of family, school and throughout an individual's life course by social experiences (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). *Habitus* is therefore an enduring subjective schema that drives individual dispositions, tastes and sensibilities within a specific environment or *field* defining an individual's social position (Reay, Crozier & Clayton, 2009). However, when a *habitus* meets a *field* with which it is not aligned then the corresponding tensions can cause *habitus* to change and transform (*ibid*). *Hysteresis* was a term that Bourdieu (1977) used to conceptualize an associated time lag with any change in *habitus* when there was a disruption in the relationship between *habitus* and the *field* structures to which it no longer corresponds (Grenfell, 2008):

As a result of the *hysteresis* effect necessarily implicated in the logic of the constitution of *habitus*, practices are always liable to incur negative sanctions when the environment with which they are actually confronted is too distant from that in which they are objectively fitted (Bourdieu, 1977, p.78)

In simple terms, *field* can be thought of as a setting within which agents and their social positions are located. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) defined *field* as "a

configuration, of objective relations between positions. The positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by their present and potential situation” (p.97). One can think of large social formations being structured around complex assemblies of social *fields*. Some of the key principles concerning *field* theory refer to the structured hierarchy that exists within, with agents occupying dominant and subordinate positions (Naidoo, 2004). The fundamental dynamic within *field* theory is the interplay between *field* and *habitus*. *Field* structures *habitus* and *habitus* contributes to constituting the *field* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992):

... social reality exists, so to speak, twice, in things and in minds, in *fields* and in *habitus*, outside and inside social agents. And when *habitus* encounters a social world of which it is the product, it is like a ‘fish in water’: it does not feel the weight of the water and it takes the world about itself for granted (p.127).

To be able to explain this more clearly, we move to the third piece of the theoretical framework, that of *capital*: a metaphorical concept that provides the means by which *field* products and processes are valued and not valued (Grenfell, 2009). *Capital* is the currency of the *field*, it is the fundamental medium of communication between *field* and *habitus*. Bourdieu’s purpose in extending the use of *capital* beyond its traditional economic application was to highlight the other forms of exchange that subordinate some, and privilege others, the *symbolic* forms that are transformed and exchanged across networks and across *fields* (*ibid*). *Capital* can be thought of belonging to a certain *field* and it is the *field* that sets its value. Therefore, *capital* is only *capital* when recognized by a *field* (Bourdieu, 1986). *Capital* has value because “it only exists through esteem, recognition, belief, credit, confidence of others, and can only be perpetuated so long as it succeeds in obtaining belief in its existence” (Bourdieu, 1997a, p.166). *Capital* can be viewed as the transfiguration of a power relation in a sense relation. It is interchangeable and can be converted from one form into another: *capital* ‘buys’ a position within a *field*. According to Bourdieu, the three main forms of capital are *economic*, *cultural* and *social*. I will focus on these forms, as well as providing an understanding of *symbolic capital* as the overarching concept for the non-economic form of *capital* and its sub-categories.

The most commonly used and understood concept of *capital* is *economic capital*, being related to the command an individual has over economic resources such as cash and assets (Grenfell, 2008). The more abstract forms of *capital* that Bourdieu

developed within this conceptual frame were his descriptions of power in terms of *symbolic capital*, which would encompass such sub-sets as *cultural* and *social*. According to Bourdieu, *symbolic capital* comes with social position and afforded prestige and led to others paying attention to the holder (Bourdieu, 1977). Using symbolic power against another implies *symbolic violence* and takes such forms as dismissal and judging other persons as inferior. This power may be dispensed without words, using physical symbols and behaviours, such as ‘looking down one's nose’ (Grenfell, 2008). *Symbolic capital* engenders a sense of duty and inferiority in others who look up to those who have that power.

Cultural capital is the dominant currency of a particular *field* and bestows on the individual the ability to succeed more so in that field. *Cultural capital* allows the individual to be at ease with cultural norms and can manifest itself in a person's education, accent, character, and disposition, making them comfortable within libraries, universities and places of learning, for example. It is closely linked to knowledge, with connections and experience giving the individual familiarity with the dominant culture (Grenfell, 2009). It requires investment of an appropriate kind, which can enable a subsequent return on that investment. Forms of *cultural capital* can include personal assets such as skills, qualifications which the holder can exert cultural authority over another; embodied facets of cultivation or physical disposition; material objects such as paintings, writings, or instruments; or institutionally bestowed ranks, awards or academic qualifications (Bourdieu, 1984).

Within the world of education or employment, there are *cultural capital* gains to be realized when an individual joins a particular university or organization. The education gained from a particular school or from cultured family norms then bestows high status *cultural capital* on children, all helping an individual to fit seamlessly into a new social setting. For example, the traditional English public school delivering a classic liberal humanist education (Ernst, 1991) will confer on an individual the embodied dispositions to be able to speak the right language, say the right things, be comfortable with the formal settings and higher cultural forms of high status society (Grenfell, 2009), or what Bourdieu termed a cultured *habitus* (Reay *et al*, 2009).

Social capital is a concept that pertains to the “aggregate of the actual or potential resources that are linked to an individual's durable network of relationships of mutual

acquaintance and recognition” (Bourdieu, 1997b, pp. 47-51). Others have described the term as ‘trust networks’ that an individual has, that they can draw upon for social support (Giddens, 2000). A more functional definition is ‘aspects of social structure, facilitate certain actions of individuals who are within the structure ... making possible the achievement of certain ends that would not be attainable in its absence’ (Coleman, 1990, p. 302). Putnam (1995, p.65) defines *social capital* as “features of social life - networks, norms and trust that enable participants to act together”. Quinn (2010) developed a concept of *imagined social capital* as the “benefit that is created by participating in imagined or symbolic networks” (p.68). Her empirical analysis identified the symbolic and imagined nature of networks with people who a person may know, or not know, but who provide a resource that may be drawn upon for support.

Complementary to these principal concepts are two further Bourdieusian tools that I will use within my analysis, that of *illusio* and *doxa* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). To best explain these terms we can conceptualize the *field* analysis as the playing of a game. Bourdieu, however, noted caution with this approach as in the social world the *field* is not a deliberate act of creation (*ibid*, p.98), but the metaphor serves a purpose to allow understanding of the terms. If the *field* is where the game is played, then *capital* represents the *stakes* that the players possess (*ibid*), used within their strategies to, “make moves, take positions, seek to position others, play to win, and/or play to transform the game and its immanent rules” (Colley, 2014, p.699). From this metaphoric perspective we can conceptualize *illusio* as the player’s belief that the game is worth playing and perceive *doxa* as the fundamental understanding in the rules of the game. The player’s *illusio* is naturalized and unconscious, it is, “a deeply somitized feel for the game” (*ibid*, p.670), what one could describe as an instinctive sensibility. As with *illusio*, *doxa* also holds this fundamental and deep founded meaning, referring to something that is an unconscious value or belief that is taken as a self-evident universal truth, that informs a player’s actions within a particular *field*. If a player has a feel for the game, then they will be a ‘fish in water’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.127), their *habitus*, *capital*, *illusio* closely aligned with the *doxa* of the *field*. If the player then leaves the *field* and enters another that is not so familiar, and where their *habitus*, *capital* and *illusio* are misaligned with *field* structures, then the resulting disjuncture between *habitus* and *field* will cause *habitus* to transform (Bourdieu, 1977).

Critics of Bourdieu highlight that, through his use of metaphors for economic exchange, he offers a limited view of human relations and interaction (Reay, 2004). It could be argued that this debases human relations into a form of metaphorical economic interaction and nothing more. James (2015) identifies that Bourdieu's theories have been criticized as tending towards pessimism, as they focus on an analysis regarding issues of social dominance. Therefore, analysis based on his theories may offer limited options for positive action (*ibid*). It could also be argued that Bourdieu's concepts lean towards structuralism and therefore do not offer enough opportunity for agentic action by individuals. I believe that these points can, however, be challenged from a number of perspectives. In Bourdieu's theories, agency comes with reflexive understanding of the 'structuring structures' and therefore provides a way to enable agentic action by the individual through the uncovering of these social structures. The issues of pessimism can be countered by arguments that the findings of the analysis that challenge the social relations under observation, may be warranted and therefore lead to positive change. It can also be argued that the structuralist view is, in part, based on a reading of his theories that leans towards a realist understanding, whereas alternative interpretations of identity construction provide understanding through a socially constructed focus, using Bourdieu's tools to construct a relational analysis.

In reviewing Bourdieu's theoretical tools of *habitus*, *field* and *capital* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1990; 1998), I suggest that they do not have a literal meaning; they are but conceptual metaphors that allow us to explore the social world and illuminate understanding of particular social contexts. The social context is fundamental to my understanding of these terms because "to claim to analyze '*habitus*' without analyzing '*field*' is thus to fetishize *habitus*" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992 cited in Grenfell, 2008, p.61). What is recognized, therefore, when talking of *habitus*, is that "one does not 'see' a *habitus* but rather the *effects* of a *habitus* in the practices and beliefs to which it gives rise" (*ibid*, p.62). My reading of these theoretical concepts is one where *habitus* is understood as a system of knowledge structures and dispositions that generate practices as the *habitus* interacts within social settings, or *fields*. Within this reading, objects are therefore only constructed relationally, the externalized effects of *habitus* and the mobilization of *capitals* only manifest in

relational terms, existing within interactions between people, artifacts and ideas (Bourdieu, 1977).

3.6 Research Method

The research method is a single case study, *College*, with its embedded Military Academy, staffed exclusively by ex-military teachers, located within the context of the macro level socio-political discourse of this particular period of time. By adopting an in-depth interpretative methodological approach, the research was able to develop a deeper, contextualized understanding of the complex social interactions that take place within the research *field*. This allowed analysis of the positioning of the teachers, and other research participants, within this particular educational setting (Schwandt, 2003). This case study approach (Yin, 2009) drew on the narrative experiences of the ex-military personnel who had recently made the transition from the military into teaching.

The research method and setting influence the data objects and the instruments of data collection that were selected in order to complete the research. At a micro level, the narratives of the participants within *College* were captured through interview, focus group and observational data (Cohen, *et al*, 2011). At a macro level, discourse that defines the national education and military culture were investigated through documentary review and analysis of secondary data (*ibid*). Combined, the collection and analysis of this data allowed me to construct a rich picture of *College*, enabling me to provide an explanation and understanding of the research setting in order to answer the research question and sub-questions. This section provides my reading of these data collection methods and of issues surrounding the use of these data types.

The data sample for the research included the four ex-military individuals who now formed the teaching staff of *College's* Military Academy, as well as three members of *College's* senior management team, three other staff members of *College* and twenty-two students who were in the first and second years of the Military Academy programme. The justification for this spread of research participants was to ensure that the data collected not only captured the verbal narratives of the ex-military teachers as they made their transition from a career in the military to one in

education, but also to catch the wider interplay and positioning that took place within the *field* between both these central actors and other staff and students within *College* (Clandinin & Connolly, 2000). The inclusion of focus groups and teaching observations added to the data set and allowed me to understand important relational aspects to the group formation of identities (Bourdieu, 1977).

With regards to the Military Academy teaching staff, I conducted one individual hour-long interview with each of the four members (Will, Rob, Yan and Zac) and also conducted two focus groups with all four staff. The focus groups allowed me to observe the co-construction of narratives through the participant interaction, allowing views to emerge that may not have been voiced within individual interviews. The focus groups provided another data set against which to triangulate emergent themes within data analysis processes. The interviews and focus groups were semi-structured, prompting the participants as individuals and groups to tell their stories of the formation of the military academy and also of their transition from a career in the military to one in education. As well as these sessions, I conducted one teaching observation with each of the four ex-military teachers to capture some of the unconscious and embodied nature to the *capital* exchanges that took place between teachers and students, and to uncover the more subtle aspects of the social phenomena I was trying to observe.

With regards to data capture from other participants, four student focus-groups were conducted. These included two six-student male focus groups with first year students; one four-student focus group with female first year students; and one six-student male focus group with second year students. The focus groups were conducted in a semi-structured manner, with the researcher facilitating the discussion, eliciting the student experience and narratives regarding the Military Academy programme. The decision to conduct a female-only focus group was taken to provide an opportunity for the four female students to speak freely regarding their experiences on the programme, removed from the influence of their male counterparts. No student pseudonyms were used; instead a generic Student (First Year/Second Year) was used to guarantee a higher level of anonymity. One programme field trip event was recorded: a visit to a military museum in Hampshire, England, to observe the students and staff in a more relaxed and informal setting,

again to capture the more subtle positioning and *capital* exchanges that take place between the staff and students within the Military Academy.

The final element of the data set was captured through interview data with wider *College* staff members. This data included three one-hour interviews with members of the senior management team (Roy, David and Clare); a one-hour interview with a member of staff who was responsible for Teacher Quality Assessment (Heather); a one-hour interview with a member of staff from student services (Tracey); and a one-hour interview with a Head of Department (Tom). All these staff members had been employed within *College* prior to the implementation of the Military Academy. This final data was important in capturing the construction of others and positioning of research participants, particularly from a cohort whose perspectives reflected a higher-level management view from across *College* and were therefore in positions to provide powerful accounts of the wider influence and effect that the Military Academy staff had had on *College's* identity and culture.

As researcher, I believe that this data has allowed me to use my tools of analysis to understand issues of identity and culture regarding the transition both individuals and *College* have been through. In attempting to build an understanding through the narrative of the transition that *College* undertook, it was important to obtain data that not only 'told the story' (the individual texts), but also captured the more subtle social interplay that took place between *field* actors, revealing the symbolic interaction between participants through observational data recorded as field notes. The limits of the data have been set through practical considerations: my research could not impact the research setting too adversely, and I had to take guidance from the team within *College* on what was achievable regarding the amount of data collection to ensure a minimal level of disruption. The Military Academy staff and senior managers were chosen as a total population from those positions, the students and other *College* staff participants were chosen at the discretion of *College* to ensure minimal disruption.

The use of interview data within my research marks my position in seeing research participants as more than just objectified data sources in a realist sense; instead, within my epistemological approach, the interview process is an exchange of views, a human interaction of knowledge creation between participants, with interviewer and

interviewee discussing interpretations of the social world (Verschuren, 2003). However, the interview is not an ordinary conversation (Dyer, 1995) as it has a specific purpose. The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured approach with research participants asked to tell their story of the Military Academy, with my intervention in the narratives minimized to questioning phrases such as, “can you tell me more about that”, or “so what happened then” to elicit more detail regarding a particular point or event. Towards the end of each interview, I occasionally asked more directed questions regarding a particular theme that I want to explore such as, “what do you believe military values are?” and “were there any reported differences in the behaviour of the students when not being taught by Military Academy staff?”

The data from the interviews was captured by audio-recording equipment, each participant giving written consent to the electronic capture of the data. The interviews were planned in advance to an agreed timetable with *College*. The location of each interview was in a *College* classroom or office that would be free from disturbance such as individual offices, or in the Military Academy classrooms in the basement of the main college building. A professional transcription service was used to convert the audio files into typed text files. Each participant had the opportunity to review the transcripts of the interview data, although no participants requested this.

One of the key issues with interview data is the influence of the interviewee’s and interviewer’s lived experience that may act to bias the conduct of the session (Cohen *et al*, 2011). This has to be recognized and is lessened by the researcher acting reflexively, considering their position within the social *field* of research, throughout the data collection process. Power relations must be considered, as a significant mismatch between interviewer and interviewee may lead to the answers to questions being shaped to meet the apparent expectation or desire of the researcher (*ibid*). This was a significant consideration within my interview process as the research participants knew me as a military officer and this positioned me in an influential position of authority and therefore may have affected individual participant responses.

To address this, I had to ensure that I built a strong rapport with the participants, put them at ease and as much as possible encouraged them to give honest responses. By using an open-ended questioning technique to the process, encouraging

participants to tell 'their story', I believed that this would allow and encourage interviewees to tell their own unique and honest story. I also ensured that the interviews were well managed, making sure that their scheduling, conduct and completion were undertaken in a professional manner, minimizing the amount of intrusion into participant's lives and making sure that the process was undertaken on a voluntary basis and that it was totally transparent. I sensed that throughout the process individuals participated openly and provided honest answers and narratives to the questions posed. I reflected, however, that in any relationally constructed social process, the question of power and the differential between subject individuals could never be fully addressed. The researcher has to be alive to these issues, minimize their influence as much as they can, and then recognize that they would have not fully addressed the issue. In this way one can more carefully navigate their analysis and interpretation of the research data.

Another element of the interview process was the focus group sessions, which were an important part of the data collection: since I was using Bourdieu's theories to explore and analyze the research data, the relational aspect of the social interplay was important in understanding the group formation of individual identities (Bourdieu, 1990). The conduct of the focus group relied on the interaction within the group who discussed topics, facilitated by me as the researcher. Within this process, it was found that the group's agenda could dominate rather than the researcher's. The focus group sessions took place with the military academy students (three six-person groups and one four-person group) and with the military academy staff (four in the group). The student group size was established as the optimum to enable me to facilitate the group effectively, but also provide enough diversity in participants to get the greatest range of views. For their convenience, *College's* management staff chose the focus group composition. Again, a semi-structured approach was adopted, with me facilitating the group with a clear one-hour time limit on the session to enable the participants to understand what their commitment was. The key drawback with the focus group sessions was the management of strong characters within particular groups who had a tendency to take over the conversations and let their points of view dominate.

To provide another perspective to the data collection process, I undertook teaching observations of the Military Academy staff and also observed staff and ex-military

teachers on a field trip to a military museum. The process of observation was challenging: it is more than just looking; it is a process of systematic observation and note taking, trying to capture the people, events, behaviours, settings and artifacts that make up a specific social setting or interaction (Cohen *et al*, 2011). It provides an opportunity to capture live data from naturally occurring situations, although the classroom observations are always going to be influenced by the fact that the position of researcher is more pronounced and intrusive within a teaching session for both teachers and pupils. The observational data is a good way to create understanding of the contextual nature of the research and is useful for being able to record non-verbal data on behaviours. My position as observer within this research was as complete observer (Gold, 1958 cited in Cohen *et al*, 2011), detached from the group and trying to remain as unnoticed and unintrusive as possible. I found this part of the data collection process the most demanding, trying to make accurate and detailed notes regarding the events taking place, but with the detail compromising my ability to make clear observations. Reflective sessions after each observation were required to ensure that I had fully captured the social interactions that had taken place.

With regard to developing a macro level view of the discourse and ideological context that shapes *College's* culture, the key method to undertake this task was through the review of secondary documentary data in the form of inspection reports, government policy papers, media reports, secondary quantitative data and Internet discussion forums, to state the key sources (Cohen *et al*, 2011). This data set was very convenient as it is freely available through the Internet and library sources and provides rich factual data. One of the key drawbacks with this form of data is the fact that it might not represent all of the views, is potentially selective and may have been written with deliberate intent to deceive (Finnegan, 1996). Nevertheless, this form of data can enable the researcher to explore discourse and issues outside the direct *field*. A potential downside to this is the amount of data that could potentially be included. The researcher has to choose what to review and what to ignore and therefore this could lead to conscious or unconscious bias in the research process.

The collection of research data was conducted in a trustworthy fashion, an alternative view to the criterion of validity, reliability and generalizability (Cohen, *et al*, 2011) that the positivist research paradigm demands. Trustworthiness within my research is

achieved through research design that ensures a prolonged engagement with the research setting; captures data through persistent observation of research participants; ensures a triangulation of data sources; maintains auditable and accurate records of data; ensures that findings, interpretations and recommendations are supported through the data; and that as researcher I acted in a reflexive manner regarding the conduct of the research and the methods employed (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Creswell, 2009). Within the writing of the text, verisimilitude is also of concern, or that it possesses the subjective quality of seeming to be true (Clandinin & Connolly, 2000). However, despite attempts to ensure trustworthiness, it must be recognized that determining what people actually think and believe through interview data and observation may not be possible. The process will always rely on the interpretation of the researcher taking what the participants say they think, believe and do in order to understand how individuals position themselves and are positioned within the research setting and by wider macro level discourse.

The entire scope of research data collection involved thirty-two research participants, the conduct of six focus groups and nine individual in-depth interviews. Five teaching observations were also recorded, the entire data collection process creating over sixteen hours of audio data, translating into 72,000 words of transcribed text. The data were collected over a nine-month period between November 2013 and July 2014, most sessions taking place in *College*, with one research observation session taking place in the military museum. With the inclusion of documentary analysis, I believe that the data provided the opportunity for a broad and in-depth understanding of the issues surrounding the employment of ex-military as teachers within this specific educational setting.

3.7 Research Ethics

When considering the conduct of social research, especially with respect to a qualitative case study, the process of investigating the private lives of research participants and then publishing research findings in the public arena raises ethical issues that must be addressed within the modern context of human-based research (Miller *et al*, 2012). Ethical questions regarding the use of human-derived data, and the interpretative and analytical approaches the researcher then employs, have driven a significant change in academic practices. Academic institutions have

introduced stringent processes of ethical regulation and governance to ensure suitable standards are adhered to (*ibid*). Whilst quantitative data can be aggregated so the individuals are not traceable, this is not the case with qualitative data where total anonymity can never be assured. Within the conduct of this research, I have been positioned overtly as a researcher within the research setting, conducting data collection with informed consent from *College's* management team and the individual research subjects. I have made every effort to ensure the confidentiality of all parties involved with the research and have used pseudonyms throughout my writing. The nature of the research and data collection techniques have been made transparent to the research participants and each individual research subject had the right to withdraw from the research process up until the point of the publication of this thesis.

Throughout the research process, I have complied with the ethics protocols of Plymouth University. The key elements of the university's ethics policy are centred around: openness and honesty - ensuring that there was no deception involved in this research; giving participants the right to withdraw - informing participants that they had the right to withdraw any data from the project, or withdraw themselves completely from the research at any point without giving reason, up to the publication of the report, paper or thesis; protection from harm - ensuring as researcher that I could advise and signpost research participants to relevant support services if need be; ensuring that participants were properly debriefed following interview and or observation; informing participants regarding the likely domains in which the research findings would be disseminated - thesis submission, academic journal papers and reports; and confidentiality - that the research findings would be presented in such a way as to minimize the chances of the research subject being identified. This element has included the anonymity of research participants and arrangements for security and storage of interview data.

Over and above these considerations, from a broader ethical perspective, I had to confront the fact that I was also a military officer and this could pressure or compel an ex-military research participant to take part because, by definition, they have all been recent members of the Armed Forces and may feel obligated to support the service. I reflected on how this could lead to research participants feeling obliged to give the 'right' answer to what they believe the Ministry of Defence would want to hear to protect their future relationship with the Department. The approach and

conduct of the interview sessions mitigated some of these issues. Throughout the research process, I progressed with an honest and open approach ensuring the maintenance of the integrity of data as collected. The key way in which I addressed these tensions was by recognizing that they existed and by adopting a reflexive approach (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). By being open and transparent with participants within the research, and ensuring that I remained aware of power relationships throughout the process, I believe that I kept these issues from unduly influencing the research outcome.

3.8 Researcher Reflexivity

Researchers are in the world and of the world. They bring their own biographies to the research situation and participants behave in particular ways in their presence. Qualitative enquiry is not a neutral activity. (Cohen *et al*, 2011, p.225)

With regard to researcher bias, Bourdieu highlights the significance for knowledge claims of the “neglected objectifying relation between subject and object, knower and known” (Maton, 2003, p.57). Bourdieu’s epistemic reflexivity comprises making the objectifying relation itself the object for analysis; the resultant objectification of objectification is, he argues, the epistemological basis for social scientific knowledge. He identifies three principal sources of bias in a knowledge claim: the social origins and coordinates of the researcher; the researcher’s position in the intellectual field; and ‘intellectual bias’, the result of viewing the world as a spectacle (Schirato & Webb, 2003). If I consider my own potential biases that may emanate from my social origins, my life history and personal story have led me to investigate this particular research area and therefore this must be considered. As well as this, my position in the intellectual field and my position regarding academic bias must also be taken into account.

I will not dwell on my intellectual journey, but will highlight that I initially engaged with the academic *field* of the Professional Doctorate in Education as a positivist: my entire academic life until that point had been an exploration of the world through computer modeling, questionnaires and quantitative data. However, quite early on in the programme I considered the issues surrounding objective truths, and I questioned the limit of what numbers could tell me about the complexity of the social

world. This moment was quite unsettling and it fundamentally changed my perspective as researcher. The philosopher Wittgenstein (1921/2001) intrigued me with his perspectives on the role of language in human thinking and its representation of reality, especially in our supposedly neutral use of words even though we belong to a particular culture. I also considered Bruner (1986) and his theories of human understanding and thinking in terms of storied text, and Husserl with his concepts of habituality and habitus, a constituted self as a stable and abiding ego (Moran, 2011). The sociologists and philosophers Michael Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu provided me with fresh intellectual tools with which to go out and unpick the world. New perspectives on the nature of 'Truth' and knowledge, the concept of the 'archaeology of knowledge' (Foucault, 1989), how discourse and understanding are socially constructed and sedimented over time – all these interested me. The thinking tools of *habitus*, *field* and *capital* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1984; 1990) provided a framework that would help me unravel the complexity of social interaction, forming complex *field* analysis between the macro and micro, an analysis that could play back and forth between *field* and *habitus*. I wanted to understand the way the social world shaped the individual, but the notion of the individual shaping the social world had a resonance that bought clearer understanding. I firmly found my self rooted in a social constructionist ontological and epistemological frame, preferring to create meaning and understanding through rich interpretative methods, ones that could employ complementary forms of both qualitative and quantitative data, escaping the subjective-objective dichotomy.

It is worthy of note that I inhabited two intellectual worlds during the course of my research, that of Plymouth University's Professional Doctorate in Education programme, with requisite study weekends, assignments and conferences, but also my professional world. As a part-time student, the majority of my time was spent at work rather than in the university, a professional world dominated by numerical analysis and objective-based evidential decision-making. Therefore, my research and professional life were in tension. My exploration of the subject of 'the employment of ex-military as teachers' would potentially develop into a critical analysis of the subject area and put me in a sensitive position with respect to my findings and my professional position with my employer.

Once located in the research field, conducting data collection and undertaking the physical act of analysis, I had to position myself in a different frame to proceed in a reflexive manner. To do this, I had to acknowledge, understand and recognize my relationships to the knowledge, knower and known within the research (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). I also had to recognize my metaphorical relationship to the world, including how the world is constructed, the power relations within the research process and how questions can be loaded regarding my own 'map of the world' or *habitus*. In short, I had to ensure a balance within my arguments and guard against unconscious influence in my embodied way of being in the world (*ibid*). I reflected that a way of countering researcher bias would be through giving research participants 'voice' within the data collection process and a role in the interpretation of data. This could have potentially introduced risk into the data collection process and conflict if participants had challenged what was said during interviews or what was recorded during participant observations:

When it comes to writing up, the principle of reflexivity implies a number of things. The construction of the researcher's account is, in principle, no different from other varieties of account: just as there is no neutral language of description, so there is no neutral mode of report. The reflexive researcher, then, must remain self-conscious as an author, and the chosen modes of writing should not be taken for granted. (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983: p.207-8 cited in Cohen *et al*, 2011, p.541)

I concluded that the researcher's narrative would never be the research informant's narrative. As researcher, I would be using others' words and presenting them within my thesis and that this was the reality with this particular method of research. I therefore decided that the approach I would adopt to ensure a level of trustworthiness in my research would be peer review, which was already being achieved through the research supervision process. I had chosen my research supervisors not only because of their illuminating perspectives on the work of Bourdieu, but also because I felt they would challenge me regarding my particular subjectivities. I believe that this has helped guard against bias within the research and provide greater reliability and validity, or rather confidence and trustworthiness (Clandinin & Connelly, 1990) in the case of my interpretative approach, through continuous critical review of my work throughout the entire research process.

3.9 Analysis of Data

The purpose of this research is to investigate the employment of ex-military as teachers from a perspective of identity and culture. In doing this, I will develop an understanding of how the research participants construct identities and are positioned within this specific research setting. This will allow an understanding of the impact of identity constructions on *field* actors and how the positioning impacts the educational setting itself. As already discussed, the theoretical frame for analysis is Pierre Bourdieu's *habitus*, *field* and *capital* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1990; 1998). This theory of 'research practice', in Bourdieu's terms (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.104-107), demands three distinct levels of analysis. An initial analysis of the *field*, *vis-a-vis* the *field* of power, is conducted within this research through the socio-political, macro level, discourse that influences the research setting - *College*. Secondly, a mapping is undertaken of the objective structure of positions occupied by the agents, who compete for legitimate forms of authority of which the *field* is a site. Finally, an analysis is performed of the *habitus* of agents, which determines their social and economic condition, which is achieved through analysis of *capital* exchange and positioning, contained within the narrative and symbolic interaction between research participants (*ibid*). To conduct a complete *field* analysis, it was fundamental to consider all three levels (Grenfell, 2008); failure to do so would only give a partial understanding. These principles were not applied in a mechanistic or linear fashion but when required, acknowledging "one another at one and the same time", (*ibid*, p.227) to build a rich picture of influences that shaped practice within *College*.

Analysis of the macro level discourse was conducted through selected secondary text data sources, documents from Government policy, law, education policy and practice, the media and secondary quantitative data. This allowed me, as a researcher, to understand the wider cultural influences that acted on the research setting and that position both staff and students within *College* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Reay, 2012). The process of discourse analysis started with the identification of the objects of discourse, tracing the relationship between the words and the objects; how the words that are used to communicate end up producing the very objects of which they speak (Graham, 2011). Within this process there was a need to consider the mechanisms of recognition, how they are made recognizable and are constituted through language representations, conventions that produce their

culturally and historically located meaning (Butler, 1997). The identification of how the discourse classifies the subject or object can then be clarified and this can enlighten understanding on how this shapes identities, beliefs and actions (Graham, 2011). This has allowed me to understand the macro level influences that shape the micro level relationships within the *field* of research.

Micro level discourse and narrative were analyzed through the Bourdieuan lens of *capital* exchanges and positioning. An important aspect of this analysis is the “construction of the research object” (Grenfell, 2008, p.220) and the relational nature of the interpretation that is constructed. The researcher has to avoid the temptation of making substantive claims regarding the social phenomena identified within the analysis, recognizing instead the relational nature of their thinking, an understanding in terms of “social spaces, positions and relationships pertaining in a particular time and place” (*ibid*, p.220-221). Within the analysis of interview transcripts and observation field notes, I began by reading, re-reading and reflecting on the data, making myself completely fluent with the storied accounts. I began to identify and categorize exchanges that I deemed significant, setting them against the research questions (macro discourse, capital exchanges, constructing others) and into thematic groups, starting with a ‘wide angle lens’ through to the identification of the more nuanced understanding of the social interactions as they emerged out of the data (Cohen *et al*, 2011).

The process of synthesizing new understanding within the research area used both this macro and micro level discourse and narrative analysis; identifying linguistic and symbolic markers; linking texts to theories developed within the literature review; assembling thematic groups; conducting interpretative analysis; and abducting subjective understanding as I aggregate the findings into a coherent whole (Cohen *et al*, 2011; Graham, 2011). To fully explain my research analysis method, and to attempt to achieve a high degree of transparency with my interpretative processes, I will now use a research data text extract to provide a specific example. What I will present is an exposition of my analytical approach, talking through the process in a narrative dialogue to provide clarity to the reader of my application of theory and methods. The data text is taken from an interview with Claire, a senior manager within *College*:

And there's etiquette for these military dinners and when you have to sit down and who's on the top table and, etc. But I sat next to this lad and we had soup to start and I then - he basically was going to lick his bowl out and so I had to say, oh no, no don't, have my roll, have my roll. And some of them had their knives and forks the other way round. And they were saying you know in the military you can't do that. He said, but I'm not there yet! I hadn't anticipated, that sounds really tiny, but for them to actually socially be able to interact, which I guess if you come from a background that you're taught table manners and you know how to socially interact and there's a lot of that in your family - how that sets you up in confidence to be in a big group of people and actually be socially accepted. How a dinner like that and what is expected of you, those lessons - how on earth do they learn those lessons. So me telling that lad you really don't do that in public, have a roll. He will have that then and it's just - that would never have happened unless we'd sat down and had that dinner.

The exchange of *capitals* regarding table manners and the symbolic interaction through the giving of a 'bread roll' stands out, by inspection, as an element of data for analysis. Within my approach I aimed to move through the data, to a description of the text using the Bourdieuan frame, then link the interpretation to established theories and writing I have reviewed within the literature review, before offering my interpretation, my abductive reasoning, a synthesis from current understanding and new insight. To begin my analysis, I considered the *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1977) of the individual actors involved within this scene. The student within this text is constructed by Claire as a *lad*, positioned in generalized terms as not possessing a cultured *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1984), "how on earth do *they* learn those lessons". This construction represents a form of 'othering' (Said, 1978), a divide between the uncultured 'other' in comparison to a cultured middle-class disposition. Claire's wider construction of 'student' painted a narrative of cultural deficit, "some of them came from very mixed backgrounds, care backgrounds and they didn't have any strong role models".

This student construction as a 'lad' could be held up in opposition to Claire's own biographical account as a degree-qualified teacher who had started her working life as a house-mistress within a private school. She held a senior management position within *College* and therefore possessed a dominant power position with respect to the student. Claire had high levels of dominant *cultural capital*, as defined within national societal discourse, and a refined *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1984), distinct to that of the student with which she was seated at the military dinner. She understood the 'rules of the game' regarding a formal dinner and she embodied the appropriate

etiquette transferred from family experience, “*if you come from a background that you’re taught table manners and you know how to socially interact and there’s a lot of that in your family*”. The comparative processes position student behaviour in deficit, Claire identifying that some students were holding “*their knives and forks the other way round*”, and that the student next to Claire was acting to “*lick his bowl out*”. Within her narrative, the behavioural standards dictated by Claire determined whether the students would be “*socially accepted*” and what behaviours should not be exhibited “*in public*”.

The narrative describes a realization of macro discourse at the micro level, the dominance of middle-class values as taken for granted behavioural norms. These norms are seen to be fundamental to fitting the individual for their place within society, behaviours required to be socially accepted. The construction of student identity that Claire offered aligned with conceptions regarding undesirable working-class masculinities that had been objectified within modern social discourse (Lewis, 2004; Barker, 2005; Quinn *et al*, 2006; Deuchar, 2010; Jones, 2011). The issue is located in the family, issues related to the lack of a cultured background, in comparison to Claire’s construction of her own cultured *habitus*. It can be argued that conceptions of acceptable social norms predominantly come from a middle class perspective, the dominant form of *cultural capital*, whereas inner-city youth social norms are situated in the social networks and social space they inhabit (Young, 2012). To the student, holding your knife and fork the wrong way around or licking your bowl out might not seem deviant practices.

Within the narrative, Claire has conflated her values with those of the military; she sees no separation between the expected social norms of her cultured *habitus* and those required at the military dinner (“*you know in the military you can’t do that*”). This is, however, a misrecognition of reality. She has a sense that the military dinner is a normal event for all in the military context, but in fact it is a social ritual that is confined to the senior non-commissioned and commissioned Officers and not the Other Ranks who, as described earlier in this thesis, are more aligned to a working-class *habitus*. Employment within the Other Ranks was what the majority of students within *College’s* Military Academy were aiming to achieve. Within the context of the military dinner, the student is seen to exhibit unthinkable behaviour. The student is saved from disgrace through the giving of a bread roll, which acts as a symbolic

metaphor within Claire's account, the giving of *cultural capital* from Claire to the student ("So me telling that lad you really don't do that in public, have a roll. He will have that then and it's just - that would never have happened unless we'd sat down and had that dinner"). My conclusions are that the positioning of the student through Claire's symbolic interaction at the military dinner places the student in deficit and can be viewed in Bourdieusian terms as an act of *symbolic violence*. Claire, who has come from a family and education that has provided her with the dominant middle-class *cultural capital* of British society, aligns cultivation and table manners with service in the military and the norms expected at a military dinner.

My approach to data analysis allows me to conduct a complete field analysis, to understand the interplay between *field* and *habitus*. It recognizes this as an essential element of the application of Bourdieu's *theory of practice* (1977), the need to connect the macro level influences with the *field* structures and *habitus* of individual agents who are the objects of the research. Effective application of these methods of analysis required me to recognize the relational nature of the social phenomena and the importance of the reflexivity within the process, something I leave the reader to assess as they judge the trustworthiness of my writing.

3.10 Assumptions, Limitations and Scope

The social and educational world is a messy place, full of contradiction, richness, complexity, connectedness, conjunctions and disjunctions. (Cohen *et al*, 2011, p.219)

As a social researcher, my study is underpinned by a series of fundamental assumptions, the first being that my research is intended to make the world a better place. My work will endeavour to fill a knowledge gap and is designed in such a way that I will convey a trustworthy picture of reality as opposed to reporting a fiction. My research assumes that this reality is constructed by the social actors within the research *field* (Burr, 1995; Gergen, 2009) and that they are relational, contextual and contingent to that localized setting within the timeframe of the study (Clandinin & Connelly, 1990; 1996). As a researcher, I had to assume that, as I interacted with the participants of the research, this affected their responses and behaviours (Maton, 2003).

Findings are created through interaction between researcher and the research participants. As researcher, it must be a fundamental assumption that the research participants will provide genuine answers and narratives to the questions posed and that the stories they tell are not intended to sabotage or misdirect the research intent. Random selection of participants would have only been important if my work wished to make broad generalizations or attempt to make statements of fact or truth, but this was not the intent within the research's epistemological design. A final assumption within my research is that my definition of 'military' is focused on the 'combat soldier', which I read as the focus of the socio-political discourse.

It must be recognized that the research approach brings certain limitations that must be understood; narratives are always interpretations and there are no means of determining their absolute validity. It is a fact that no researcher can be apolitical and objective: personal subjectivities will always influence the design, collection and interpretation of the research data (Kenway & McLeod, 2004); however, this is an issue with all approaches to the research endeavour. There are also socio-political limitations placed upon the research insofar as research based on small numbers of participants is taken less seriously by some academics and policy makers (Eisner, 1988; Clandinin & Connolly, 1990).

One of the key limitations of the research regarded the amount and breadth of data: the practicalities of gaining access and conducting data collection should not be underestimated. My initial intent to examine the *Troops to Teachers* policy failed because I did not gain permission from the Department for Education to conduct the research. I had underestimated the politicized nature of the subject and therefore had assumed that all parties would want the topic area to be explored. This issue demanded another approach, so access to *College* provided an ideal opportunity and this option was taken forward. The staff and students at *College* live busy lives and have limited time to give to research. There had already been one research team investigate the space, invited in by *College's* management in the first year of the Military Academy. The research team had conducted a mixed methods research project focusing on a social impact evaluation of *College's* Military Academy. This factor made me conscious that I would have to limit the amount of disruption in my data collection methods due to potential research fatigue by the participants. To ensure that I did not unduly impact the research setting, I undertook what I

subjectively believed was enough data collection, enabling the construction of field objects to illuminate a rich picture of College's social setting without overstepping the generosity of the staff in supporting my work.

Because of the nature of the research epistemology, the use of the Bourdieusian theoretical frame, I needed to consider both the objective and subjective dynamics of the setting, interpreting both *field* and *habitus*. I needed to capture the macro level influences that acted on the research setting as well as the actors' narratives that provided me with their subjective interpretations (Bourdieu, 1977). I therefore needed examples of qualitative and quantitative data that would allow me to conduct a full *field* analysis in terms of the Bourdieusian principles described in the previous sections. Without the macro level data, it would be difficult to construct the wider *field* structures. The lack of large-scale primary data that would allow me to understand the structuring structures within macro and micro level *fields* could be deemed a significant limitation, but within the scale of this research would have been difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, what has been used was what I deemed to be trustworthy secondary data, and this allowed me to create interpretations of the structuring structures of the macro level *field* that influence and shape the research *field*, structures that centre around issues of gender and class.

With regard to data needed to support the analysis of individual subject *habitus*, a limitation was the lack of direct biographical data. The data collection design relied on the collection of biographical data from the narratives captured through the interview process, which was derived from the stories that the research participants told of their lives and experiences within *College*. However, in hindsight, this could have been better captured through a biographical questionnaire to clearly collect the component elements of what I deemed to be important in the definition of *capitals* and *habitus*. The narrative data was sufficient, but the additional, more directed data capture would have simplified and possibly enhanced my analysis.

A more subjective limitation that I encountered and considered within the research process was the issue of reflexivity, the issue of my personal bias that would shape the selection, collection, interpretation and composition of my research project. Within my early research design, I had intended to involve the research participants in the interpretation and analysis of my research data to ensure that I captured their

understanding, not just my perspective. This may have been a naive aspiration as in reality my capacity and that of the participants to engage in analysis workshops, and also the risk to the research with respect to the potential differences in the individual interpretations, made it too complicated to achieve. My approach in reality was to use peer review by colleagues who understood Bourdieusian *field* analysis, but primarily using my supervisory team who reviewed my work in detail as I constructed my research narrative. I believe that these methods have allowed me to be confident that the data has been analyzed and interpreted in a trustworthy manner.

My final challenge has been the nature of the outcome of my research writing. Bourdieu's approach has led me to construct a particular view of the research setting in terms of dominant actors exercising power through legitimized *symbolic capital*, and this leads to what is a critical reading of the research setting. The participants, particularly *College's* management, welcomed me into their educational institute and made available staff and students for interview and observation. I feel a sense of unease as an individual who now portrays the setting as a competitive class-structured social group where the actions of some exercise power over a marginalized group of 'others'. The subject matter and results describe a politicized social dynamic that may be perceived as overly critical. To overcome this problem, I have endeavoured to be honest with my data, analysis and self, analyzing the data rigorously with the tools I have chosen and standing true to the results and outcome of the analysis.

3.11 Summary

My ontological and epistemological assumptions led me to conduct research with a view that human participants actively construct their own meaning of situations and that meaning arising out of social situations is understood through interpretative processes. Behaviour, and therefore data, is then socially situated, context related, context dependent and context rich (Cohen *et al* 2011). Case study research led me to create descriptions of the contextualized data where people, situations, events and objects within the research have meaning conferred upon them rather than possessing their own intrinsic meaning (Yin, 2009). My theoretical framework, Bourdieu's *habitus*, *field* and *capital* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1990; 1998), demanded data

that would allow interpretation of both the subjective and objective regarding research phenomena (Bourdieu, 1977). The primary data collection allowed interpretation of the subjective, with quantitative secondary data providing insight into the objective (*ibid*).

Within the research, knower and known are interactive and inseparable. My closeness as researcher to this specific case study required me to act reflexively (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992), understanding that my conduct would be prone to bias, but by using peer review I hoped to produce research that is a trustworthy account and understanding of the research setting and of the social interactions that take place within it. My methodological approach led me to use abductive reasoning, providing a 'best explanation' of the phenomena observed, understanding that this approach does not provide results that are easily generalizable or cross-checked, but does, however, provide results that can be widely understood, capturing the unique features that would be lost within purely large-scale quantitative research, thereby providing an approach that would best answer the research questions and intent (Cohen *et al* 2011).

Chapter 4 - Findings and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

I don't know why, but I felt quiet [*sic*] nervous arriving at *College* for my first data collection session, the approach to the college is imposing, arriving through a white washed Georgian gate house with a central arch, approaching up the quarter mile ruler straight drive, lined with tall 'monkey puzzle trees, until you reach the gentle rising bend in the road that provides you with the view of the lake and your first glimpses of *College* House. The red brick three storied Georgian mansion house has an imposing view of the countryside and the lake, mature trees tower across the grass frontage, cows graze and students kayak on the water, facing the instructor in the centre of the group. I take a moment to immerse myself in the scene in front of *College* and prepare myself mentally for my first day of data collection. (Research Diary - November 2013)

The analysis of my data is a snap shot in time, positioned in a particular context: the period between November 2013 and July 2014. It concerns a single case study, *College*, which, like all educational establishments, is subject to the cultural influences of its history, wider macro socio-political discourse which shape the institution and its practices, and the stories and narratives of the actors within the *field*; the managers, teachers, administration staff and students that make up, constitute and sustain *College's* identity and culture.

The research participants who were interviewed and observed as part of the data collection process came from a range of positions within *College*. They were individuals from the senior management team, the Military Academy staff, wider *College* teaching and support staff, and students from the Military Academy. Within *College's* management team, Roy was the CEO and Principal. Roy came from a farming family and had a state school education. He had undertaken a Higher National Diploma in Agricultural Engineering and had spent the majority of his working life within a land-based college setting. Claire was a degree-qualified teacher who had started her working life as a housemistress within a private school. She was the Deputy Principal within *College*. She had held a childhood ambition to join the Royal Navy as an Officer and had undertaken the Admiralty Interview Board for selection, but took a career path in education instead. David was the final member of the senior management team and was Head of Employer Engagement & Foundation Learning. David was from a state school education background and had been a

former Warrant Officer. David had also worked within Defence apprenticeship provision as a senior manager, prior to arriving at *College*, and had been the initiator of the Military Academy concept.

From the wider college staff, Heather was in a mid-management role as Head of Teaching and Learning; she was responsible for teaching standards within *College*. She was also the manager for four curriculum areas: Equine, Sport, Military & Public Services and Outdoor Adventure. Heather was a specialist in Equine and had worked within a land-based education context for over twenty years. Tom was the Section Leader for Agriculture, Engineering and Countryside Management and had been a teacher for six years, all of which he had spent within the land-based environment. Tom was passionate about vocational education, but stated a lack of knowledge regarding the military. Tracey was a Student Services Coordinator who looked after the welfare of the residential and day students. Her role was to help students, but also to instill discipline. Tracey had a son in the British Army Other Ranks and her narrative indicated that she understood military culture. The Military Academy staff and students will be introduced within later sections.

From my data I will build a picture from the outside in, from macro to micro, through *College's* history, embedded within its particular context. It is a context of a national education discourse that shaped the focus and value of education provision through policies, political debate and a national culture that influenced the management team and the teachers, staff and students within *College*. This includes the Military Academy staff, their relationship with the management, students and other teachers, and finally the positioning and *capital* exchanges that the students are subject to and those which they exert on others. At this point in time, *College's* Military Academy was in its second year of being, and I entered the *field* having been invited in by *College* management and Military Academy staff to conduct my research.

4.2 Field Culture - Performativity, Management and the Market

College's history defines its enduring culture, a history that is firmly placed in agriculture and the countryside. From my initial visit I learnt the history of *College* House and the grounds on a tour of the site. Following the Second World War, and a request from the Ministry of Agriculture, the local council were directed to find a large

house and farm which would be suitable for use as a 'Farm Institute' to train ex-servicemen and women in agriculture as part of a rehabilitation programme. *College* House and grounds were leased to the local council by a wealthy landowner and in 1947 the College Farm Institute was formed and academic staff welcomed their first course, individuals from the Women's Land Army (Research Diary - November 2013). Roy explained, "the college's cultural identity has been developing since 1947 and it's pretty rooted in some historic characteristics".

College records show that in the early 1950s, more than 80% of students returned to farms after they finished at *College*, the rest into National Service or other education. The venture was so successful that the outright purchase of *College* House and the estate was made in the mid-1950s to form a permanent educational institute (*ibid*). This service of providing an education to the local agricultural community has endured, as described by Tracey, a Student Services Coordinator:

I think that a lot of our agriculture students have probably, they already know what they're going to do because a lot of them as well come from farming backgrounds. So they're perhaps taking over a farm or going into the farm business you know, from parents, grandparents. So yes, the majority of them do know what they already want to do and where they're going to be.

The focus and philosophy of *College* was entwined with the land-based community they served, and the pedagogy was positioned as vocational "land based training" (Research Diary – November 2014). The teachers and students came with a lived experience of agriculture, a certain form of cultured *habitus*, a "product of history, produc[ing] individual and collective practices, and hence history, in accordance with the schemes engendered by history" (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 82). This defined the *field* culture, "the relationship between the structure of a *field* and the *habitudes* of its members to be one of varying degrees of fit or mismatch" (Grenfell, 2008, p.57). Heather, head of teaching and learning within *College*, described her experience of arriving to work at *College*:

I came from another college, very similar, land based setup. It was a land-based campus as within a large FE culture. So coming to this sort of site was quite familiar, even though it was, this is a prettier site and more rural. (Heather)

Heather had transferred from another land-based college seven-and-a-half years before, experiencing a *field-habitus* match (Grenfell, 2008), finding her self a "fish in

water”, (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.127), a *habitus* aligned with the practices within *College*, a *habitus* socialized in the countryside, having as a young woman, worked within the equine discipline since she had completed formal education and started work as a teacher.

The teaching practice within *College* was focused on vocational knowledge and credibility, the dominant *capital* of the *field*, as described by Claire, a member of the senior management team:

I’ve always believed that you have to have credible teaching staff anyway so if you’ve got, it’s delivering to agriculture students you want someone preferably, and we have quite a mix of part-time staff because they run their own farms so they actually say, sorry I’m a bit tired, I was up at whatever time, milking. So you’ve got that reality and you’ve got to be credible in their eyes. (Claire)

Students were predominantly drawn from the local farming community. The college had an inclusive approach to student admissions, positioning itself as providing a service to those who wanted to work within this vocational sector:

There is a stigma that the college does take anybody. We’re an inclusive college and to be - generally within the practical vocational context that we deliver in agriculture, animal care, equine. Those sorts of practical vocations. They, you don’t need to be that academic. So how lovely, to be able to learn whilst doing. So yes I think there’s a real range of students that we get here. (Heather)

The modern day narrative of *College* was tied to this deep-rooted land-based culture, forged from its historical legacy. However, this culture was impacted by Government policies of the 1980s and 1990s, particularly the introduction of the national inspection frameworks of the Adult Learning Inspectorate (ALI) and Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). It is from this perspective that I have explored *College*’s modern day cultural context by analysis of Ofsted documents:

College is inadequate, say inspectors ... Leadership and management are unsatisfactory, with little improvement in the quality of provision since the first inspection of the college in 1997. (Ofsted News Release)

The following year, *College* was inspected again through ALI/Ofsted and was highlighted as having made progress “through a significant period of change” (Ofsted Report - *College*). The report highlighted good vocational teaching, but observed continuing weaknesses in classroom teaching, assessment, standards of students’ work and slow progress towards framework achievement for work-based learners

(*ibid*). The focus of practice within *College* was towards authentic vocational experience over teaching and pedagogic practice, which meant a lack of focus on the processes and procedures required to ensure and assure the delivery of high quality education in terms of national standards.

From 2008, *College* was put into formal “financial recovery” and received an overall Ofsted quality rating of ‘Satisfactory’ for Social Care within its Inspection Report (Ofsted Report - *College*). That year, Ofsted carried out an unannounced random inspection to assess whether previous recommendations had been met and were assessed at a ‘Good’ overall standard, witnessing a steady improvement in assessed standards.

The context of Ofsted inspections, commercial targets and measures, such as financial recovery, focused *College*’s management on the business aspects of the education provision. There was a need to diversify their offer and maximize the usage of *College* resources to secure the foundations of a financially successful future:

We had an imperative to grow our student numbers to increase the scale and size of the organization to better carry our cost overheads and improve our financial performance. And it was recognized that we did have quite a narrow and traditional curriculum offer in terms of our full-time provision. We were not fully utilizing our residential accommodation, so that was a cost burden on the college, or an opportunity lost for income. (Roy)

The language conveyed a financial performance-focused narrative on “*cost overheads; financial performance; cost burden*”, where the business imperatives of the management team demanded change outside the traditional land-based provision of *College*. Ball (1990; 2008) argues that this trend in education has ushered in an era of the market, management and performativity, which has fundamentally impacted on teacher identity and subverted personal agency within the classroom. The centralized and prescribed definition of the work of schools and teachers has created ideological tensions between differing perspectives on the purpose of education:

... with the political left broadly intent on continuing the egalitarian ideals of comprehensive reform and the right regarding education as a critical component of social order that defended traditional academic values and

prepared young people for (class appropriate) employment (Passy, 2013, p.1063).

This focus placed teacher identity and ideological perspectives in conflict. Tom, a section leader within agriculture, provided an insight into this unsettling dynamic: “And gone are maybe the days of doing a course for your own spiritual enhancement. Now there has to be an outcome. I don’t know where I sit with that. I’d like a bit of both but we don’t get to make those decisions”.

Tom portrayed the complex dilemma between his personal ideology regarding education, education for the purpose of “*spiritual enhancement*”, which is aligned with a more progressive liberal model of learning, being in tension with the modern dominant ideology of the industrial trainer paradigm with its market-based focus (Ernst, 1991), the purpose being a financially-measurable “*outcome*”. His intrinsic appreciation regarding the value of education was set against the pragmatic economic reality of education as a means to achieve measurable outcomes, “a performative culture in which teachers align their practice to external targets and evaluations” (Ball, 2003 cited in Passy, 2013, p.1067). Within Tom’s account, he portrays a sense of powerlessness with his situation, “*we don’t get to make those decisions*”, or the lack of agency within his professional ability to control the education of the students he taught. Claire’s management perspective of aligning teaching and education standards with Ofsted caused issues between teaching staff and management, as she worked to embed lasting change within teaching practice:

You know when you set up, you set up your academic year, you put in processes and we’ve obviously got through to an Ofsted good. And people have to comply; they have to do the basics. Well after sort of - what I found after say - Ofsted happened last year and this year people had dropped off. They’ve not done the things that I’m assuming that they should have done. So there’s this lack of discipline seems to come into and I suppose also from a management point of view you try and change your style from being so dictatorial to actually being a little bit more relaxed and trusting. Well I’ve realized actually you can’t - if you’re really striving to push through success and that level, you can’t. (Claire)

The nature of reality for staff at College, from the 1950s onwards, was a strong sense of ontological security (Woods and Jeffrey, 2002) created within the closed world of *College’s* working farms and country estate. The institutional culture of *College* was rooted in an agrarian paradigm where, historically, teaching staff had delivered land-

based training content within a realistic vocational context. Teachers within this period had agency to create realistic vocational environments, focusing on the growth of students learning through a child-centred approach (Ernst, 1991). This was a context that valued a form of *cultural capital* based on farming experience over pedagogic expertise and process. The introduction of the ALI and then Ofsted inspections challenged the ideology of the land-based community and the approach of the teaching staff. Staff *habitus* was seen as resistant to change, exhibiting a *hysteresis* in alignment to the new *field* conditions. Senior management recognized that modifying the practices of the teaching staff would take time and a continuous monitoring of behaviours to ensure that change was enduring.

The financial context of *College* demanded an expansion of the traditional land-based curriculum and this led to the creation of the rugby and military academies. The ex-military staff arrived with practices and experience that fitted them well for the new performance related focus of the organization:

And they've been successful despite us but that's - and I think if another team, if you were bringing them in would flounder but because they've just got on with it and they've got quite a few similarities. Will had left behind a lot of work towards Ofsted so they were very aligned to what that meant. They knew what they needed to do to be successful. (Claire)

This changing focus of market, management and performativity (Ball, 1990; 2008) and the need to drive change into the institutional culture of *College* positioned the new ex-military staff positively with the management board, their dispositions and approach differentiating them from the existing teaching staff:

But there's - I'm not suggesting it's all because of the military academy but there is that element of when you add in a new team and they are as good as they are and they are as strong as they are, it adds an element of competition. (Claire)

This positive accounting for the forces of "*competition*" within Claire's account portrayed a view that aligned with a capitalist ideology that suggested competition would raise standards and performance through comparative processes within the *field* (Ball, 1990; 2008). Heather, who was the senior manager overseeing the Military Academy provision, had another perspective on why she valued the arrival of the ex-military staff:

... what I find really refreshing is that they are really good at following orders! [Laughs.] That sounds really controlling but I am a control freak. And as a manager if I say I need something done, I'm not doing it just for fun.

Heather used humour within her narrative regarding the ex-military teachers, but this hid a deeper message regarding the subordinated nature of military service and personal obedience to the collective aim. The military team had an immediate effect on the management structures and governance within *College*, driving a change that led to devolved responsibility and accountability to a lower level, leading the organization to operate as efficiently as possible, aligning with the structure that had been introduced by Will as he set up the Military Academy:

From a business model we are as I say looking very healthy next year. So what they've now decided to do is each area of the college...is have a section leader in charge of it with the same focus as me...So across the college now they are saying, right okay if we can make every department work as efficiently as possible and accountable, then clearly the college will be a successful college. (Will)

The ex-military teachers arrived with differing perspectives and differing practices to the established teaching staff of *College*, particularly in identity, born out of socialization within another *field* that affected the way they regarded their work (Passy, 2013). These practices were relational, “not simply the result of one's *habitus* but rather of relations between one's *habitus* and one's current circumstances” (Grenfell, 2008, p.52). The ex-military staff's practice aligned with the management project and they were able, from an early stage, to influence the senior management team, establishing themselves and succeeding within the new *field* structure.

4.3 Military Discourse and Education Policy

As discussed within the methodology chapter, a Bourdieusian analysis of the subject area demands consideration of the macro level influences on the research setting, *vis-à-vis* the *field* of power (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). To do this I considered key Government policies that underpinned the broader socio-political discourse regarding military values that was prevalent within the United Kingdom during the period of the research. This consistent societal discourse was one that was strengthened and

sustained through the words of politicians and coverage in the media, with a particular focus centred on the *Troops to Teachers* policy.

The *Troops to Teachers* policy was championed by Michael Gove who during this period was the Secretary of State for Education. He, and subsequently David Laws, had a consistent message that military values were centred on concepts of “teamwork, discipline and leadership” (Department for Education, 2013). Within Government policy papers on the Combined Cadet Force (Moon *et al*, 2010) and Military Ethos Alternative Provision (Department for Education, 2014), Armed Forces ethos was seen as a way of instilling self-discipline, confidence, leadership and a sense of service into school children, which would realize societal and educational benefits and all supported the military discourse within British society.

Prior to this politically constructed narrative, the Ministry of Defence and Department for Education had already engaged with schools regarding the Skill Force charity, which initiated a pilot ‘life skills’ provision within state education in 2000. This used ex-military personnel to inspire ‘hard to reach’ children, working closely with young people facing exclusion or underachievement (Department for Education, 2014). The provision was delivered from primary level to post-16, with the aspiration to reach over 10,000 children every year (skillforce.org accessed 26 Apr 15). There were differences in school staff attitudes towards Skill Force (Hallam & Rogers, 2014). In most schools there were excellent relationships between Skill Force personnel and school staff:

... with teams being treated as members of staff, being fully integrated into the school. In a few cases there were tensions between school staff and Skill Force personnel. In most cases these were the result of poor early communication where the programme had been implemented at speed. Where these tensions existed the programme tended to be less successful (*ibid*, p.11).

To highlight the level of debate surrounding the use of ex-military in teaching, I have made a comparative study of the number of UK newspaper articles regarding Skills Force and *Troops to Teachers* over the period 1998-2014 (Table 1 below) to show the politicized nature of the *Troops to Teachers* policy. I propose that the frequency of articles appearing in the UK media relates to the intensity with which it was problematized and debated. To set a contextual timeline to the appearance of both

initiatives, US *Troops to Teachers* was initiated by the US Department of Defense in 1994 (Burkard, 2008). In 2000, the scheme transferred from Defense to the US Department of Education, the same year that Skill Force started its provision in its first schools. In 2008, Tom Burkard published his *Troops to Teachers* policy paper, through the centre-right think tank, the Centre for Policy Studies (*ibid*). In 2010, the UK Department for Education published its education white paper, *The Importance of Teaching*, stating the intent to set up accelerated and fully funded routes into teaching for members of the Armed Forces (Department for Education, 2010).

Concurrent to this policy release, the Conservative and Labour Parties engaged in rhetoric regarding the use of military values and military ethos within education to equip British school children with the skills required for life in the modern world. The initiatives would teach values producing a greater sense of morality and service to counter the pervading discourse of individuality and selfishness that defined modern society (Clay & Thomas, 2014; Hunt, 2014).

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
SF	0	0	0	4	1	0	5	2	2	1	3	4	5	5	1	0	0
TtT	0	1	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	36	11	35	33	19	33	18

Table 1. Articles regarding ‘Troops to Teachers’ (TtT) and ‘Skill Force’ (SF) in major British newspapers 1995-2014 (Source: LexisNexis Academic)

The level of coverage within British newspapers regarding Skill Force indicated a lack of political controversy surrounding the subject. The *Troops to Teachers* policy, in comparison, embedded the military within discourse and a debate that was highly politically charged; politicians had objectified the military, and military values, to further their own ideological aims. It is my interpretation of the data that this practice placed the military in tension with the teaching profession and led to heated debate within the media, as the data in Table 1 illustrates. Some of the key criticisms identified that the policy devalued the teaching profession as weak and incapable and portrayed a pervasive underclass responsible for a discipline crisis within British schools (Tipping, 2013). The articles surrounding this subject area between 2008 and 2014 were of polarized opinion; military values were politically positioned in distinction to educational culture and teacher values.

This objectification of the military, and the strengthening of the military discourse within society, continued throughout the tenure of the coalition government. The Cameron Government's focus on military values within society and education had its roots in his schooling, informed by his experiences of the Combined Cadet Force at Eton (Swinford & Farmer, 2014). The values and ethos of the military aligned with his political concept of the 'Big Society' that was conceived to rebalance the relationship between individuals, society and the state (*ibid*). Sasson-Levy (2002) has highlighted links between the military and citizenship, arguing that "the masculinity of the combat soldier has achieved a hegemonic status and turned into a social ideal, the emblem of both masculinity and full citizenship" and, therefore, "...defining the combat soldier as the 'good citizen' serves the interests of the state" (Sasson-Levy, 2002, p.359). I would argue that Sasson-Levy's research mirrors similar socio-political positioning within British society at the time of this research. Within the imagery of national socio-political narratives, the combat soldier put the state before his own needs and was willing to sacrifice personal agency and even life for the wider good of society. This collectively focused positioning, and macro level identity work, was presented as an idealized construct to counter the opposing discourse surrounding the individualized and selfish nature of modern society.

This personal vision of Cameron's had disappeared from his rhetoric at the time of the research analysis and there was a re-focusing of the narrative on 'character' and the provision of Government funding to help schools "ensure that more children develop a set of character traits, attributes and behaviours that underpin success in education and work" (Morgan, 2015a). Following these initiatives, Morgan announced further Government funding for rugby coaching within state education, stating that this would "instill character and resilience in disaffected children" (Morgan, 2015b). It can be argued that much of this policy setting was related to taken for granted ideas of value, influenced by the private school education system, through the development of cultured *habitus* that supported and maintained middle-class values within British society since, "by virtue of *field-habitus* match, social agents share the *doxa* of the *field*, the assumptions that "go without saying" and that determine the limits of the doable and the thinkable" (Grenfell, 2008, p.59).

Taken for granted perspectives can influence those with power to set policies based on their own subjective lived experience because "the school thus acts as a "habit-

forming force" that gives rise to "the cultivated *habitus*" (Bourdieu, 1971 cited in Grenfell, 2008, p.64). Within British professions, 62% of senior military officers, 50% of the House of Lords, 36% of the Cabinet, 35% of professional rugby union players and 33% of Members of Parliament were privately educated (Arnett, 2014). With policies being implemented that privilege the introduction of the military and rugby within state education, overlaid with the perspective that both the military, through the Combined Cadet Force (Wood, 2014), and rugby union (Nauright & Chandler, 1996) are central within the culture of the public school system, leads to an interpretation that they are valued activities that are held up as middle-class ideals.

Aligning themselves with this growing discourse of discipline and military values, the Labour Party policy review into *Service Ethos* proposed that society could benefit from the values and expertise of the Armed Forces, defining those values as "responsibility, comradeship, hard work and a respect for public service" (Murphy, 2013). Despite the concept using language that had closer linguistic ties to socialist values, *comradeship* and *public service*, reaction on the Labour policy website to this potential development was a critical rebuke, the project seemingly countering the socialist values of its grass root members, highlighting the fact that the military are "professionals in violence" (Janowitz, 1960, p.3):

This proposal would not have been out of place in Hohenzollern Germany. I would be far more comfortable if Labour were launching a document titled 'The Cooperative Ethos'. The document ignores the fundamental *raison d'etre* of the armed forces: delivery of deadly violence on the orders of the state. Without acknowledgement of the purpose of the armed forces any discussion of the values and ethos of the forces is meaningless (Murphy, 2013).

The Labour party also aligned its proposed policy with the concept of 'character into the curriculum' (Hunt, 2014). Tristram Hunt, the Shadow Secretary for Education during the period of the research, proposed within *Schooling for the Future* that a focus of the educational process should be on developing 'character', stating "we want young people who are confident, determined and resilient; young people who display courage, compassion, honesty, integrity, fairness, perseverance, emotional intelligence, grit and self-discipline" (*ibid*). These references to character aligned very closely with the discourse surrounding military values and ethos. They also reflected an association with the cultured middle-class *habitus* and educational experience of Hunt, a privately educated graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge (Chorley, 2014).

Within *College's* Military Academy, the staff produced documentation outlining the core values and student charter on which the provision would be run. The core values that students were to exhibit were: courage, cheerfulness, determination, unselfishness, discipline, respect, integrity and loyalty. These closely aligned with the Army's published values (British Army, 2008) and were further enshrined in a Military Academy charter that every student had to read, agree to uphold and then sign. The student charter rules covered standards of behaviour, dress, movement around college, marks of respect (the use of Sir and Ma'am when addressing teachers and senior staff), regulated use of mobile phones, rules regarding littering, personal cleanliness, accommodation cleanliness and respect for others. The charter summary stated:

This charter reflects the sense of responsibility, respect and self-discipline required of all students who aspire to enter the Military or Public Services. During the course these qualities will develop to ensure you have the best preparation for the future whichever path you decide to take. All students must acknowledge responsibility for their own actions, but should also be proud of their position within the Military Academy. This pride should bring with it a genuine desire to raise yourselves above the standards of 'normal' society and reflect the tradition, ethos and values instilled in the Academy programme. Any major infringements of this code will result in disciplinary action being taken against either individuals or if necessary groups. In signing this charter I agree to, and acknowledge, the rules laid out in it. (*College Military Academy Charter*)

This charter produced by the staff of the Military Academy positioned the military and their values above those of "*normal society*". It positioned those who are outside the military as a social group subordinated and in deficit with the military grouping. This can be considered through the concepts of Said (1978) and his descriptions of 'othering', where the weaknesses of one group are highlighted by a more powerful group so that the less powerful are seen as lesser and as requiring improvement; "In other words, we define ourselves negatively, in terms of being different from somebody else. Those who are not 'us' define who 'we' are" (Edley & Wetherell, 1997, p.208). These concepts mirror the processes within projects of moralization within socio-political discourse (Hunt, 1999; Hier, 2002; Critcher, 2009) where identities are constructed through negative normalizing discourse. Students joining the Military Academy were offered the opportunity to join this privileged group, providing access to resources in the construction of new identities, if they observe the codes and behaviours articulated within the core values and charter. According to Hinojosa (2010), this ability to access resources also came with dis-benefits,

The irony is that by accessing the resources of the military to construct a hegemonic masculinity, they will be subordinated and/or marginalized. Thus, constructing a hegemonic masculinity through discursive subordination is viewed as an exercise in wielding symbolic, rather than real, power (p.192).

This symbolic power, or *imagined social capital* (Quinn, 2010), would be fundamental in the construction of Military Academy student identities as they orientated themselves within the *field* structures of *College*. This positioned *field* actors outside the Military Academy, whether they are other students, staff or teachers, in a subordinated position to that of the military.

4.4 The Arrival of Ex-Military Teachers within *College*

The Military Academy team joined *College* over an eighteen-month period, having to set up a new programme and curriculum within a short space of time with limited resources. Will was the first to arrive, designing the programme, basing much of the content on what he knew of the military training system that he had just come from:

We had to secure the appointment of someone very credible who would not be a pastiche of a military ethos but would be the real thing. So we were looking to appoint the retiring head of training at - from the military base, Major Will Jones, and he then became a key part of the team that planned the launch and delivery of the first year's cohort. (Roy)

This concept of credibility came with a desire to recruit an individual who was genuinely 'military', someone who possessed significant amounts of operational military experience. This experience would translate into a form of *symbolic capital* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1986), linked to qualification through military experience, rank and position, which would enable the candidate to establish authority within their new work setting.

Will came to *College* with over thirty years experience within the military, with dispositions born out of this professional lived experience. Will was a physically impressive figure, despite being in his fifties; he had the "clear physical fitness and bearing of someone from the military" (Research Diary - November 2013). He arrived at *College* having been responsible for the management of a military training school, he had gained bachelors and masters degree within his military service and had also completed a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

Will came to the college *field* with the ability to mobilize and deploy significant *cultural* and *social capitals* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1986). *Symbolic* forms were realized through the stories he and others told of his military service, his embodied physical state, and in institutionalized forms through his military rank, honours, graduate and postgraduate educational qualifications. *Social capital* was mobilized through the local military network that he was part of, which allowed him to quickly access resources to support his programme. He therefore came powerfully equipped to the setting and this provided him with the ability to quickly establish himself within the *field*. He also held a genuine interest in teaching that reached back to his childhood and family experiences:

Well I suppose in a way the whole teaching thing stems right back to when I was a child. Because my father was a schoolteacher and so it was something which as I went through my schooling was one of my potential aspirations actually from when I left school, was to become a teacher. (Will)

Will was recognized as coming to *College* with significant operational military experience, which mobilized as a powerful form of military *cultural capital*. Promoted to the officer corps from the ranks, Will had an extensive operational and leadership record from the military, leading to influence over senior management within this new work setting, allowing him autonomy in running his team:

So it's their work ethic is very different to what I would say a normal FE lecturer is and it's also the team. They work very, very solidly as a team...but it's much stronger, it's the strongest I've seen in any team in what they do and get done and they're very self-sufficient. They don't need really anybody else to do what they need to do. (Claire)

This narrative regarding work ethic and the relational construction of the ex-military teachers positioned negatively against the '*normal FE lecturer*' (Said, 1978) was a theme that appeared throughout the data regarding the military and the construction of the normalized other. Hinojosa (2010) has linked this form of identity construction to hegemonic masculine identities and the military:

One tactic for constructing an identity in-line with hegemonic masculinity is to compare the perceived qualities of service members to non-service members. One way this is done is to construct narratives in which the men possessed greater self-discipline, a characteristic that set them apart from civilians (p.183).

This example provided an indication of the identity construction that began with Will and his team's arrival within *College*. This construction was articulated by Claire, the Deputy Principal within College, whose narrative suggested that the ex-military were in some way 'better' than the existing staff. Claire's narrative throughout the research supported the ex-military teacher over the existing staff. My interpretation of this was that the military practices aligned with the management's business-focused perspectives and Claire's cultured middle-class *habitus*, supporting her efforts in trying to instigate change within *College* and in tension with a resistant historically sedimented agricultural culture.

Will recruited Yan because of his adventurous training qualifications and also because he was assessed to have the right coaching and mentoring attributes to his teaching style. Yan, who was twenty-nine years old, also had a genuine ambition to become a teacher. This had been born out of his nine years experience in the Royal Air Force as a Physical Training Instructor, in the rank of Corporal, having spent the latter part of his career teaching adventurous training in North Wales:

I really enjoy what I've learned in the military and I always saw myself when I was younger being a teacher. But I didn't want to be a PE teacher. I thought, right no actually I don't want to be a PE teacher anymore because I've seen the world, I've done it and I don't want to be stuck in one kind of - I want to be quite diverse in what I teach. (Yan)

Within the narrative accounts of the research participants, Yan involved himself in identity work that positioned him in deficit regarding military *cultural capital*, in comparison to other team members: "he was a PTI but he was taking people out and doing holidays with them. That's about, that's all he ever told us" (Male Respondent - Student Focus Group 4). His previous employment, as a Physical Training Instructor, provided him with less combat experience than the other members of the team, and hence less ability to construct identity through military *cultural capital*, in comparison with the other staff. His particular work experience, however, was highly relevant to his new work setting, directly qualifying him as a highly skilled adventurous training instructor.

Rob was the next to be recruited: he again came to *College* straight from the military with a clear ambition to teach, an ambition nurtured from his experience within the military. He arrived in *College* as a twenty-nine year old ex-Corporal from the Royal

Marines: “I’d spent 10 years in the marines, I’d been running around getting muddy, getting out there, gone to Afghanistan three times” (Rob). He also brought significant experience from his military service within the training domain:

So I went through all the promotion, the junior command course to get all the training and to then deliver back to the recruits and ended up doing 3 years down at the Commando Training Centre, actually training. And my greatest achievement there at the end was to get ‘most inspirational corporal’ award. So I really did hit that target...I developed so much skill and knowledge and qualification that I knew when I left I wanted to be a teacher. It was just right...with that all in motion and really enjoying it, I then signed myself onto the DTLLS degree level course which I’m due to finish in June this year...
(*ibid*)

Rob was positioned within an operationally focused narrative with *College* actors, related to his combat experience. This allowed him to mobilize significant levels of military *symbolic capital* within the team and his recent frontline experience was recognized by staff and students alike: “when I read Rob’s CV ... I was in awe of him” (Heather); “Rob was reconnaissance ... we know he’s done this on the front line” (Male Respondent - Student Focus Group 2). Rob was highly regarded across staff and students within *College*, and was constructed within a masculine narrative, realized through his combat experience. Sasson-Levy (2002) has highlighted the link between combat, the military and masculinity within hegemonic discourse:

The mutual connection between the military and masculinity was analyzed by Cynthia Enloe (1988; 2000), who claimed that the military has a special role in the ideological construction of patriarchy because of the major significance of combat in the construction of masculine identities and in the justification of masculine superiority (*ibid*, p. 358).

This narrative aligned with the current situation within the United Kingdom where, at the time of the research, females were excluded from serving within the British military in combat roles. It is my reading of the data that Rob was positioned within *College* as an exemplar of an idealized military vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003), constructed by staff and students as the embodiment of military masculinity, providing a focus to their own identity work.

The final member of the Military Academy team was Zac, an ex-British Army Infantry Sergeant with ten years military service, including operational tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. He had also spent a significant amount of time as a recruit instructor with junior soldiers. Again, Zac had a genuine ambition to be a teacher and had a

series of jobs after leaving the military in community education and also as an adventurous training instructor:

Also spent a bit of time at one of the training establishments and I actually worked on the junior soldiers programme for recruits who didn't get into Harrogate for whatever reason, missing grades and stuff...I then started working at a charity...called Routeways, working on a family learning project. Basically it was to get families from hard to reach backgrounds engaging in learning together... So yes from the outset I always knew that when I left I wanted to work within this kind of industry or teaching, whether it be outdoor activities or more academic route. In that period in-between I actually applied to work for SkillForce and went for an interview. (Zac)

Despite the fact that Zac had been outside the military for longer than the rest of the team, his embodied practice within *College* was of someone with significant military *cultural capital*, a cultured military *habitus* exhibited through the language and physical behaviours of an ex-soldier, "because its dispositions are embodied, the *habitus* develops a momentum that can generate practices for some time after the original conditions which shaped it have vanished" (Grenfell, 2008, p.59):

Zac has short hair, looks extremely fit and must be mid-thirties in age. Zac delivers with an air of formality, standing out front with a moderately didactic manner. He has military bearing, military delivery (old school) to his session. (Teaching Observation - Zac)

The ex-military teachers came to the setting with the ability to realize a powerful form of military *cultural capital*, which was constructed and sustained at a macro socio-political level and then transposed into the new micro work setting. Through narrative and symbolic interaction, the ex-military teachers mobilized this military *symbolic capital* to create powerful masculine identities that enabled them to establish dominant positions within the *field*.

4.5 Positioning of Ex-Military Teachers and *College's* Staff

The management within *College* recognized that the Military Academy staff came with their own professional experiences, their own ways of doing things, and that their differing practices caused tension within the new *field* on their arrival:

But it was also an insight into how sort of unprepared I guess people from the military would be coming into an FE establishment as teachers. Which was another insight into how difficult maybe it would be to actually employ staff and we always knew we would have to bridge the gap between coming into an FE college and leaving the military behind...them adapting to us and us

adapting to them. Because they're very self-contained and very focused and they will just get it done. So they might not know there are certain procedures and it's not because - it's because people haven't told them or explained to them, that's what we found. But they'll just get it done. (Claire)

The imposition of the *military habitus* within *College* with its "...ways of acting, feeling, thinking and being ... bring[ing] this history into ... present circumstances" (Grenfell, 2008, p.52), caused a mis-alignment of practice within the structured cultural *field* of *College*, the Military Academy staff finding themselves subject to sanctions as their behaviour produced disjuncture and disquiet among wider *field* actors (*ibid*). Claire excused the Military Academy staffs' behaviour, blaming others for not informing them of the rules. Will found that as he arrived in *College*, macro and micro level discourse influenced the perception of him with other members of staff from around the college; the military experience that he came with constructed him as a differentiated 'other' (Said, 1978) which he recognized from early on after his arrival:

... clearly I came here and I came here with a bit of a reputation from my past, and of course, one thing I learned very quickly is that reputations are great but you also have to re-establish yourself within your new environment and so that was a challenge in that I had to make people see me for who I was rather than what I was in the past. So that was probably the first six to eight months was a challenge to get people to know me as a personality, not from what I'd done in the past. (Will)

Will was positioned through discourse and narrative processes, positioned and constructed as an individual with significant military *cultural capital*. He consciously recognized the need to align practices with the *field* structures of *College*. His unconscious behaviours and practices, however, created tensions with existing *field* actors: "Will particularly ... people have got the perception that, well he just does his own thing. And when he doesn't comply with what people know as the normal college procedure they think he is being a little bit rude" (Claire). This positioning, and mobilization of *capital*, was unconscious within Will's behaviour as he created a dominant position through resistance to expected *field* practices, establishing a powerful military identity across the *field*:

It is in the very nature of the phenomenology of power that those ... who have it experience its workings the least aware of it. [T]o have power is to find no resistance to the realization of one's desires. [I]t is those without power who find at every turn resistances to the realization of their desires. (Edley & Wetherell, 1997, p.215)

This construction of military *cultural capital* at a macro level, being primarily based on operational combat experience, was recognized at a micro level and positioned the Military Academy staff as a differentiated highly masculine grouping. Military *cultural capital* appeared highly transposable from their former employment setting and positioned them as accomplished individuals (Grenfell, 2008) with unique qualifications and experience, positioned through a rarified discourse:

... these guys have actually been out there. They've been out there. They've seen it...I mean all of them because of what they'd done and what they've seen and what they've gone through and it's a different, yes it is completely different. (Heather)

Heather constructed military identities aligned with macro discourse, military *cultural capital*, created through symbolic and narrative interaction, based on recognized combat experience – “*these guys have actually been out there*” – her understanding shaped by macro discourse, but confirmed and validated through narrative processes at a micro level, through symbolic engagement with the new staff. The military discourse was established as a powerful *capital*, Edley and Wetherell (1997) identify that the

... ways in which men are positioned by a ready-made or historically given set of discourses or interpretative repertoires, but also at the ways in which these cultural resources are manipulated and exploited within particular rhetorical or micro-political contexts (Edley & Wetherell, 1997, p.206).

Heather's narrative indicated that all the ex-military staff had the same levels of combat experience; she positioned them all with the same levels of military *cultural capital*, a mis-recognition as this was not the case. This narrative highlighted the power of the rhetorical military discourse in defining an idealized 'imagined' masculine military identity.

Claire's construction differentiated the role of the military within society, setting it apart from other vocational areas of teaching, positioning the military as an objectified class by virtue of their *capital*, identifying them as a collective 'other':

So it's no different than any other qualification but I think it has a lot more meaning because of what the military represents to the country. You can't take that element away from it that we are preparing young men and women to go into the armed forces. It's quite a special thing to do. It's quite a unique thing. Yes. (Claire)

Claire's narrative highlighted that her perceptions were also shaped by macro level discourse that created the *capital* exchanges, elevating the ex-military teachers to a privileged position. Sasson-Levy (2002) has proposed that "in the West, military service emerged as a hallmark of citizenship, and citizenship as the hallmark of political democracy" (p.359). He has suggested that there is a fundamental link between the power identity discourse of the combat soldier with notions of citizenship, but that this macro power identity construction is based firmly within a hegemonic masculine ideal:

... in the West, military service and war have become integral to the definition of citizenship and to the development of the nation-state. Thus, military identity practices make a direct link between masculinity and the state and, therefore, are salient in the construction of both gender and civic identities (*ibid*, 359).

Claire possessed a cultured *habitus*, aligned with middle-class ideals and beliefs, exhibiting a "*field-habitus* match" (Grenfell, 2008, p.59) with the discourse surrounding masculine military identity and the micro *field* of the Military Academy staff. Her narrative described the ex-military team's behaviours in very positive terms, making supportive assertions based on common sense assumptions (*ibid*). One of the early examples of this positioning was an issue regarding the interplay of *capital* and the subordination of some former members of the management team who were positioned as inferior to the newly arrived group. With respect to the line management support for Will, his manager felt unqualified to provide direction and guidance to someone from such a background, "And so for example with Will, he has let Will go and do his own thing out of respect probably...(Claire)".

Will's line manager was unable to provide any leadership, the construction of the dominant military identity, through *capital* exchanges, subordinating the individual within his authoritative role:

... and there wasn't enough leadership at the start from...because he thought well, who am I to tell this person who's been running military training for the last few years, what to do. So that dynamic has been an interesting one which you couldn't really plan for and we've had to just feel our way with regards to. (*ibid*)

The consequence of this positioning was disjuncture for the *College* manager, a sense of disquiet and uncertainty that led to his move to another department away from the Military Academy. It could be argued that Will's construction of a hegemonic

masculine identity within the *field* had allowed him to inhabit a dominant position within *College's* hierarchy. This suggested process, highlighted by Hinojosa (2010), through which "... the everyday narrative practices that enable men to claim a hegemonically masculine identity by discursively constructing dominance over other men/masculinities" (p.181).

Another differentiation that was constructed between military practice and that of the existing staff was one regarding discipline, relating to work ethic. The ex-military teachers were perceived to work much harder than other members of staff, which caused some members of staff within *College* to reflect on the cultural norms within their own working practice:

I mean they are, they're just very, very focused on their jobs. They've given some teams a good kick because we've looked at them and gone, phwoaaah. Like that. Like the way they're doing that. You know, we need to increase, bring a bit of that in. (Tom)

Within the narratives of the ex-military teachers, this differential was constructed as an innate disposition of the military *habitus*, something that was generally associated with the military minded person:

Whereas us, we're - although we want to be in that education system we're very much seen as we'll do anything...and it's almost like we're taking on too much but it's just in our nature, that's what we do naturally. It doesn't - I don't feel like I'm doing more work, I feel like I have to do it almost, or I need to. I want to. (Yan)

The identity work that the ex-military teachers engaged in closely linked their own practice with a clearly defined military ethos, indicating that "definitions of masculinity emerge within collective practices, definitions that reside as much within organizational patterns and practices as within individual personalities" (Barrett, 2001, p.130). The military as an institution was constructed within the narratives as a masculine institution, supporting the construction of masculine identities. Alternative narratives regarding discipline and work ethic overtly differentiated the military from a civilian teacher:

And of course a civilian teacher from a completely civilian background would not get that military ethos. They wouldn't get that sort of - all my guys are very happy to come in at five o'clock in the morning if I ask them to and go home at eleven o'clock at night. And I know many of our civilian counterparts here at the college, they would not entertain that. Their day starts at eight-thirty and

their day finishes at quarter to five. And that is another major difference between the attitude of the staff... (Will)

This narrative again linked identity to institution, leading to situations where “among dominant groups of men, the circuits of social embodiment constantly involve the institutions on which their privileges rest” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p.852). This identity construction and positioning between military and civilian teachers (Said, 1978) had consequences: the practice of the military academy staff engaging in longer than funded working hours drove out established staff members from their existing employment positions, seeing them transfer to different curriculum areas:

Roger, he found it quite hard initially because he was that kind of, I'm in at half eight and I'm away by quarter to five. So that complete integration, he's now moved on to teach on another course but I can't blame him for that because that's the culture that he's been brought up in, within teaching. Whereas my guys have come from a different background and that whole thing of if it has to be done, it has to be done (Will).

This created tensions with *College's* staff, a reaction to the construction of the civilian teacher identity and the positioning that had been created by the arrival of the ex-military teaching staff:

I was chatting to Heather yesterday in the office about my future here at the college. And it was a strange comment; she said that the military academy staff are getting a reputation. And I'm thinking well good or bad? She said, well it's a bit of both. Whereas...the staff here will just do the bare minimum because they've been in that teaching world for so long, or they've come through the teaching world. It's almost like, okay I work Monday eight till five and I'm working Monday eight till five. It says in my contract I'm having an hour for lunch, I will have an hour for lunch. Anything after five o'clock I'm not interested in. (Yan)

Claire, who had been the lead in trying to drive through change in teaching practice and standards within *College* following ALI/Ofsted inspections, noted the difference between military and teacher practices:

They won't stop working until they actually have it ready, everything ready for the next day or the week ahead. They plan their whole curriculum to the Nth degree in terms of this whole term is sorted in terms of mini buses have all been booked out, packed lunches probably have all been booked out. So every single detail to make the whole term work has already been done. Whereas other staff will probably work on a week by week basis and not put that much detail and effort in. (Claire)

The ex-military teachers, through distinction born out of their professional practice, set themselves apart from the existing staff, exhibiting a disciplined work ethic that reinforced a military identity construction. This placed them in a superior position in an unconscious struggle through practice (Bourdieu, 1977). Again, this can be viewed through the lens of Said's (1978) 'othering', where "people often gain a sense of their own identities through a related process of differentiation" (Edley & Wetherell, 1997, p.208). This was a key theme that ran throughout the data, a gendered differentiation of masculine ex-military teachers, set in contrast to the feminized positioning of the 'normal' College *teacher*. This led to Claire forming critical views of established staff within the other departments:

So that's quite interesting in the ethics and values they bring to their work is second to none compared to staff who have been here a little while, think the grass is greener on the other side. And the word that I've picked up this year that I'm using with the curriculum managers for this year is 'discipline'. (Claire)

The distinction between military and teacher practice was discipline, the ex-military teachers possessing it and the wider teaching staff in deficit. The ex-military were aligned with practices that supported the management's efforts to improve *College's* positioning within the constraints of the Ofsted inspection regime, the existing staff being positioned as blocking progress.

Will's *habitus*, partially shaped by thirty years' experience within the military, was in tension with the new setting: it was a conflict between *College's* existing culture and his professional dispositions, a disjuncture that created frustration, feelings of being a 'fish out of water' (Reay, *et al*, 2009), "so that was probably the one that was the hardest because there were the frustrations of working with people and alongside people who were not as dynamic ... so that was *the* frustration" (Will). This narrative supports Will's construction of a masculine identity: frustrations of working with people who were less "*dynamic*" can be interpreted as the construction of a less powerful and energetic grouping. The overall positioning of the Military Academy staff through macro national level discourse and the subsequent interplay of military *cultural capital* placed the individuals in tension with other staff members within *College*, and the positioning and *capital* exchanges between the differentiated groups began to create sanctions from existing *field* actors:

So I think it would be fair to say that I think moving into a department like this was probably quite hard. I would imagine there was some negativity, probably

born out of frustration or ignorance really. What are these guys going to do? You know? What's going to happen? This, this is a land-based sector, what are we doing with the military here? I can understand that came in. That's a hard one. That's a hard one to fight against, yes, yes. That's tough. (Tom)

The symbolic struggles regarding military *cultural capital* and *field* structures also determined sanctions for existing *field* actors, particularly with respect to other highly masculine areas of vocational education, such as the outdoor leisure staff, who found themselves marginalized by the arrival of the Military Academy team:

No I think, I mean I certainly find as a team that they are a pleasure to work with. It's interesting the dynamics between the outdoor leisure guys and the military guys. There's a bit of a clash, personality clashes. They used to be the kind of golden boys. You know, the kayakers and the surfers and the climbers and you name it, they were doing it. And the limelight's off them... (Heather)

The *capital* exchanges that took place within *College* witnessed the ex-military teachers taking up dominant masculine positions in relation to existing hierarchies within the research setting, unseating previously dominant groups such as the outdoor leisure staff. Edley and Wetherell (1997) have proposed that this can be understood in relational terms:

Post-structuralist theorists have pointed out that all concepts are relational; defined, that is, by contrast with other concepts. The concept of masculinity is, of course, no exception to this rule, being constructed most clearly as a difference from femininity (Edley & Wetherell, 1997, p.208).

Will's construction of other teachers, including the outdoor leisure staff who taught students within the Military Academy syllabus, used narratives of distinction (Bourdieu, 1977), or processes of 'othering' (Said, 1978), constructing a counter identity of "*civilian staff*", other to that of military staff, as being highly feminized through the use of metaphor:

And that's an issue I think a lot of colleges would have if, even if they bring in someone, you know it's the military teaching coming in, and adjusting to the civilian system. And also the civilian teachers, but also the civilian staff, way of doing things. Because I think it's incredibly *pink and fluffy*. Really *pink and fluffy* and that's when we, there's been a few student issues we've been dealing with... there's none of this *pink and fluffy*, you've got a D, well done you know, good effort, it's a pass. Look, it's not really a pass but it, you know - it's the kind of language that they use (Will).

The use of the term "*pink and fluffy*" positioned "*civilian teachers*", "*the civilian system*" and "*civilian staff*" in a highly feminized frame, painting a feminine and soft

approach regarding their interaction with pupils and students. This positioning of masculine identity in opposition to a feminized identity construct aligns with Dermott's (2012) critique of the *Troops to Teachers* policy in which she explored the original premise for the 2010 Department for Education policy with its highly gendered overtones:

The version of military masculinity which emerges from the *Troops to Teachers* proposal offers a return to the caricature of the 'military man'. *Troops to Teachers* reinforces a single version of masculinity associated with characteristics of hardness, both physically and mentally, and an explicit opposition to supposedly 'soft' feminine traits (*ibid*, p. 236).

My analysis supported Dermott's view: within the narratives that surrounded the arrival of the ex-military teachers within *College*, both the ex-military teachers themselves and the existing staff engaged in identity work through the process of the mobilization of *capitals*, a specific species (Bourdieu, 1997b) of military *cultural capital*, a masculine military identity, which allowed the ex-military teachers to establish dominant masculine positions within *College's field*. These masculine identities had successfully translated from their original professional settings through the workings of macro and micro level discourse. These identities were supported through socio-political cultural mechanisms, enabling the ex-military teachers to start to re-order the hierarchies within *College's* social system.

4.6 Positioning of Ex-Military Teachers and *College* Students

Will said before that they all go quiet if any of them start talking about their experience, can't hear a pin drop. So I don't know if you see - and I'm not being very eloquent, I don't know - there is that difference. If you're an animal care lecturer I'm not sure what a teacher would have to be talking about to get that silence. There is something awe inspiring isn't there I think. (Claire)

The identity work that took place between the ex-military teachers and students was most powerfully illustrated through narrative and symbolic processes, the telling of stories and the use of military practices; stories that were told within the classrooms, and then re-told by the students within their own spaces. This had the effect of creating concepts of idealized military vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003), the "set of dispositions derived from both idealised and realised identities, and informed by the notions and guiding ideologies of the vocational culture" (*ibid*, p.493). These were identities that dwelt in the consciousness of the Military Academy students (Sasson-Levy, 2002), constructed from the micro *field* discourse:

Male Respondent: What I liked about some of the stuff Will said was pretty cool just like stuff that yes [inaudible]. Yes stuff that he told us that other people had been through. Like, what's Mandy's dad's name?

Male Respondent: David.

Male Respondent: Yes he broke his leg at the end of this endurance course [assault course within military training] and they carried him through it and kept doing it. So I think stuff like that was like when you're sat there and you're like oh I'm a bit cold and wet and it's not that much of a big deal. Well you're like, yes probably could carry on if someone else can do that. Yes

(Student Focus Group 4)

This narrative supported a highly masculine ideal and developed an imagined identity construction of what being 'military' meant, a particular vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003), that students orientated themselves to through the accumulation of *imagined social capitals* (Quinn, 2010). This process of construction was most powerfully mobilized through the narratives of the ex-military teachers' combat experience, which I observed during a teaching observation with Rob:

He was telling stories with them relating to using the skills in a sniper position in Afghanistan,...during the stories of service in Afghanistan the students were leant forward hanging on every word, relating the subject to their imagined experience on operations, talking through the subject as if they were there (Research Diary - Teaching Observation).

My interpretation of these narratives was that the Military Academy students engaged in a process of imagined involvement, placing themselves within the narrative process, creating fantasy identities within the stories of arduous military training and combat within Afghanistan. This identity work created their sense of a military vocational *habitus*, claimed through powerful *imagined social capital* (Quinn, 2010), enabling the mobilization of *capitals*, but also leading the students to engage in positioning of non-military 'others' (Said, 1978). This identity construction valorized the ex-military teachers, the combat soldier providing a construction of masculine superiority (Sasson-Levy, 2002), creating student narratives that positively positioned the military against a negative *civilian teacher* construct (Hinojosa, 2010):

And I don't know - like you could get a teacher in school that does English, maths and science and then does art as well. But these teachers [ex-military]

know what they're on about. They've done it though, they've spent most of their lives in the military. (Female Respondent - Student Focus Group 3)

Male Respondent: They were just better than *normal teachers*, they had more control I think. More -

Male Respondent: Yes you have instant respect for them.

(Student Focus Group 1)

The use of the term "*normal teachers*" positioned *College's* existing staff in deficit through a comparative process with the ex-military teachers (Edley & Wetherell, 1997; Barrett, 2001), using narratives that portray a taken for granted view of difference: "like I've got a lot more respect for them being in the military than I did just an English teacher, without sounding horrible" (Female Respondent - Student Focus Group 3). Some of the students developed narratives that were antipathetic towards this teacher identity, basing views on generalized, and broader societal discourse (Edley & Wetherell, 1997):

... they didn't really know what they were on about. They were just, they were probably gone out of education, gone straight into teaching and they were sort of just like, you've done nothing. And what I used to say is kind of like why should I listen to you? (Male Respondent - Student Focus Group 4)

Military identity work positioned other teaching staff negatively and in this last student narrative was delivered with aggressive overtones towards the *civilian teacher*. One student, however, who had already been a pupil at a six-form college, challenged the normative group narrative:

Male Respondent: Also, the teachers are a bit better aren't they?

Male Respondent: Yes.

Male Respondent: Because in school you say Mr Thomas for instance but now it's bit like you actually know them a bit better. So -

Male Respondent: I've got banter.

Male Respondent: It was like that at sixth form anyway.

Male Respondent: I didn't do sixth form so for me -

Male Respondent: Yes, you wouldn't know.

Male Respondent: Yes.

Male Respondent: You got closer to your teachers as you got older. So it's not just here.

(Student Focus Group 2)

This student disarms (Hunter, 1992) the dominant narrative by challenging the group with his previous six-form experience, creating a *capital* exchange that establishes his autonomy (Connell, 1987; 1995) from this student group narrative. This positioning of the *civilian teacher* as an 'other', was co-constructed between ex-military teacher and student:

It's the functional skills, it's more like at school where they just tell you what to do - they treat us like we're back at school, we're not in college. And then here like, Will said they give us a bit more respect, we give them a bit more respect. Because they just talk to us and whereas Functional Skills they'll just tell us what to do... (Male Respondent - Focus Group 1)

This overt positioning by Will, "*Will said they give us a bit more respect*", supported the construct of military identity positioned against the civilian norm. The data indicated that there were discipline issues between the *civilian teaching* staff and the Military Academy students through identity work the students 'played-up' within lessons taken by the non-military staff, constructed within a sympathetic narrative with the ex-military; the ex-military staff positioning one particular teacher as inflexible in his ways within the student-teacher relationship:

So with Ben as you said, he's probably mid to late fifties and very much set in his ways and a number of times you know early on, get out of my class, you're not coming into my class unless you behave yourself up there. You know the next thing we get a guy knocking on the door saying, I've just been kicked out of maths...so we have to go back across, he apologizes and lets him back into the class again you know. That's the difficult bit. Because the students refer [*sic*] back to type back at school. (Will)

The narrative was one of difference, with the existing teaching staff placed in deficit regarding teaching style and an ability to control groups of young males:

Male Respondent: I do functional skills, yes, it's a lot different compared - like your functional skills she is a lot stricter and doesn't really take any like I've got the jokes and stuff we'd normally get away with in class. So she is a lot more stricter and doesn't really understand us as well as what our [military] tutors do.

Interviewer: Okay.

Male Respondent: She struggles to keep hold of the group. [General laughter.]

Male Respondent: Yes.

The contradictory nature of this narrative was that the teacher in question above is ex-military. The male students joked about her struggling “*to keep hold of the group*”, identity work that portrays her as feminine and weak, unable to maintain discipline with the male students. The female military academy students had a more positive narrative of the female ex-military functional skills teacher; they talked of her ability to contextualize the teaching material to concepts that related to the military:

Female Respondent: Yes, so it somehow it doesn't really have anything to do with military in functional skills but yes.

Female Respondent: She'll compare it to a military like she does.

Female Respondent: Yes.

Female Respondent: Hard to explain it really. She'll say that -

Female Respondent: She'll give examples instead [multiple speakers - inaudible].

Female Respondent: She'll give you a scenario and the she'll be like oh I'll pull it through.

Female Respondent: A bullet travels this fast and stuff like that.

Female Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: So the context is set to something more meaningful?

Female Respondent: Yes.

(Focus Group 3)

This teacher was ex-military but was not engaged in the identity construction processes of the male students and ex-military staff. She was not recognized to possess the masculine military *cultural capital* (Bourdieu, 1984) and was challenged in student identity work regarding her ability to control their behaviour. In the relational process of identity construction, the female ex-military teacher did not support their idealized perception of military masculinity (Barrett, 2001; Hinojosa, 2010). There was another case regarding the recognition of military *cultural capital*: one of the existing teachers was ex-Army, highly masculine in his dispositions, but did not engage in military identity construction with the military academy students.

Male Respondent: I think he was in the Army, imagine that.

Male Respondent: [Inaudible.]

Male Respondent: He didn't tell us anything, he just kind of, I'm your teacher, I'm your tutor now.

Male Respondent: He didn't tell us anything about himself. He just -

Male Respondent: He said like he's always been a sports teacher or something.

Male Respondent: Wasn't the best

(Student Focus Group 4)

The teacher discussed within this focus group session was ex-army: he had been working within *College* prior to the initiation of the Military Academy and, within informal conversations with him during the research process, I noted that he involved himself in his own identity work that was centred around professional teaching expertise and educational qualification, focusing on different forms of *cultural capital* as a part time doctoral student, rather than aspects involving his previous military experience (Research Diary - Jun 14). Both he and the female ex-military functional skills teacher did not engage in identity construction regarding military *cultural capital* (Bourdieu, 1986). They aligned themselves with a teacher identity, recognizing the *capital* of another micro social *field*, countering the *capitals* of the newly arrived military *field* structures (*ibid*). Both held moderately negative views regarding the behaviour of the Military Academy students, who showed a tendency to 'play-up' when away from their Military Academy staff. This issue was highlighted by Claire:

Which - and so they would just - they were being what I would call normal students. Normal student behaviour. Whereas when they had their military staff in the room they wouldn't dare. So it was quite an interesting experience to see that they weren't what I expected them to be, they were just normal students. I always send the staff out and they were really quite naughty. Nothing that I couldn't handle it as a teacher but I was quite surprised at how a little bit disrespectful they were. They were talking over each other. There were some clear, strong leaders dotted around but there were some silly boys in it and there were also the girls all sat on one end and in that discussion some of the girls were saying how they find the boys really frustrating and there was a difference sometimes between how they were treated they felt. And so we were - the teaching staff were still feeling their way at that point.

Claire's narrative positions the unruly male students' practice as "*normal student behaviour*", leading to a generalized expectation from her that the male students natural behaviour was poor. Claire's narrative indicates that the male and female students were treated differently by the Military Academy teachers, "*there was a*

difference sometimes between how they were treated they felt". This indicated a relational aspect of practice, with the students and Military Academy teachers engaged in mutual identity work that was focused on claiming and reinforcing masculine identities. This resulted in differences in how male and female students were treated, those who did not support the construction of the idealized masculine identities being marginalized within the academy's micro *field*.

Claire's experience was opposed to the military academy staffs' view: "I mean it works perfectly with the fact that these guys want to join the military. So that initial discipline is a lot easier to control" (Rob). Students engaged in relational identity work (Edley & Wetherell, 1997) with the ex-military teachers and realised powerful forms of *imagined social capital* (Quinn, 2010) through the stories and narrative processes they engaged in. As they orientated themselves to their military vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003), they engaged in processes of positioning with other staff and students within *College*, constructing negative narratives of those who did not match their imagined military ideal (Said, 1978). This identity work produced exhibitions of disruptive behaviour with the Military Academy students, particularly with female staff (Sasson-Levy, 2002). The Military Academy students did not recognise the military experience of other ex-military staff within *College* who did not engage in processes of identity work with them; again, these two existing ex-military teachers were positioned within negative narratives.

4.7 Student Identities and Military Masculinities

Bourdieu holds that the ultimate spring of conduct is the thirst for dignity, which society alone can quench. For only by being granted a name, a place, a function within a group or institution can the individual hope to escape the contingency, finitude and ultimate absurdity of existence (Stones, 2008, p.218).

The students on the Military Academy Public Services programme predominantly wanted to join the Armed Forces: out of the sixty on course, fifty-three stated they wanted to join the military straight after the course, the majority stating a preference for the Army and Royal Marines. The males within the student group predominantly wanted to fulfill combat roles; only two male students on course wanted employment with the uniformed emergency services, while another two male students were undecided on their future career choices. All three females on the course wanted to

join the Army as combat medics (Research Diary - 7 Mar 14). The dominant focus of the students was on employment within combat roles that indicated a group alignment with wider societal discourse, or understanding of a military vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003), regarding the masculine nature of an idealised military identity: “the masculinity of the combat soldier has achieved a hegemonic status and turned into a social ideal” (Sasson-Levy, 2002, p.360). Will summed it up with regards to the Military Academy programme and the type of student that was attracted to the course of study: “and of course the military academy draws in quite a few alpha males, we seem to attract that type”. I propose that this indicates the student’s perception of potential fit between their imagined masculine *habitus* and that of the vocational military *field*.

The construction of student identities within the Military Academy was realized through relational processes, identities that were “*accomplished* in the course of social interactions; reconstructed from moment to moment within specific discursive and rhetorical contexts” (Edley & Wetherell, 1997, p.205). Within the Military Academy, social interactions constituted the *capital* exchanges that took place between the Military Academy students, the ex-military teachers, wider *College* staff and other student actors within *College’s field* (Bourdieu, 1977). Within this research, the focus of the data analysis was on the symbolic *capital* exchanges that took place, aligning with the view that “masculinity is embedded within an ensemble of social practices, symbols, discourses, and ideologies” (Barrett, 1996, p.130) and it is through the analysis of these phenomena that one will provide an explanation that understand the construction of student military masculine identities.

The student narratives indicated they held perceptions of a vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003) that they aspired to orientate to: “and when the Marines come over and everyone was like, well especially last year when everyone was like really unfit and everyone was dreaming to be a marine - it seemed stupid but that’s what it’s like” (Male Respondent - Student Focus Group 4). The words relay an imagined ideal, “*dreaming to be a marine*”, a comparison between themselves and this idealized vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003). This led to feelings of inadequacy, “*when everyone was like really unfit*”, in comparison with the trained Royal Marines Commandos that were visiting; inadequacy due to their own subordinated comparative masculine identities, a lack of dominant *cultural capital* of the micro *field*.

Connell & Messerschmidt (2005) have questioned “how men conform to an ideal and turn themselves into complicit or resistant types, without anyone ever managing to exactly embody that ideal” (*ibid*, p.841). Within this analysis, the formation of student identities was viewed to be constructed against some of the ex-military staff and visiting military personnel, who through discursive positioning were held up by the students as the ideal of the military vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003). These processes were supported through narratives of military masculinities created within wider societal discourse, embedding a vocational culture of masculine gender stereotyping.

The mobilization of military *cultural capital* (Bourdieu, 1977; 1984), as discussed previously, is partially sustained through external artifacts such as uniform, badges of rank, badges of specialization and other symbolic artifacts. For the students, the wearing of the combat uniform was recorded as very important:

We had a little drama at the start of the course with getting in the uniform quickly and we noticed in that change whereby all the students were - they couldn't wait, they could not wait until their uniform arrived and it was just they were knocking on the door daily, has it come yet, has it come yet? Just - it's on its way and when it did arrive they all wear it, they all look after it, it's always clean, it's always pressed, they're proud of having it. You can tell when they walk around the college they like having that identity. Because they feel that they're aiming towards something and when they've got the logo, they're proud of wearing it and proud to be a part of it. (Rob)

The impact of the uniform on behaviour within the group, when positioned within a military context, had a dramatic effect: “once they got uniform on and we did drill with uniform on, they were a different, completely different group... almost a different persona” (Will). This effect was interpreted as existing through their embodied membership to the military group, through the wearing of the uniform, a linkage to the imagined military ideal, a form of *imagined social capital* (Quinn, 2010), the embodied (Gill *et al*, 2005) and literal, material nature of this military *cultural capital* immediately realizing identification with a military self: “and then they get their uniform and they feel part of something and they grow and develop with that type group...they feel they belong to something” (Zac). The wearing of uniform enabled the students to embody the objectified symbolic *capital* of military identity, aligning with Connell & Messerschmidt's (2005) perspective that “to understand embodiment and hegemony,

we need to understand that bodies are both objects of social practice and agents in social practice” (p.851).

Identity work, through processes of symbolic and participative interaction, also occurred during visits by military recruiting teams to *College*, where they provided the Military Academy students with demonstrations and recruiting activities:

Rob: Again that comes down to role models again. They see, they've seen something, i.e. the army act that way or the marines that way, so they adopt that kind of personality, that persona. [Inaudible.]

Will: And as you say, when they see, the 'Look at Life' teams of course, the Coldstream Guards, the Royal Marines coming here and they see exactly what he just described. That very military, disciplined, well-dressed, well-turned out individual.

The interaction that students had with the recruiting staff met the needs of the students in their construction of military identities; “consequently, ‘masculinity’ represents not a certain type of man, rather, a way that men position themselves through discursive practices” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p.841). The visiting military personnel acted as exemplars of the military vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003) against which the students could orientate their identity work (*ibid*), engaging in a process of symbolic interaction that supported these idealized representations that the students held of military identities in their construction of hegemonic masculine norms:

Interviewer: **Yes. What are the - the biggest challenges you've had to do here?**

Male Respondent: When the marines and things come in I think.

Male Respondent: Yes, that's PT [physical training] again.

Male Respondent: [Inaudible] the marines [inaudible].

Male Respondent: Yes marines, different forces when they come in and have lessons, well not lessons but they will show us something - it's like we had PT with the marines a couple of times and the army.

Male Respondent: And Coldstream Guards men.

Male Respondent: Yes Coldstream Guards came here.

Male Respondent: Just like got teamwork and stuff so that if you don't do very well that can let the whole team down so it's quite -

Male Respondent: Would you say the work is a step up as well?

Male Respondent: Yes.

(Student Focus Group 4)

The physically challenging nature of the sessions with the soldiers and marines from the recruiting staff aligned with the imagined toughness and strength of the hegemonic masculine ideals of the combat soldier. Connell & Messerschmidt (2005) have proposed that "the importance of masculine embodiment for identity and behaviour emerges in many contexts. In youth, skilled body activity becomes a prime indicator of masculinity". (p.851). Throughout the student focus groups, it was the nature of the physical activities and extreme physical challenges that held the central theme within their narratives of identity construction: "so you do like 2 PT sessions a week which is obviously going to be good because it builds you up for the marines or army or whatever course you want to go to" (Male Respondent - Student Focus Group 1).

Male Respondent: Doing new stuff. Like Bergen swims. So like last week that was really good and stuff like that.

Male Respondent: Learning physical preparation is what I enjoy the most.

Interviewer: How does that compare to your experiences of school?

Male Respondent: I did PE in school but yes not compared to this. It wasn't -

Male Respondent: It was more just games like football, rugby, that sort of stuff. Whereas this is like proper training yes.

(Students - Focus Group 2)

The sentiment '*this is like proper training*' aligned with an interpretation that the activities and the imagined identity were matched, reinforcing the military masculine ideal and embodied physical practices (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), not only narratives surrounding the discourse regarding physical strength of the military ideal, but also the mental strength that was required:

Male Respondent: So nothing, no amount of fitness would help. There is obviously a standard of fitness I mean that would help but it's all about your physical state of mind.

Male Respondent: Grit really.

Male Respondent: But I had cramp the whole way round the endurance course and I - it hurt so much that it was just - well the pain had gone because it was just hurting so much.

(Students - Focus Group 4)

The *imagined social capital* (Quinn, 2010) that the students realized from their interaction with the ex-military teachers and visiting military personnel, linked within their consciousness to orientate to the military vocational *habitus*. This had a motivating effect on the individual students within the processes of identity work: "well, when I first came here I was like uber unfit, really bad, I think my first mile and a half was like 17½ minutes, which was terrible. And it motivated me because everyone else was fit around me" (Male Respondent - Student Focus Group 4). The severity of the sessions held mythical status: "but there's nothing you can do to relatively prepare you for what's going to happen. Because it's just the, it's just that even if you're - they had two Olympic cyclists or whatever from down there. Like a couple of months ago" (Male Respondent - Student Focus Group 2). The physical abilities required for the military assault courses were positioned as challenging Olympic athletes. This placed their masculine identity work in an elite status, realizing masculine *symbolic capital*, engaging in the implicit construction of masculine identities. This aligned with Hinojosa's (2010) position that suggested the link between the practices that enable men to claim hegemonically masculine identities through narrative and symbolic acts, enabling students to position themselves as physically masculine (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

Another important aspect to the military identity narrative was the intellectual requirements for the military role, "the fact that service is training people as soldiers to be very responsive and adaptive on the field and in the conflict situation to be able to think quickly on their feet. Fit to deal with any situation" (Roy). The narrative constructed by staff and students supported a modernised image of the military from the historic norm: "it's not so much the shouty, shouty, bully, bullying approach but it's much more attuned to understanding the emotional, psychological, intellectual

capacity of the man” (Roy). Data portrayed a differing culture within the rugby and military academies towards academic study, the rugby students only being interested in their sport “because again predominantly lads they’re here because of the rugby, they’re not here for any other reason” (Claire).

Within the Military Academy, however, because selection processes tested intellectual fitness as well as the physical, the focus between academic and practical skill was in greater balance, “whereas the military academy students, the way it’s been set up, it’s the whole package. So the academic work is equally important for them to get entry into whichever force they want to go into and that’s very strongly sold” (Claire). This cultural focus on academics had a motivating effect on student results, “so one of the lads gaining his, I think it was just his level one maths and he’d never actually passed an exam in his life and he ran out of the - when he got his results - ran out of the teaching block over there and did cartwheels because he was so happy” (Claire). The previous year the Military Academy had achieved a one-hundred percent academic success (Research Diary – November 2013) and, due to student demand for an extended course of study, *College* developed the original 25-week syllabus into a 2-year programme.

As well as the student’s physical and intellectual identity work, narrative processes, through the telling of stories related to the combat soldier, held a powerful place in the relational processes of identity construction. An example of this was the student’s reaction to Rob’s stories of his combat experience in Afghanistan, linking the storied nature of the lesson material to images and scenarios that students would have already encountered within film, on television and wider media. Images of British soldiers and marines on combat operations were often in the news and hosted on Internet platforms such as YouTube. Bourdieu (1990) has proposed that, “Only in imaginary experience (in the folk tale, for example), which neutralizes the sense of social realities, does the social world take the form of a universe of possibles equally possible for any possible subject” (p.64). This imagery of combat, linked to Rob’s position that was reified through his ability to mobilize military *cultural capital*, had a significant effect on the students: “what I think we learnt when we were talking to the students, is they really want that identity. Really wanted. They wanted as much, they couldn’t get enough military input and the power of having someone talking to them

about their real experience, you can't put a value on it" (Claire). Reay *et al* (2009) have highlighted Bourdieu's concepts that support an understanding where:

Bourdieu makes a distinction between the relationship to the future that might be called a project, and which he poses the future as the future, that is, as a possibility constituted as such...as opposed to the relationship to the future that he calls protension or preperceptive anticipation, a relationship...to a future that is almost present (p.1110).

Claire's description regarding the "power" of "military input" paints an image of the construction of identity through processes of imagination, an alignment to images and identity that were constructed within wider discourse and realised through the symbolic interaction and narratives with the visiting military personnel and ex-military staff. Students' future selves became accepted as almost realised in their present experience and form powerful *imagined social capitals* (Quinn, 2010) that support student identity construction. Sasson-Levy (2002) has proposed that "masculinities, like femininities, pose a methodological challenge for the researcher, as they do not 'exist' in reality but dwell in people's consciousness and are constantly expressed through everyday embodied practices, symbols, and metaphors" (p.361), further supporting a concept of imaginary processes within identity construction. I believe that it is apparent within this data that in the processes of student identity construction there was a complex mix of imagined military vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003), lived experience, embodied practices and authentic story telling that led to powerful processes of identity formation, the students realizing masculine military identities that shaped practice within the Military Academy student cohort.

4.8 Military Identities and Discipline

An important thematic within the research data was the link between the construction of student identities and discipline, and the practices and behaviours closely related to the particular context of the social settings in which the students were located. As previously discussed, military identity construction, through close interaction with the ex-military staff, led to subordinated behaviour within the student cohort. When the ex-military staff input was limited, because of resource constraints, student behaviour was perceived to decline:

So in the first year it was understood they would be out drilling at 6 in the morning and they were doing PT, going on yomps and that there would be

close attention from the delivery team [Military Academy Staff] not only in the core working hours of an FE college but in the silent hours early morning and early evening as well. And that was the case. But the funding levels that we're enjoying for this underlying funded FE qualification are not sufficient to enable us to sustain that level of input from the delivery team at the level that we started out with. We've had to temper it a little bit in the second year and I think that is hurting us a little bit in terms of the experience and what's being achieved in terms of ethos and behaviour. (Roy)

Within the early stages of the academic year, in which the research took place, the contact time of ex-military teachers with the Military Academy students was limited because of funding restrictions. This period was the second year of the Military Academy programme. The ex-military teaching staff viewed student behaviour as directly related to the level of immersion achieved for students within the simulated military environment: "on one side it is a relation of conditioning: the *field* structures the *habitus* ... on the other side, it is a relation of knowledge or cognitive construction. *Habitus* contributes to constituting the *field* as a meaningful world" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.127).

Will understood from his career within the military that any lasting change in individual dispositions took time, experiencing a *hysteresis* (Bourdieu, 1977), in changing enduring individual dispositions "our dispositions are not blown around easily on the tides of change in the social worlds we inhabit" (*ibid*, p.61). Wider *College* staff expected a more immediate effect on behaviour:

... well in the college the other thing as well is the expectation. This, the other teachers think that these guys are going to come in and in three weeks we worked a miracle and they're perfectly well-mannered, respectful. Very, very well disciplined, and they've been the guy that's been kicked out of their school six months ago for being the biggest reprobate in the school...so all of a sudden we have responsibility for turning this guy round in three weeks. Well that doesn't happen. Even in the military it takes, ... it takes a minimum of ten weeks just to get somebody into the frame of mind. And then eventually it starts to sink in. That takes time. (Will)

Will recognized that disciplining effects required a constant and consistent application of social interaction and sanctions: "they want to have, it's almost like they want to still be, have their own personality, sneak the old earring every now and again and they let their hair grow a bit and then we just remind them" (Will). Will's *illusio* challenged the students' feminized identity markers, earrings and long hair conflicting with the masculine vocational *habitus* of the Military Academy micro *field*. This

normative behavioural regulation restricted students' choice regarding their ability to express themselves through alternative identity work that countered the masculine military ideal, a denial of the feminine. Within the Military Academy context the staff created the "structures and routines that call for continual testing of these qualities" (Barrett, 2001, p.129). "Yes. You know for, you know, and when our students understand, there's the line, there's wrong and there's right, there's pass and there's fail. That's something they've never been exposed to and which takes time" (Will). Will believed in the application of consistent sanctions, applied over time, that would incrementally modify student practice through their immersive lived experience (Reay *et al*, 2009); his practice based on the *doxic* values of the military – a fundamental belief in the way things should be.

Exhibitions of disciplined behaviour were not simply matters of *habitus* modification; many practices were relational performances in the early construction of military identities, "selves as being *accomplished* in the course of social interactions" (Edley & Wetherell, 1997, p.205):

... at one point when a student admitted to not bringing a pen to the class he stated, "you know what you have to do...you owe me twenty", at which point the student jumped from his seat and does twenty press-ups. A few minutes later a student admits he has not bought his note book and immediately gets up and does twenty press-ups without command. (Teaching Observation - Will)

The physical act of the punishment of press ups in class was seen as a validated ritualised activity of military service, the students relishing the opportunity to undertake this perceived symbolic military act that set the context of the military academy apart from their previous educational experiences. These acts aided the students in the construction of military masculine identities; identities that did not 'exist' in reality, but that were expressed through embodied symbolic practice (Sasson-Levy, 2002). Claire, however, noticed that the behaviour of students was not so consistent in the early stages, especially with domestic cleanliness standards in the accommodation at times when the military staff were not expected to conduct inspections:

It's been quite interesting with just this year how we would - like cleaning their rooms and keeping - because obviously the students are taught to iron and wash and clean. Not to say, because they have room inspections, military room inspections. However, when we've done an unannounced inspection,

they're not always as tidy as they should be so I don't think they're as consistent as they should be. (Claire)

The domestic practices regarding accommodation cleanliness were not adhered to at first: unless it was part of the military inspection regime, student behaviour returned back to old behaviours, to the original conditions of practice, when not situated within the relational context of the military programme. After time, student narratives spoke of changes in attitudes, modified dispositions towards personal fitness and behaviour, *habitus* adapting through the processes of social experience within this new educational *field*:

I feel I've got more discipline about me as well. I was never a wild child but you know I was a bit cheeky sometimes and now I'm just like oh - and I won't say that, and I think my fitness has improved quite a bit. Yes. When I go home I'm like more motivated to get up and go for a run. Whereas before I'd be a bit like you know - I'd sit there all day kind of thing. (Female Respondent - Student Focus Group 3)

Later in the academic year there were indications that student dispositions had modified: towards the end of the programme, room inspections were decreased and "for those four weeks that we didn't have inspections, it was like really weird. It was a strange feeling. Because we had to keep our rooms tidy, yes we did because - It's so strange, you kind of crave it even when you don't have to do it" (Male Respondent - Student Focus Group 4). This language suggests an emotional and physical reaction, a habituation in practice, and then a *habitus* in *flux* following changes in *field* routines such as room inspections (Reay *et al*, 2009). Practice had transformed during the military programme, not only in domestic routines, but also in the embodied way in which the students dressed and wore their military uniforms. During a field trip to a military museum, I observed the transition that the majority of students had made regarding embodied dispositions, standards of dress and behavioural practices. My interpretation was that the group had visibly orientated towards masculine military identities, however, one particular student seemed isolated from the group:

The majority of the students have adopted the standards you would expect of Phase 1 recruits [military recruits in initial training]; they were all wearing combat trousers and boots, the College Military Academy polo shirts and fleeces. I noted the subtle points of dress, boots were highly polished, trouser ties were done up tight and turned up correctly, they mostly had short cropped haircuts and stood with the masculine pose of chest out, muscles tensed. They were in good humour and there was banter being used within the group. I did notice one student was not quite turned out the same, hair much longer than the rest, uniform not quite worn in the ultra smart detail of the others. I

noted that he seemed separated from the group during the lesson and afterwards during lunch, he was isolated on his own. Both physically (dress and posture) and attitudinally he seemed apart from the group and separated. (Field Notes from Museum Observation - 7 Mar 14)

The student within my observation, who seemed separated from the group, was not interested in a career within the military and wanted to become a member of the ambulance service, he did not orientate himself towards the military vocational *habitus*. The need to adopt the physical embodiment of a military identity had little effect on this individual and he did not wear the uniform with the same attention to detail or stand in the same way as the other students. The adoption of military identities led to examples of unwanted behaviour when the students were not under the supervision of their ex-military staff:

... we're seeing some of that boyish behaviour, some of that adventurist behaviour, actually, we've got this lovely estate. It offers lots of opportunities for good stuff and mischievous stuff. And these are young men and women who are full of energy, not afraid to be adventurous, take risks. So climbing the roof of the main house is a tempting opportunity that we've got to make sure they can't take for example. (Roy)

This behaviour aligned with the performances linked to the construction of masculine identities, risk taking, "*boyish behaviour*" (Hinojosa, 2010). Exhibitions of masculine identity work had an unsettling effect on the wider *College* population:

"But from what I have heard from some others that they can be as a group quite intimidating to other groups of students. Maybe the more prominently female groups and groups that aren't used to that sort of discipline and large groups mainly of males. A few females, but predominantly young men. And it's a bit like the rugby academy. That again put another angle on to it where you've got more strong looking young men which could be quite intimidating". (Heather)

The "*intimidating*" and "*disciplined*" masculine behaviours of the Military Academy students allowed them to claim hegemonic masculine identities, symbolically constructing dominance over other student groups through embodied practices within *College* (Hinojosa, 2010). Within the Military Academy student accounts, banter was also seen as a behavioural norm that went with the masculine military identity:

There's a lot more kind of banter and fun with actually speaking to them because like obviously they're used to working with groups of like probably like young lads like ourselves. Rob used to be a corporal teaching. Like new recruits and stuff so it's kind of like a, it's like a kind of different. (Male Respondent - Student Focus Group 1)

The construction of the military identity was through a discourse of difference; perceived superiority from normal students led to practice that was viewed as bordering on arrogance:

I think they perhaps perceive the military sort of think they're a little bit better. It's what they're sort of like aiming for isn't it? It's a type of employment that they're going into. So and they've got their uniform and the same with the rugby. They're got their uniform so they stand out. Whereas the others, I mean you can tell which ones are agriculture students anyway, but you know, so they think that the military are more superior to them. It's not the case, but that's what they perceive so until they get to know them you do have this. (Tracey)

The narrative describes an embodied difference between students, despite a lack of uniform, meaning being able to “*tell which ones are agriculture students*”, identifying embodied differentiation, a distinction between competing groups. Tracey from student services, whose son had recently joined the British Army, highlighted a significant behavioural issue with the Military Academy culture:

From my point of view, the problem that I had is, um, banter. Because it's not banter. My son's in the army. I know what they get up to and I know they do things to each other and but that is my pet hate word this year, is banter. Because the military will see it as banter but other students will see it as bullying. (Tracey)

Tracey saw the issue of banter as one of bullying, something that was normalized within military vocational culture through the use of “*banter*”. Tracey's narrative identified the behaviour as being a cultural norm within the Army, but a practice that did not comfortably fit within *College's* educational environment:

... they'll go in and turn somebody's room upside down. Fill the room with stones and things like that. And put glue in their locks and the trouble is, to us we have to, our campus services team have to charge the student the damage in the door. So it's just, it's just having that fine line of banter and bullying. Because then the parents will start ringing in, so that's not banter, that's bullying. So - but we know it, we know it goes on in the barracks. I mean, flipping heck, my son, the stuff my son used to say that happens in there you know. (Tracey)

Student practice modified relational constructions within specific contexts in *College* and the Military Academy, “*accomplished* in the course of social interactions; reconstructed from moment to moment within specific discursive and rhetorical contexts, and *distributed* across social contexts” (Edley & Wetherell, 1997, p.205).

Within the symbolic interactions with the ex-military staff, students enacted performances to orientate with a vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003); those who did not engage did not hold the military identity as a future idealized self (Lauriala & Kukkonen, 2005). For those who did orientate with a military vocational *habitus* there was a tendency to conform with the narratives and rituals of the military behavioural norms and adopted close embodied alignment to the military masculine ideal. It was seen that the identities that the student chose shaped their dispositions, behaviours and practices to fit that of their future identity roles.

Military identity was indivisibly linked to a masculine identity, aligning with Johnson's (2010) view that "the military and masculinity define one another and are bound up in a symbiotic relationship" (p.580-581). The highly masculine nature of military identity led to wider behavioural problems within *College* where the students' practice was seen as intimidating and where risk-taking activities could potentially lead to trouble. It could be argued that this aligned with Connell & Messerschmidt's (2005) empirical research findings that "specific patterns of hegemonic masculinity have been entrenched but were becoming increasingly problematic" (p.834). The biggest issue related to abusive and disruptive behaviour, which within the military context was identified as "*banter*", tolerated within the military vocational culture, but behaviour that the educational culture of *College* was seen as bullying.

4.9 Masculinities and *Field* Identities

But the quiet, very land based, narrowly focused student community has certainly been impacted upon by the ninety rugby lads and sixty military academy students and because both groups are in residential accommodation that has significantly changed the character of the residential community.
(Roy)

Another key theme within the data was the conflict between the dominant student grouping within *College*, the male agricultural students, and the military and rugby academies. The conflict was born out of a competitive process in establishing dominant *capitals* (Bourdieu, 1997) within the opposing groups, the three groups displaying their own forms of masculinity:

The agriculture students then tended to be the big, beefy alpha male kind of characters within the college and all of a sudden you had this almost sort of super alpha male culture that had come into the college while they'd been away so there was that. And that was purely I think because it was new. (Will)

Within the research narratives, a highly masculine identity positioned the existing agricultural students, which aligned with the findings of Morris and Evans (2001) who studied rural gender issues, finding representations of hegemonic masculinities within the farming communities of Britain. The language used within Will's narrative portrayed a highly muscular "*big, beefy*" masculine "*alpha male*" identity for the agricultural students, based on an embodied *physical capital*, a student identity that was challenged by the arrival of the "*super alpha male culture*" of the Military Academy students, identities based instead upon symbolic forms of military *cultural capital*. Struggles for dominance between competing forms of masculine identities caused conflict:

Whereas the agriculture students, the first year, last year - very, very fractious I must admit. (Will)

There is conflict, there has been since day one. It is because of that history and grounding of what was here before. (Yan)

So there is a friction with military and ags [agriculture]...the first years it's always military/ags, military/ags you know because the attitude of military students. (Tracey)

The arrival of the military and rugby academies confronted the dominance of the existing student cohort, challenging their symbolic power within the research setting: "Yes so because obviously it's always been an agricultural college, so our agricultural students are seeing the military maybe coming in, saying oh you're taking over our college. So there is that bit of animosity between them" (Tom).

The impact of the changes within their *field* was heightened by the fact that the senior agricultural students had been away from *College's* campus on one-year work placements and returned to find the *field* conditions within *College* had changed:

It was, we had a difficult period and the main reason for that was that the agriculture course used to be a 3 year course where the first year is done in college, the second year is done on placement in agriculture somewhere and then they used to come back to the college for the third year. And so what you had was you had - we came in, and in the year that the agriculture students - then you could say the senior agriculture students they disappeared for their year of farming, came back to the college, finding a new rugby academy and a new military academy where many of the rules had been changed and the code of conduct had been changed to adapt to this new group of people. (Will)

The returning students, originally 'big fish in a small pond', found their habitat changed, found alien species within their environment, *habitus* in flux, leading to feelings of disjuncture, disquiet and uncertainty (Reay *et al*, 2009). This led to displays of masculinity and aggression from all parties, "so there was a clash with these third year returning" (Claire) in a symbolic struggle to establish superiority within this educational field. Within the rugby academy, the establishment of masculine identities was primarily centred around aspects of physical capital ("we'd launched the rugby academy, so that had brought into the college a bunch of bigger and burlier lads all focused upon physical training, bulking up, being big and beefy and effective on the rugby pitch" (Roy)) and skilled body activity. As proposed by Connell & Messerschmidt (2005), "The importance of masculine embodiment for identity and behaviour emerges in many contexts." (*ibid*, p.851):

They were kitted up, big lads, running around, throwing rugby balls around. The reaction from the college was really adverse. Especially from the agriculture students and so the first year we ran the rugby academy the whole college, all the students were up in arms, they didn't like the rugby academy lads, they were - everything they did was wrong. They were rude, they were boisterous and they had no respect. We hadn't done anything to prepare the college for their arrival. Well it happened so quickly. Even the staff weren't very happy about it. (Claire)

Yan proposed that the positioning between the Military Academy students and the agricultural students was nothing new; prior to their arrival within *College*, there had been discipline issues between the agriculture and sports departments:

When, before we arrived the agriculture students always used to be in conflict with the sports. Now we came in as a new department, the sports now are getting on with their lives but the agriculture students are in conflict with us. I think it is definitely that male testosterone kind of, we were here before, this is our college, you've now come in.

Yan's narrative aligns with an interpretation of competing masculine identities, opposing groups of young men who value and reify masculine *physical capital* as a dominant form of symbolic *capital* and compete through practice and displays of masculinity within the *field* in order to establish dominant positions (Hinojosa, 2010). The collective practices of the differing groups are born out of the relative cultural values of their own micro *fields*; however, the agricultural students feel a taken for granted right to their dominant position within *College* and from the narrative accounts are seen to challenge any new comers to the setting. An interesting point of

note to the dynamic within *College* was the lack of problematic positioning between the military and rugby cohorts themselves:

I think there's a tension between those two groups and the rest of the college community, not any tension between rugby and military per se, and I suspect that there's a closer knit identity and cultural feeling between military and rugby than with the rest of the college. Because they're both engaged in physical fitness routines and training and drilling in their own way. And they've both got a course team, a delivery team that is strong on the wraparound physical part of the experience in addition to the delivery of an underlying FE qualification. And that's the thing that knits them together perhaps. (Roy)

Military and rugby identities were closely linked and there was a natural affinity between the staff and students of the different groupings:

The actual rugby academy itself I think there's quite a lot of similarities. It's run by the - well they're all male, very slick, very disciplined. Bill is an amazing coach, a huge amount of respect for the players and he then has a positive impact on the students with their studies because he can dictate whether they're going to play rugby or not...we need quite strong leadership, where there's about eighteen young men who are eighteen to twenty-one, big rugby players, all in one room, they're proving a challenge this year for the staff, the teaching staff. (Claire)

As with the Military Academy student identities in the previous section, the masculine identities of the rugby students subordinated themselves to the idealized masculine identities of the coaching staff, but exhibited disruptive behaviours across the wider *College*. Again, these hegemonic masculine identities created discipline issues within the *College* setting (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

4.10 Military and Middle-Class *Cultural Capital*

A class based thematic event within the data was that of the Military Academy 'Regimental Dinner', a formal dinner similar to that held within the older and more established universities within the United Kingdom or other middle-class institutions. These events within the military context are normally held with strict adherence to tradition, with Officers or Senior Non-commissioned Officers wearing 'full mess dress', a 'black tie' dress uniform, with formal observances such as orchestral music, grace, toasting the Queen, the use of 'Mess Silver', speeches and the hosting of a 'guest of honour'. The event was seen as a civilizing experience for the students, whose behaviours were perceived to have changed over the course of the

programme, “and so you could very quickly see in eight months the difference between the individual that turned up in his hoodie day one and you couldn’t get his hoodie off him, to the individual that was sat at that regimental dinner” (David). This compared to the initial event in the first term where “oh oh, at the first one, one of them didn’t even turn up properly shaved” (David).

Within the context of the military dinner, and wider *College* discourse, the students were constructed within narratives as lacking a refined *habitus* or the *cultural capital* required to meet the expectations of the micro *field* norms of the formal occasion. The narrative from staff that positioned the ‘student’ identity constructed an individual with low socio-economic *capital*, with “the majority from a state school background” (Will) and where the academy was socialising them by “taking them away from the Xbox, their little box room and forcing them to live side by side with other people” (Roy). Working-class student *habitus* met middle-class social expectations (Bourdieu, 1984), and students found themselves subject to *capital* exchanges and sanctions as they exhibited deviant behaviour within the formalised setting:

And there’s etiquette for these military dinners and when you have to sit down and who’s on the top table and, etc. But I sat next to this lad and we had soup to start and I then - he basically was going to lick his bowl out and so I had to say, oh no, no don’t, have my roll, have my roll. And some of them had their knives and forks the other way round. And they were saying you know in the military you can’t do that. He said, but I’m not there yet! (Claire)

As previously described in the methodology section, Claire’s account constructs the student within the narrative as a “*lad*” with uncultured dispositions. This is in opposition to Claire’s own high levels of dominant *cultural capital*, obtained through her experiences of family socialization and university education. Within the text her *habitus* is aligned with the *doxic* values of the formalized micro *field*, an understanding of the *rules of the game* (Colley, 2014) regarding a formal dinner. Claire feels an instinctive need to address the *lads* behavior, a fundamental belief in how one should act within society, her *illusio* leading her to challenge and position the student in order to regulate his behaviour to her normative values. She embodied the appropriate etiquette transferred from family experience: “if you come from a background that you’re taught table manners and you know how to socially interact and there’s a lot of that in your family” (Claire). Comparative processes positioned the student behaviour in deficit, Claire identifying that some students were holding “*their knives and forks the other way round*” and that the student next to Claire was

acting to “*lick his bowl out*”. Within her narrative, the behavioural standards dictated by Claire determined whether the students would be “*socially accepted*” and what behaviours should not be exhibited “*in public*”. Claire’s understanding of middle-class *doxic* values dictated what was acceptable behaviour and what was seen as deviancy (Bourdieu, 1984).

Within the narrative, Claire conflated her values with those of the military, she saw no separation between the expected social norms of her cultured *habitus* and those required at the military dinner (“*you know in the military you can’t do that*”). This is, however, a mis-recognition. She has a sense that the military dinner is a normal event for all in the military context, but in fact it is a social ritual (Dacin *et al*, 2010) that is confined to the Senior Non-commissioned and Commissioned Officers and not the Other Ranks who, as described earlier in this thesis, are more aligned to a working-class vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003). Employment within the Other Ranks was the ambition of the majority of students within *College’s* Military Academy. Within the context of the Regimental Dinner, the student is seen to exhibit unthinkable behaviour. The student is saved from disgrace through the giving of a bread roll, which acts as a symbolic metaphor within Claire’s account, the giving of *cultural capital* from Claire to the student: “So me telling that lad you really don’t do that in public, have a roll. He will have that then and it’s just - that would never have happened unless we’d sat down and had that dinner”. The student, however, challenges this positioning through counter-identity work (Hunter, 1992) in which he states that he is “*not there yet*”, maintaining face by exhibiting agency and asserting autonomy within the relational exchange.

Later in the academic year, a second Regimental Dinner was conducted and student behaviour and dispositions were seen to have adapted, the disciplining processes of immersion within the Military Academy programme having transformed the students to adopt cultured behavioural norms:

On the second one they had, and they were told that they would have to dress up smart and prepare to talk to guests of honour - not an issue, not an issue. Some of them even went out and bought new dresses and ties and jackets, etc, etc and the second meal amazing, absolutely amazing. (David)

The expectations of behaviour at the Regimental Dinners aligned with the taken for granted cultured *habitus* of the individual that possessed recognized dominant

cultural capital, staff within *College* conflating the military and middle-class cultural norms through 'taken for granted' perspectives (Grenfell, 2008). The students within the narrative accounts were initially resistant to formalized events, with imposed expected social norms, and exhibited counter-identity work, influenced by their 'previous' *habitus*. Narrative data of the second formal dinner, however, suggested that the student practice had indeed modified and that student behaviour was subordinated to the expectations of the Military Academy and wider *College* staff.

4.11 Ex-Military Teachers in Transition

The ex-military teachers entered the *College field* needing to undergo a role shift in their identities, from military professional to teacher (Malderez *et al* 2007). Some individuals made the transition quickly and easily, some finding it more difficult to adapt their identities to the new work setting (Passy, 2012). *College's* management had recognized the challenges they faced in employing ex-military teachers: "we always knew we would have to bridge the gap between coming into an FE college and leaving the military behind" (Claire). Within Will's narratives, the dominant *capital* that supported his identity work was that from the military, from his thirty years' service within the Royal Marines: "we've been there, we've done that, what we say is legit and that's where that role model comes in, where he's got other teachers that haven't been there but say it". Will's narrative of *normal* teaching practice was critical, but his own teaching practice was also negatively critiqued by Heather, who was responsible for teaching standards within *College*: "Okay so well I mean Will, well you saw Will, I didn't really, so quite didactic style and he has learnt that style which is a style that suits him. It doesn't necessarily suit the learners he's got in the classroom". My own field notes of the teaching session painted an equally negative picture:

The teaching style is very didactic and PowerPoint driven, the students do not seem totally enthralled and engaged, Will briefs the material irrespective of the student reaction, he fights on through the session. The session was taught as if to a formulaic specification and started with an initial health and safety brief including the location of the toilets. I felt that the student reaction was puzzled as to why he had included this. (Teaching Observation - Will)

Within a leadership and management context, Will was a 'fish in water'; but in the classroom he was a 'fish out of water' (Reay, 2009). There were many references within the data relating to the frustrations that Will felt within his role at *College*: "frustrations of working with people and alongside people who were not as dynamic";

“they didn’t have the level of management training and leadership training that I had in the past which created frustrations for me”; “another frustration of course was I came from a Rolls Royce organization” (Will). Will’s annoyance led him to negatively position the culture within *College* and the practice of other teaching staff, views that were shared with the other ex-military staff:

Will: It’s like we got quite upset didn’t we, in the office yesterday, because we were like oh there’s one student on our course that owes five assignments, outstanding - five assignments since January.

Rob: All overdue.

Will: Yes, overdue. He’s well behind on handing in and we were like, oh what do we do, oh what do we do? So we spoke to the department in the office next door and said, do you have students like this? They went, how many assignments? We went, five. Oh don’t worry about it, one of ours is twelve assignments, five is nothing. It’s like, but for us five is a lot. But he said, don’t worry about it, five is nothing, five is normal for us. Twelves is when you want to start worrying.

Yan: Because we’re getting upset, it’s like Jesus Christ for us, we’re not used to that, we want them to be on time, every time.

(Military Academy Staff Focus Group dated 26 Jun 14)

It was my interpretation from the data that Will’s identity was his military identity, sedimented and aggregated over 30 years’ experience within the military, difficult to modify, difficult to transform (Bourdieu, 1977). It was a *self* firmly anchored to the military *cultural capital* that he could mobilize and that defined who he was: “we had this newspaper chap in the other day and he rang me up yesterday afternoon and said, oh how do I refer to you? ... introduce me as Major Will Jones who recently retired from the military, or - and something like that” (Will). Will was making a point regarding the credibility to run a Military Academy programme: “and if you just refer to me as Will Jones then it would not give that credibility”. The explicit use of military *symbolic capital* was, in Will’s view, central to the standing of the programme, military *cultural capital* validating the quality of programme delivery.

Yan was also critical of wider *College* teacher practice, a perspective that led to a *field-habitus* clash (Grenfell, 2008) regarding lax discipline with students, something that would not be tolerated by the Military Academy staff: “I can kind of see that because we’re very much structured or we’ve been taught and driven to be

structured, quite regimented and wanting the best every time” (Yan). Within Yan’s narrative, he was again critical of other *College* staffs’ practice and the ‘system’, which had an over-reliance and focus on grades and management statistics rather than the students: “But you have to give that student an opportunity and I think that’s where the college education system doesn’t, they literally focus on stats, whereas we’re not focused on stats”. Heather’s assessment of Yan’s teaching practice was initially quite critical, but he exhibited the ability to learn from his mistakes and rapidly adapt his teaching style:

So he’s again quite didactic but he’s able to adapt so he was observed in quite a didactic session and got a grade 3, I went back and observed him and he got a grade 2. Because he had taken on board the feedback and was able to adapt considerably and actually with a bit more of a tweak he wouldn’t be far off a 1, he would have been able to pull that out of the bag with a bit more support and a bit more help (Heather).

Within my teaching observation of Yan, which took place after Heather’s assessment, I had been impressed with his ability to build rapport and hold the attention of the students:

... he created good student engagement with the topic material, maintaining a paced delivery with the students involved with creating the learning. It was my opinion that Yan was/is less militaristic with his delivery. He was informal, but easily maintained control of the class. He projected his voice with confidence; he controlled talkative students through ‘eye-to-eye’ contact and questioning and knew everyone’s name, addressing everyone by their Christian name. If anyone drifted from the subject of the lesson he would spot it quickly and engage them in the subject material (Teaching Observation - Yan).

As has been previously discussed, Yan had come to the setting with less military *cultural capital*, limited operational experience, reluctantly forced out of his military career within the Royal Air Force: “it was just literally there’s the door, see you later, and it was really a kick in the teeth, really”. Yan’s narrative aligned with Hinojosa’s (2010) view that military service comes with symbolic rather than real power. He had come to *College* with significant teaching practice from his service as a Physical Training Instructor, teaching in a civilian environment within his military career, and his ability to adapt his *habitus* to meet the requirements of the new *field* setting was far greater. He was able to quickly adopt and assimilate the requirements of his new teacher identity.

Rob had impressed staff and students since his arrival within *College*. He arrived with significant military *cultural capital* but, more importantly, a genuine desire to realize a teacher identity, supporting the claim that “the identities teachers develop shape their dispositions, where they place their effort, whether and how they seek out professional development opportunities” (Hammerness *et al*, 2005, p.383-384). Through the experiences of working within the military training environment at the end of his military service, he had a clear idea of his future designated identity (Sfard & Prusak, 2005): “I felt teaching was the right choice for me” (Rob). Whilst serving within the military, Rob had undertaken teacher-training qualifications and was close to completing a graduate level Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector. He exhibited a real passion to understand the techniques and knowledge of his new chosen profession and was seen by Heather to be a proactive learner who was able to quickly adapt his teaching practice through experience:

Rob who is that bit younger. Who can really enthuse and engage the students. Because he is, kind of understands where they're coming from a bit more. And also has, is far more malleable and adaptable with his process. I'll try that, that didn't work; I'll try something different. So he's at that stage in his training and in his life that he is trial and error. Whereas you get to a certain stage where maybe you don't reflect as much maybe, or you reflect but you then struggle to adapt because you're stuck in that way (Heather).

Heather's narrative regarding Rob was set in comparison with Will. Rob was young, “*malleable and adaptable*”; Will, on the other hand, was seen to “*struggle to adapt*”, being “*stuck in that way*”. The key attribute that Rob was assessed to possess, which set him apart from his peers in his teaching practice, was his ability to learn, unlearn and relearn, leaving his previous military *capitals* behind him and synthesizing new knowledge and teaching practice:

I don't think he's quite as exciting a prospect as Rob. Because you've got a range and Rob is doing a teaching degree as well. He is very, he's like a sponge and that I think is quite, I don't know whether that's unusual as with military style but it's, he doesn't seem to kind of carry, oh because I did whatever I've done before I've come here, that means I must stick to my guns and do, excuse the pun but do like I've done there. He is kind of absorbing all the processes and able to adapt. It's not to say the others aren't but I just see that he is able to absorb it differently. (Heather)

Within my own teaching observation of Rob, I was highly impressed with his ability to engage students in learning. I found myself being drawn into his teaching session, rather than observing the lesson as an unbiased researcher:

Rob ran a very effective warm up session, getting the students into two groups and getting them to write their answers up on flip charts. This obviously energized the students and had them engaged and discussing the subject matter. Rob was very good with his building rapport; he stood close to the students engaging them in individual conversations, his body language very positive and his face very open, enthusiastic and engaged. His personal presence motivated the students within the class and they all seemed keen to engage him in conversation. The session was very well planned and the students were deeply engaged throughout. I found myself being drawn into the lesson by Rob despite my best efforts to make field notes and sit back from the lesson. Following some content delivery through PowerPoint, we went outside to the front of *College* house to use the skills that we had learnt practically. Students were engaged, they talked with Rob, they showed their work and asked thoughtful questions around the subject matter. (Teaching Observation - Rob)

Zac was the final ex-military teacher to join the academy. Heather had not observed and assessed Zac's teaching at that point in time, but had received positive feedback about his delivery: "Zac, I haven't seen. But I know that he is a good, solid kind of - he is able to engage the students and get them working" (Heather).

One of the key attributes within the transition of the ex-military teachers and their ability to assimilate and adapt to new professional identities was their ability to change, to let go of the *capitals* of the past and forge new designated selves for their futures. Grenfell (2008) proposed that Bourdieu saw that transformation of *habitus* as an "ongoing and active process - we are engaged in a continuous process of making history, but not under the conditions of our own making" (p.52). Will, whose cultured *habitus*, adapted through the accumulation of significant *cultural capital*, found it hard to change, to adapt. Where his *capitals* gave him dominant positioning, within leadership and management contexts, he felt 'a fish in water', able to align his well formed *habitus* to facilitate a dominant *field* position. Where he needed to change his teaching practice within the classroom, he did not do so, relying instead on his previous style of delivery and his dominant military *cultural capital* in the execution of lessons, which failed to engage students and transfer learning. In comparison, Rob had the ability to rapidly change. He was seen to be able to throw off previous identities, mobilizing differing forms of *capital* that allowed him to rapidly develop his craft as a teaching professional and deliver inspirational learning. Flexibility of *habitus* adaptation related to the *capitals* one possessed, *capitals* determining the flexibility one had in adapting to one's new environment. Following the analysis of this data set, I received feedback in March 2015 regarding developments within *College* and

the Military Academy that allowed me to understand further developments within the research *field*.

Due to the financial issues that *College* had faced, they had been forced by the Department for Education to merge with another larger college. After a period of deliberation, *College* had chosen the *Southern College Group* as their partner. *Southern College Group* already had seven college sites and *College* had become the eighth. It was reported that it was mainly the land-based link and promises to keep a similar structure at *College* to that of the existing model that had allowed the merger to take place. The first priority for the *Southern College Group* was to get *College* back on track financially and they set a multi-million pound budget saving target in 2015. This meant a major staff restructure based on the current student numbers, which for *College* were low, due to the bad press of potential closure and limited budget for advertising. The Military and Sports Academies were reported as buoyant and were successfully recruiting students again. However, the savings had meant major staff changes and cutbacks. Roy, the former principal, had left along with the financial manager. Claire was now head of *College* under the *Southern College Group* principal. Will had just been appointed head of Military, Sport and Outdoor Adventure. Up to fifty teaching and support staff were still under threat of losing their jobs and the selection process for redundancy was currently underway. The Military Academy course was seen to continue to strengthen as it successfully sent more students into the Armed Forces. The ex-military staff had also achieved an 'outstanding' grade during an internal inspection.

In a further update, received in July 2015, I learnt that Claire, David and Will had left *College* and that Rob now ran the Military Academy.

4.12 Summary

Micro level identities were shaped through macro level discourse, socio-political narratives that valorized the military and their values (Burkard, 2008; Department for Education, 2013; Clay & Thomas, 2014) and denigrated working-class youth as undisciplined and feckless (Cricher, 2009). The influence of discourse was clearly represented in the narrative accounts of the research participants, appearing as generalized micro narratives that relationally positioned *field* actors (Said, 1978). Other macro level influences observed within the research study were the tensions

between two opposing ideologies within education: that of capitalism and market forces, driven through political education policy and enforced through the mechanisms of education funding and the Ofsted inspection regime (Ball, 1990; 2008), set in polarizing opposition to the liberal social ideal of education for the betterment and growth of the individual (Passy, 2013). The industrializing forces of capitalism were still in the process of reshaping the education landscape and the agricultural *field-habitus* of *College* (Grenfell, 2008).

The construction of military identity through macro and micro discourse was centred on the 'combat soldier' (Barrett, 2001; Hinojosa, 2010), aligning with the research data that the dominant military *cultural capital* (Bourdieu, 1977) was focused on operational combat experience. This identity construction was seen to be a hegemonic masculine identity, a masculine ideal that embodied the military ideal (Barrett, 2001), which led to an idealized concept of citizenship (Sasson-Levy, 2002) that presented an ideal to counter the negative normative construction of the undisciplined masculine working-class discourse (Hunt, 1999; Hier, 2002; Critcher, 2009; Clay & Thomas, 2014; Hunt, 2014). These identity constructions were evident in the macro socio-political discourse, political rhetoric and policies at the time of the research, as well being embedded within the narrative accounts within the research data.

Within the research *field*, the single case study site of *College*, the new ex-military staff used the macro level discourse and identity constructions to mobilize powerful forms of military *cultural capital* (Bourdieu, 1977) that enabled them to establish rapidly dominant positions within the *field* structures (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). At a micro level, *capital* exchanges in the form of the telling of stories, symbolic interaction through uniform and other symbolic markers, embodied practices and the use of rituals, used to position students and staff within the social setting (Edley & Wetherell, 1997). The construction of identity through the mobilization of military *cultural capital* was relationally observed: where other existing ex-military members of *College's* staff did not engage in identity work, negative Military Academy student reactions were captured within the data and these teachers themselves engaged in other forms of *capital* exchange and identity construction.

Within the construction of student identities, the processes were interpreted as involving students having a sense of a vocational military *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003), which were created from the stories that were told, retold and consumed, creating a sense of *imagined social capital* (Quinn, 2010) that offered the students the resources they needed to succeed with their ambitions to gain employment within the military. Within the processes of identity construction, students and staff engaged in 'othering' (Said, 1978), creating negative normative identities of other agents within the *field*, describing others as *normal* or *civilian* in contrast with their constructions of their superior military identities. Through these processes, 'others' were seen to be *less disciplined* or *more feminine*, again indicating the link between the military and masculine identities (Dermott, 2012).

These relational processes (Edley & Wetherell, 1997) also exhibited themselves in student behaviours. They subordinated themselves in the company of their Military Academy staff, obeying commands and enthusiastically taking part in identity rituals, but their behaviour away from the ex-military was seen to be in deficit. With other *College* staff, they were boisterous and disruptive, exhibiting demonstrations of masculinity, specifically 'playing up' when in the company of female staff (Barrett, 2001). Their behaviour with other staff, across campus and within the accommodation blocks, was described as being even more extreme, with Tracey from Student Services portraying it as typical of that within the Army, characterized as 'banter' by the students, but in her opinion, bullying.

Another interesting thematic within the data was the alignment, or mis-recognition, of military identity with that of middle-class social norms. The narrative surrounding the experiences at the Military Academy's Regimental Dinner painted a picture of students that had low socio-economic *capital*, uncultured *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1984; Reay *et al*, 2009), experiencing and being shaped by the formal dining ritual process, and therefore refining *habitus* and practice to something that would be acceptable within wider society. All of this was relayed with a *taken for granted* perspective of middle-class *doxic* norms, which were naturally seen as the standard that all should aspire to, Claire's *illusio* acting to regulate deviant student behavior, micro level relational identity work that reflected macro level socio-political moralizing discourse.

One of the final themes to be drawn out in this summary is that of *habitus* in transition, the journey that the ex-military teachers made and how they coped with the unfamiliar *field* conditions (Reay *et al*, 2009). The ex-military teachers that adapted the best within the environment of *College* were the young. Will, who possessed the cultured *habitus* and accumulation of *capitals* from a 30-year career within the military, found it the hardest to change. Rob, who was young and eager to adopt and develop new identities, was seen to be far more malleable, being able to modify practice through greater levels of reflexivity. Adaptation was interpreted as being linked to the accumulation of *capitals*, Will reverting to type and his well formed military *habitus*, not adjusting practice, doing what he had always done when teaching within class (Grenfell, 2008). In comparison, Rob was constantly trying to learn, unlearn and relearn practice, what made for good teaching, adjusting in every moment as he honed his new professional craft.

In the following, and final, chapter, I will draw my conclusions from these findings, linking my arguments, from the macro to micro, tracing how the evidence and theories converge to provide a new understanding within this contested policy space, leading to my research challenging the dominant centre-right discourse.

Chapter 5 - Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

There are ideological struggles taking place within education that demand critical empirical analysis to fully understand the issues; this thesis represents one such study that will contribute to a contested and misunderstood national policy area. A number of recent Government policies have supported the greater use of the military within schools (Department for Education, 2010; 2014), which, I argue, represent projects of moralization that wish to instill middle-class values on an objectified and demonized working-class youth (Quinn *et al*, 2006; Deuchar, 2010; Jones, 2011; Young, 2012). The research conducted to date within this area is polarized, contested (Burkard, 2008; Dermott, 2011; Tipping, 2013) and evaluations of policy have predominantly focused on a more positivistic approach to understanding (Clay & Thomas, 2014; Hallam and Rogers, 2014; Wood, 2014) and therefore present a limited view on the subject. This research, because of its methodological approach, casts a deep critical lens (Bourdieu, 1977) on the subject area. It presents a nuanced understanding of the issues at stake and proposes new findings that challenge dominant centre-right discourse.

Following this introductory section I will provide my response to the research questions, drawing together the theories and evidence in a synthesis of understanding, converging ideas in order to answer the research questions. I will then provide my analysis regarding the theoretical and policy implications for the research, how this research challenges current understanding and discourse, leading to a discussion regarding the direction for future research. I will then sum up with an evaluation of my work and provide my concluding thoughts. Within this final section I shall reflect on my research journey, the implications of my critique of military *habitus*, not only on education and wider society, but also on myself.

5.2 Response to Research Questions

My original Research Question was:

Research Question: How are the ex-military teachers positioned within the research *field* and how does this positioning influence the education setting?

Research Sub-Questions were:

Research Sub-Question 1: What macro level discourses position the research participants and the education setting?

Research Sub-Question 2: How are research participants constructing others within the research *field*?

Research Sub-Question 3: What are the *capital* exchanges that take place between research participants within the research *field*?

I have answered the research questions fully by showing that the participants were influenced by a number of interwoven and powerful macro discourses concerning: undesirable working-class masculinities; an idealized military masculine power identity; the perceived feminized nature of teaching (and proposed lack of male role models) and the marketization of education provision. These macro level discourses led to research participants constructing 'others' (Said, 1978) in objectified terms, the ex-military teachers positioned through highly masculine military *cultural capital* (Bourdieu, 1977). *College's* staff members were constructed by the ex-military teachers as feminized 'others' and Military Academy students were positioned in deficit with regards to middle-class social norms. The *capital* exchanges that were observed involved students and ex-military teachers claiming highly masculine identities through processes of symbolic interaction, performance and 'othering'. This led to the ex-military teachers claiming dominant, highly masculine identities, leading to the subordination of other staff members within *College*. There were both positive and negative effects on Military Academy student practice within the *field*, where student attendance and attainment was recorded as high within the education programme, but behaviour towards feminized 'others' was seen as sometimes being aggressive and abusive.

An additional question the research has raised regards the concept of masculinity which has become key to this analysis. Within the conduct of this research I had not

considered masculinity as being the central theme, this is something that emerged through the analysis and interpretation of empirical data. The processes of identity construction, as revealed within this research, align with a concept of hegemonic masculinity and it is with this understanding I have positioned my work. As an overarching definition, my understanding of masculinity aligns with Swain's (2000) as, "...a relational construct occupying a place in gender relations, there are multiple masculinities, there is a hierarchy of masculinities, and masculinity is a precarious life-long ongoing performance" (p.96).

Within this research, multiple and hierarchical forms of masculine identity work have been shown in the practice of different groups within *College*; the Military and Rugby Academy students, the agricultural students, the ex-military teachers and other staff performing and claiming masculine identities. In line with James and Coffey's (2013) perspective, the hegemonic military masculinity can be viewed as an, "idealized form, marginalizing other forms and defining the norm" (p.2). What I termed military *cultural capital* can be viewed as a hegemonic form of masculine *symbolic capital* that acted through processes at macro, micro and subject levels that led to the domination of other forms of masculinity and femininity within the research *field*. This research identified the macro level discourse that defined the idealized forms of hegemonic masculine identity, contained within the images, stories and discourse surrounding the role of the combat soldier (Sasson-Levy, 2002). This idealized representation was present in the discursive practices (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005) of research participants as they positioned the ex-military teachers in reified ways regarding their perceived experiences on combat operations.

The Military Academy students were seen to engage in processes that involved fantasies and desires to realize this idealized masculine identity, orientating themselves through interaction with idealized military types; the visiting Royal Marines and Coldstream Guards. The student masculine practice was legitimated by consent from the ex-military teachers, who took an opposing view to other *College* staff regarding behaviours termed as 'banter', which outside the Military Academy was seen as 'bullying'. Banter was seen as a cultural norm of military life but was not a clearly bounded concept. Both staff and students within the Military Academy exhibited behaviour which discredited women, subordinating the feminine (Swain, 2000). Will's narrative about *College* staff's approach being too "*pink and fluffy*" was

a clear example of an attack of the feminine 'soft option' (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Within the data we also witnessed the Military Academy staff policing the masculine norms of the military with regards hair length and earrings. This form of hegemonic masculinity led to the marginalization of students who would not conform and the privileging of those who did. The powerful nature of the hegemonic military masculinity comes from the interplay between macro, micro and subject level symbolic interaction. The masculine *symbolic capital* was readily transferable between *fields* and enabled ex-military staff to claim dominant positions and also led to some of the less favourable practice of the Military Academy students.

A final question the research has raised regards issues surrounding the conduct of education policy research. Centre-right discourses dominate today's society and the production of policy research is increasingly being conducted by politically sponsored think tanks (Colley, 2014). Concurrent with this trend it can be argued that university research is being placed under tighter political control, through research funding mechanisms, resulting in conditions that make it difficult to voice different points of view (*ibid*). Independent critical research has never been more important, the dominance of a single socio-political view on society, and what makes acceptable policy, needs to be challenged to maintain balance. This research is a small example of this. From an objectified viewpoint, based on performance measures of pupil attendance, education attainment and post course employment, the Military Academy provision within *College* could be evaluated as an unquestionable success. But viewed through a critical theory lens, this illuminates other less favourable aspects, the relational processes of identity construction, 'othering' and position taking creating the conditions for dominant masculine practice, including the subordination of the feminine and examples of aggressive and abusive behaviour.

My research is a single case study, with *College* as the unit of analysis, drawing upon participant narratives, *field* observations and historical documents in order to develop a deeper more nuanced understanding. The focus of my conclusions are government projects of moralization, the positioning of military within discourse and the impact that the masculine military *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1977) had within the education setting. When considering projects of moralization, then at the micro level, the Regimental Dinner at *College* provided an example of the social processes that shape such projects. Within the relational processes that took place, macro discourse, the

construction of 'others' and *capital* exchanges exhibited their influence on actors within the *field*. In considering the dinner we can conceptualize the space as a micro-*field*, with all interactions anchored within that cultural *field* containing both dominant and dominated actors (Bourdieu, 1977; 1990). The Regimental Dinner represented a middle-class socio-cultural *field*, within which Claire possessed dominant *cultural capital* (*ibid*), born out of her family upbringing, university education and experience within the private education sector. Her perspective on the cultural norms that one should follow within this micro *field* were naturalized and taken for granted.

When we read Claire's narrative we get a sense of 'othering' (Said, 1978), the construction of the unrefined student practice set against her own cultured *habitus*, "*if you come from a background where you are taught table manners*". This assumes that the student referred to in Claire's narrative did not, rhetorically asking, "*how on earth do they learn those lessons*". Claire's *illusio*, her instinctive sensibility (Colley, 2014) towards the social norms that should be followed, led her to intervene in the situation in order to modify the "*lads*" behavior to what was acceptable. This interplay between *illusio* and *field* is externally validated as benefiting the individual, to teach him behaviours that would be, "*socially accepted*".

The recent policies regarding the use of the military in education (Department for Education, 2010; 2014) can be seen as macro level examples of this middle-class moralizing tendency, the cultured *habitus* of politicians making what seem to be common sense decisions within education policy setting. One issue with this process is the misrecognition of military cultural values, the military existing as a stratified class based organization, split between an officer-class, with middle-class *social* and *cultural capitals*, and the other ranks working-class in socio-economic terms. For example, as discussed in earlier chapters, nearly half the British Army officer corps were privately educated (Parliamentary Business, 2013) and 84% were graduates (Blackhurst, 2012), whereas half of Army other ranks were recruited with the literacy and numeracy ability expected of an eleven year-old (NIACE, 2012). Claire conflated her middle-class *illusio* with that of the military. But her conceptions of military service were based around her experience set within a middle-class cultural *field*, not the other ranks, which most students within the Military Academy were hoping to join.

At a macro level, politicians have made decisions based upon their own *field doxa*, setting policies based, not on detailed independent empirical research, but on their own common sense ideas and limited data from centre-right policy think-tanks (Burkard, 2008). I suggest, that these issues of misrecognition and common sense decision-making have led the governments to position the increased use of the military within education as a disciplining influence. This is based upon the socio-political views of powerful leading politicians whose experience of the military is set within the context of their own cultured experience within the private education system (Swinford & Farmer, 2014). The idealized collective military values of leadership, teamwork and discipline (Department for Education, 2013) provided a reified 'other' to act as a counter position within the moralizing discourse regarding ill-disciplined working-class youth (Jones, 2011).

Macro discourse throughout the period of the research supported a reified conception of the combat soldier, "but I think it has a lot more meaning because of what the military represents to the country" (Claire). This supported Sasson-Levy's accounts that, "the combat soldier has achieved a hegemonic status and turned in to a social ideal" (*ibid*, p.359). Macro discourse influenced the micro-*field*, the ex-military teachers being positioned within heroic narratives, "...these guys have actually been out there. They've been out there. They've seen it...I mean all of them because of what they've done and what they've seen and what they've gone through" (Heather). Within Heather's interview she placed all of the staff with the same level of operational military experience, or military *cultural capital*, but this was a misrecognition because, at an individual level, they had different sets of experience within varied military careers.

This macro level discourse gave the ex-military teachers the ability to claim powerful, highly masculine identities, "when I read Rob's CV ... I was in awe of him" (Heather). This aligned with Sasson-Levy's assertion that, "the military has a special role in the ideological construction of patriarchy because of the major significance of combat in the construction of masculine identities and in the justification of masculine superiority" (2002, p.358). The construction of masculine identities was achieved through the reification and positioning of military *cultural capital*, but also through processes of 'othering' (Said, 1978) by the ex-military teachers with respect to the other *College* staff.

The use of the term “*pink and fluffy*” by Will, one of the ex-military teachers, was an example of the positioning of “*civilian teachers*”, “*the civilian system*” and “*civilian staff*” in a highly feminized frame, positioning other staff within a feminine and soft narrative regarding their approach with pupils and students within *College*. This positioning of masculine identity in opposition to a feminized one aligns with Dermott’s (2012) critique of the *Troops to Teachers* policy in which she explored the original premise for the 2010 Department for Education policy with its highly gendered overtones. She argued the policy provided, “a single version of masculinity associated with characteristics of hardness, both physically and mentally, and an explicit opposition to supposedly ‘soft’ feminine traits” (*ibid*, p.236). Within the research setting, the military identities that were claimed were hegemonically masculine, supporting a power-identity construct, which created issues regarding behavior with the Military Academy students.

The original premise for the greater use of the military within schools centred on ideas surrounding discipline and the need for male role models within education (Burkard, 2008). Within *College*, student identity construction positioned some military actors as ideal types, representations of an idealized vocational *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003), against which the students orientated themselves through the exchanges of military *cultural capital*. This was primarily based on the ex-military teachers’ experiences in combat, “he was telling stories with them relating to using the skills in a sniper position in Afghanistan...students were leant forward hanging on every word” (Research Diary – Teaching Observation). As well as these imaginary processes of identity construction (Bourdieu, 1990), through the accumulation of *imagined social capitals* (Quinn, 2010), students involved themselves in embodied military rituals; marching, infantry training, physical training and also wore the symbolic markers of military service, the combat uniform.

The students immersion within the authentic vocational culture, offering powerful *symbolic capital* derived from the military activities and the wearing of military uniform had a significant effect on student practice, “they all wear it, they all look after it, it’s always clean, it’s always pressed, they’re proud of having it. You can tell when they walk around the college they like having that identity” (Rob). The ex-military teachers’ perspective on discipline was understood from their own relational position, “I mean it

works perfectly with the fact that these guys want to join the military. So that initial discipline is a lot easier to control” (Rob). The authentic representations of vocational military *habitus* (Colley *et al*, 2003) coupled with the students’ ability to realize powerful forms of *symbolic* and *imagined social capital* had a marked effect on student performance. From an attainment perspective the programme had a one-hundred percent success rate and had collected significant independent qualitative data indicating the social benefits of the educational experience (Research Diary – November 2013). From *College*’s perspective, the results validated their approach and teaching methods in helping students achieve their vocational ambitions of joining the armed forces and uniformed services.

Within the military education discourse, the military are positioned as being needed to instill discipline, intimating that the imposition of masculinity within the classroom will bring greater stability. From the data, I believe this is a mis-recognition, student *practice* is relational (Bourdieu, 1977) and the introduction of masculinity within *College* came with both positive and negative effects. The hegemonically masculine nature of the military vocational *habitus* was claimed through processes of imagination, ritual and ‘othering’; through the identification and positioning of feminized ‘others’. The consequence of this was examples of poor behavior when the students were in social situations away from the Military Academy staff, “they were being what I would call normal students. Normal student behavior. Whereas when they had their military staff in the room they wouldn’t dare” (Claire). In other areas of *College* exhibitions of behavior were even worse, “can be as a group quite intimidating to other groups of students”, (Roy); “the military will see it as banter...but the other students will see it as bullying” (Tracey).

In her paper on *Troops to Teachers*, Dermott (2011) stated,

The proposal to introduce *Troops to Teachers* resolves this tension not by offering working-class boys routes to high levels of educational achievement but by diverting them towards the ‘respectable’ working-class masculinity of an authoritarian, disciplinarian, hyper-masculine armed forces. (p.237)

From my research I agree with Dermott’s conclusion. The policy agenda regarding the militarization of education can be seen from a perspective that, “politicians address the problem of masculinity with macho threats” (Quinn *et al*, 2006, p.739) –

fighting masculinity with masculinity. This approach is too great a simplification of the issue. Ill discipline within the classroom will not be resolved with another form of masculinity being introduced; it could lead, I believe, to other forms of masculine exhibition and potentially negative behavior that have been seen within this research's data. As stated earlier in this thesis, Bob, a participant in another research project that I undertook, summed it up, "I do not believe that the military will address behavior in the classroom...I believe there is one thing you can make a direct link to regarding discipline. Outstanding teachers don't have discipline issues" (Le Gassick, 2012). Bob was ex-military and an outstanding teacher (*ibid*), but did not agree with a generalized view that all military would make 'good' disciplinarians, as what was needed in the classroom were good teachers – whatever their background.

Within the research data we saw that Will struggled to adapt to the new work setting, his practice deeply wedded to his cultured military *habitus* and the accumulation of military *cultural capital* that he was able to mobilize; but he underperformed in the classroom with his teaching practice. Where Will created a dominant position was in management, unconsciously through his highly masculine practice, pushing out previous members of staff, introducing college wide changes and influencing the senior management board. His highly masculine *habitus* provided him with the *symbolic capital* to succeed within the management space. Rob, who was keen to develop a teacher identity, did not depend on the *capitals* of the past, but worked to claim new *capitals*, through academic study and professional practice, a new professional *self*. His teaching practice was graded outstanding by Heather.

Having completed this research I now believe that the policy area regarding greater use of the military within education is flawed; it is a policy perspective that is based on little empirical evidence, coming from middle-class *doxic* values which were formed through a particular social upbringing and schooling. The idea of fighting an unacceptable form of masculinity with another form of acceptable masculinity, in my view, is typical of hegemonic masculine thinking. This approach is limited, built on misrecognition and in its worst case could be detrimental to building a culture of good learning. This is not the fault of the military – this is the fault of the policy makers and the way in which they have used the military as a tool within an agenda of moralization. The military are now positioned within a contested discourse and this politicizes the many good people that aspire to careers within teaching on retirement

from the armed forces. Within my research Bob and Rob are exemplars of this – two individuals who make exceptionally successful transitions from the military to education and are able to contribute to their new professional settings. But in reviewing their cases they were individuals who sort to orientate themselves to new vocational *habitus*, disregard the *capitals* of the past and create new identities for the future. The ex-military teachers who held on to their military identities and positioned themselves through their military *cultural capital* could be seen to have a negative effect on their new work settings. I believe that this is evidence that the reifying and generalizing discourse leading to greater involvement of the military within education is wrong – the policies should be about attracting the best and most committed into teaching from any background and should not entertain ideologically driven agendas.

5.3 Theoretical and Policy Implications

The case for the use of the military within education needs to be revisited in order to understand the wider issues that surround the introduction of military masculinities within educational spaces. My assertion is based on the theoretical perspective of this research that views the *field* through relational understanding of identity and culture, opposed to the objective perspectives on which the policy decisions had been made (Burkard, 2008). Within my data, the masculine military *habitus* of Will viewed issues of discipline through an objectified lens, “our students understand, there’s the line, there’s wrong and there’s right, there’s pass and there’s fail” (Will). This objectified view of the social world, focused on the individual within it, reflected the wider macro level moralizing discourse. From my theoretical perspective, this presented a limited view of the issues within *College’s* social *field*. My understanding of the processes involved, were relational, based on my research epistemology and methodology, which I argue, gave me a broader and more nuanced understanding.

Evaluations of educational initiatives often focus on objective measures of performance in a drive for audit and accountability and therefore can miss the more nuanced understanding on what makes a learning programme a high quality experience. Equality and inclusion of all types of students must be a central theme in order to ensure that the education system reflects the diversity of wider society. Singular concepts of identity, such as the masculinity presented in the military education policies, provides limitations to inclusion, not because of explicit exclusion,

but due to the process workings of identity and culture, and their influence on the practice of teachers and students alike. Issues of highly gendered vocational education programmes must also be considered again, for the same reasons, and how cultures will invisibly exclude elements of society through unseen *field* structures.

Within political discourse, and specifically the original Burkard (2008) policy paper, the conception that was used to understand issues of identity and culture were objectified and generalized and did not take into account the interplay between structure and agency. This research bridges the structure-agency dichotomy, basing its theoretical understanding on the Bourdieusian theories of *habitus*, *field* and *capital* (Bourdieu, 1977). Colley (2014) has suggested that, “educational contexts are far too messy to allow for simplistic research or solutions” (p.664). She warned against, “think-tanks and philanthropic organizations [that] represent elite and powerful groups with vested economic and political interests in controlling educational research and it’s outcomes” (*ibid*, p.664).

I argue here, that this is the very case with the *Troops to Teachers* policy paper (Burkard, 2008), the Centre for Policy Studies being a centre-right think-tank formed by Margaret Thatcher with the purpose of taking control of social policy research from the university sector. I therefore believe that the *Troops to Teachers* initiative represented research findings in a distorted way to further a political ideological viewpoint. So, my research is important, because of it’s independence and it’s critical nature, the theories of Pierre Bourdieu (1977) focusing on issues of power and domination in order to uncover often unseen, relational aspects of the research setting. Because of the theoretical perspectives employed, I have been able to look beyond an objective understanding of the *field*, and bring into view the subsequent interrelation between macro, micro and subject level interaction within this research and challenge, what is, a powerful macro *field* socio-political neoliberal *doxa*. Within our country, universities must act as the, “critic and conscience of society” (Colley, 2014, p.677-678) and challenge the *doxic* norms, using critical social science methods to better understand policy decisions that affect our schools and wider society. I believe that this thesis has served that purpose.

5.4 Recommendations for Future Research

The government currently wishes to recruit more females and ethnic minorities into the armed forces so that the organization better reflects the society it serves. I believe, from the research I have conducted, that any initiatives will find it difficult to be successful due to the highly gendered nature of employment within the military. Pierre Bourdieu's *habitus*, *field* and *capital* have rarely, if ever, been used within military research, because, by their very nature the military would not adopt such socially based critical theories. These theories, along with developments such as *imagined social capital* and vocational *habitus*, could provide the basis for illuminating research regarding issues of identity and culture within the armed forces. It would help understand what impact this has on the recruitment and retention of gender and ethnic diversity. I believe this is not only important for allowing the military to proportionally represent the public it serves, but also because any organization that is so culturally gendered, will lack the flexibility and agility in its thinking and decision making to deal with the complexities of the future. Therefore, for its own long-term survival, the military must adopt a more diverse workforce and better understand how to adapt its masculine identity and culture, a masculine identity and culture that has endured through rigid *field* structures for hundreds of years. I therefore suggest that research using Pierre Bourdieu's *Theory of Practice* that attempts to understand '*Culture and Identity in the British Armed Forces*' with a view to understanding the practices that prohibit the successful recruitment and retention of female and ethnic personnel is an important future study.

5.5 Evaluation of Research

In evaluating my research I will first return to Bourdieu's notion of *reflexivity* and the relationships between the *knower*, *known* and *knowledge* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). The issue of *knower and known*, the process of viewing participants and the research *field* as a spectacle (*ibid*), is important as it frames the scope of the analysis and any limitations that can be drawn from this. My epistemic and theoretical positions lead me to consider the interplay between both subject individual and setting, leaning away from the unitary focus of education research that has the individual as its unit of analysis. Within this process I have taken participant statements about the social phenomena under observation and given them meaning

that those involved in the research may not recognize (James, 2015). Having reflected on this issue at some length, I propose that no research, whether positivistic or interpretative, is free of the influences of the researcher, as the researcher chooses to focus on, interpret data, and is the final arbiter of the conclusions that are drawn.

Regarding the *knower and knowledge*, the relational perspective of my research must also influence the observer and observed. The same social processes that I analyze regarding positioning and *capital* exchanges must also act between researcher and participant. In order to overcome issues of relational influence I ensured that I made minimal intervention within the interviews, focus groups and observations, allowing the participants to give their own narratives without interruption. The fact that students challenged each other within the data text indicated that they were not all just speaking to pre-determined scripts and therefore I believe that the primary voice captured within the textual data is that of the research subject (Clandinin & Connelly, 1990).

The process of data analysis and production of my written arguments must be viewed as laden with my personal bias, because what I recognize, extract and choose to interpret from the data will be shaped by my personal reading, biographical history and unconscious map of the world. My position as researcher, as being both an 'insider' to military culture but an 'outsider' to *College* culture, must have further shaped my analysis (Crossley & Vulliamy, 2006). I believe by having my research reviewed in detail, throughout the entire process, by my supervisory team and a critical friend mitigates to some extent the influence of personal bias and has led me to write a better account.

Within the research process, the intellectual *field* I inhabit is that of the Plymouth University professional education doctoral programme and my supervision staff have tested the trustworthiness of my observations, analysis and conclusions to ensure that they are valid representations within the constraints of the epistemological and methodological approach that I have taken. My doctoral supervisors were chosen for their perspectives and understanding of the subject area, and formed a significant part of the intellectual *field* that I inhabited for this research. Therefore, their own perspectives, ideologies and *habitus* will influence my writing (Bourdieu & Wacquant,

1992). I believe their ability to engage me in reflection and provide guidance, rather than specific direction within the supervisory process, led to a research outcome that is very much my voice within the thesis and not theirs.

With regard to issues of the *known and knowledge*, the Bourdieusian lens brings with it a particular understanding of the social setting and of the research actors. At its heart it is “largely a sociology of domination” (James, 2015, p.108) and therefore will provide an understanding of power and inequality. This could be taken as a pessimistic viewpoint (*ibid*) and would therefore leave the reader with little to practically take from the analysis due to its complexity and tenor. I would argue that this research, because of this complexity of analysis, provides a nuanced understanding that shines a torch on hidden aspects of the research *field* and therefore provides important new understanding that only comes with a socially critical theoretical approach.

Within the completion of the research there were practical considerations, which are worth exploring within this evaluation. Some aspects of data collection were complex; for example, the capture of observational field notes was difficult because of the need to both concentrate on the activity being observed and make notes at the same time. In hindsight, the use of video recording equipment would have been more reliable; however, this was not included in the research design due to concerns of obtaining ethical approval. The spread of data types collected enabled a full *field* analysis; enhancements could have included large-scale primary quantitative data, but again within the scale of this research that would have been impractical. This need was fulfilled through the use of secondary data, which I believe to be accurate and relevant to an understanding of macro *field* structures.

One deficit, which has already been discussed within the methodology chapter, was the decision not to collect biographical data of research participants. In order to understand the influence of individual *habitus* it would have been better to collect standardized data regarding personal histories of the research participants' backgrounds. My design led me to rely on the narrative accounts themselves, but this did not allow me to influence what data was divulged, which potentially led to gaps in information. The types of data I would have liked to have systematically collected related to family and educational background.

5.6 Final Thoughts

The domination of neo-liberal socio-political discourse in today's society has resulted in social policy making that has brought increased socio-economic inequality. At the same time university research has been placed under tighter political control, which has made it difficult to voice alternative points of view. I believe that this can lead to situations of questionable policy setting. One such policy was *Troops to Teachers* where the military was positioned as a disciplining counter to out of control working-class masculinities. This approach is flawed, built on misrecognition of the issues involved and in the worst case could be detrimental to building successful learning cultures. This is not to say, at an individual level, that ex-military do not make great teachers – my research has presented examples of where personnel from the armed forces have made very successful transitions into teaching and have brought with them great skill and commitment to the profession.

The policy has left the military positioned within a contested discourse and this has politicized the positions of many good people that aspire to careers within teaching on retirement from the armed forces. It was the ideological and generalized nature of the policy that is in question and this research suggests the policy needs to be reappraised. This research sheds new light on the issues regarding the *Employment of Ex-Military as Teachers* and provides new understanding within the arguments in order to counter the dominant discourse regarding this and other such policies. The idea of having a specific policy whose purpose is to introduce an objectified and generalized hegemonic masculinity into the classroom is flawed, as masculine identities and cultures can produce relational behaviours that lead to the domination or subordination of feminised others.

This has been a personally difficult journey for me as the research has challenged my own *illusio*. My own life story has been dependent on the military and I owe my personal success to its culture and values. I cannot, however, ignore the literature or the data that I have been immersed in over the past five years, as the process has made me reflect on my own *habitus* and the hegemonic masculine nature of western society and the military that bases its fundamental beliefs on highly masculine norms. It is my belief that this must change; the modern world is a complex place and the

dominance of masculine thinking alone is not equipped to deal with the uncertainty and ambiguity of the future. We must have diversity of *voice* within our societies, our organisations must reflect the societies they serve and we must embrace diversity in our schools so that we can equip ourselves, and our children, for the challenges ahead.

References

- Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. & Turner, B.S. (1984) *Dictionary of Sociology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Alsup, J. (2006) *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Arnett, G. (2014) 'Elitism in Britain - breakdown by profession', *The Guardian*, 28 August www.theguardian.com accessed 24 Jun 15.
- Ball, S. (1990) *Foucault and Education*, London: Routledge.
- Ball, S. J. (1994) *Education Reform*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ball, S.J. (2008) *The Education Debate*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Ball, S.J. & Bowe (1992) 'Subject departments and the "implementation" of national curriculum policy: an overview of the issues', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol.24(2): 97-115.
- Barker, G.T. (2005) *Dying to be men: youth, masculinity and social exclusion*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Barrett, F., J. (1996) 'The organizational construction of hegemonic masculinity: the case of the US Navy', *Gender, Work and Organization*, 3(3): 129-142.
- BBC (2009) "Thousands Attend Armed Forces Day", 27 June 2009, bbc.co.uk, accessed 24 Mar 2011.
- BBC Panorama, (2011) 'Classroom Warriors', 28 February, BBC i-Player accessed 3 March 2011.
- Beauchamps, C. & Thomas, L, (2009) 'Understanding teacher identity: an overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 39(2): 175-189.
- Bell, C. (1992) *Ritual theory, ritual practice*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berman, G. & Rutherford, T. (2012) *Defence Personnel Statistics*, SN/SG/02183, 30 November 2012, Social and General Statistics.
- Blackhurst, R. (2012) 'New model army: Sandhurst officers of the future', *The Telegraph*, 20 November, www.telegraph.co.uk accessed 2 Nov 14.
- Blond, P. (2010) *Red Tory - How the Left and Right have broken Britain and how we can fix it*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction - A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, London: Routledge Kegan and Paul.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) *The forms of capital in Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, ed. J. Richardson, New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1997a) *Pascalian Meditations*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1997b) 'The forms of capital', in Hasley, A.H., Laudner, H., Brown, P. and Wells, A.S. (eds), *Education, Culture, Economy, Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- British Army (2008) *British Army Values and Standards*, www.army.mod.uk accessed 20 Jan 15.
- Bruce, S. (1999) *Sociology - A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1986) *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*, London: Harvard University Press.
- Burkard, T. (2008) *Troops to Teachers: A Successful Programme from America for our Inner City Schools*, London: Centre for Policy Studies.
- Burki, A. & Burkard, T. (2011) *Something Can Be Done: Troops in our Schools will do more than Troops on our Streets*, London: Centre for Policy Studies.
- Burr, V. (1995) *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*, London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997) *Excitable Speech: A politics of the performative*, New York: Routledge.
- Chorley, M. (2014) 'A peer's son and privately educated: Now Labour spokesman Tristram Hunt is accused of fighting a class war against public schools instead of improving education', *Daily Mail Online*, www.dailymail.co.uk accessed 15 Mar 15.
- Clandinin, D.J. & Connelly, F.M. (1990) 'Stories of experience and narrative inquiry', *Educational Researcher*, 19(5): 2-14.
- Clandinin, D.J. & Connelly, F.M. (1996) 'Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes: teacher stories-stories of teachers-school stories-stories of schools', *Educational Researcher*, 25(3): 24-30.
- Clandinin, D.J. & Connelly, F.M. (2000) *Narrative Enquiry - Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Claxton, G. (1990) *Teaching to Learn – A Direction for Education*, London: Cassell.

- Clay, D. & Thomas, A. (2014) *Review of military ethos alternative provision projects research brief - December 2014*, Department for Education.
- Cohen, L. , Manion, L. , & Morrison, K. (2011) *Research Methods in Education* (7th Ed), Oxon: Routledge.
- Cohen, S. (2002 [1972]) *Folk devils and moral panics: The creation of the Mods and Rockers*, London: Routledge.
- Coldron, J., & Smith, R. (1999) 'Active location in teachers' construction of their professional identities', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(6): 711–726.
- Coleman, J. (1990) *Foundations of social theory*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Colley, H., James, D, Diment, K. and Tedder, M. (2003) Learning as becoming in vocational education and training: class, gender and the role of vocational habitus, *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 55(4), 471-498.
- Colley, H. (2014) 'What (a) to do about 'impact': a Bourdieusian critique', *British Educational Research Journal*, 40(4), 660-681.
- Connell, R.W. (1987) *Gender and power*, Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Connell, R.W. & Messerschmidt, J.W. (2005) 'Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the Concept', *Gender and Society*, 19(6): 829-859.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 3rd Edition, Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Critcher, C. (2009) 'Widening the focus: moral panics as moral regulation', *British Journal of Criminology*, 49(1): 17-34.
- Crossley, M. & Vulliamy, G. (2006) 'Comparative and international education: contemporary challenges, reconceptualisation and new directions for the field', *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 4(2): 81-86.
- Dacin, M.T., Munir, K. & Tracey, P. (2010) 'Formal dining at Cambridge colleges: linking ritual performance and institutional maintenance', *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1393-1418.
- Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2015) *2010 to 2015 government policy: public understanding of science and engineering - Policy Paper*, dated 8 May 15.
- Department for Education (2010) *The Importance of Teaching - The Schools White Paper 2010*, The Stationary Office: Norwich.
- Department for Education (2013) *New routes for talented ex-armed forces personnel to become teachers*, www.gov.uk, accessed 5 Jan 15.

Department for Education (2014) *Review of military ethos alternative provision projects*, www.gov.uk/bis accessed 5 Jan 15.

Dermott, E. (2011) 'Troops to Teachers: Solving the Problems of Working-Class Masculinity in the Classroom?', *Critical Social Policy*, 32(2): 224-241.

Deuchar, R. (2010) 'It's just pure harassment...as if it's a crime to walk in the street: antisocial behaviour, youth justice and citizenship - the reality of young men in the East End of Glasgow', *Youth Justice*, 10(3): 258-274.

Dickinson, H. W. (2007) *Educating the Royal Navy*, London: Routledge.

Dyer, C. (1995) *Beginning research in psychology*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Edley, N. & Wetherell, M. (1997) Jockeying for position: the construction of masculine identities, *Discourse & Society*, 8(2), 203-217.

Eisner, E.W. (1988) 'The primacy of experience and the politics of method', *Educational Researcher*, 20, 15-20.

Ernst, P. (1991) *The Philosophy of Mathematics Education*, Oxon: Routledge.

Evans, J. & Penney, D. (1994) 'Whatever happened to good advice? Service and inspection after the Education Reform Act', *British Educational Research Journal*, 20(5), 519-583.

Finnegan, R. (1996) Using Documents. In Sapsford, R. & Jupp, V. (eds) *Data Collection and Analysis*, London: Sage.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006) 'Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.

Foucault, M. (1989) *The archaeology of knowledge*, Oxon: Routledge.

Fullan, M. (2007) *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.), New York: Teachers College Press.

Gee, J. (2000) 'Identity as an analytical lens for research in education', *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99-125.

Gergen, K.J. (2009) *An invitation to social construction*, London: Sage (2nd Ed).

Giddens, A. (2000) *The third way and its critics*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Glover, A. & Sparks, J. (2009) *The Impact of Combined Cadet Force Contingents in State Secondary Schools in Wales*, University of Wales, Newport.

Goodson, I. & Sikes, P. (2001) *Life history research in education settings: learning from lives*, Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Government Press Release (2014) 'New fund to expand cadets units in state schools', www.gov.uk accessed 21 Oct 14.

Graham, L.J. (2011) 'The Product of Text and "Other" Statements: Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault', *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(6), 663-674.

Grenfell, G. (2008) *Pierre Bourdieu - Key Concepts*, Durham: Acumen Publishing.

Grenfell, M. (2009) 'Applying Bourdieu's field theory: the case of social capital and Education', *Education, Knowledge and Economy*, 3(1), 17-34.

Hallam, S. & Rogers, L. (2014) *Evaluation of Skill Force*, Institute of Education Report, University of London.

Halpern, D. (2005) *Social capital*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., Bransford, J., Berliner, D., Cochran-Smith, M., McDonald, M., & Kenneth, Z. (2005) How teachers learn and develop. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: what teachers should learn and be able to do* (p.358-389), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hier, S.P. (2002) 'Conceptualising Moral Panic through a Moral Economy of Harm', *Critical Sociology*, 28(3), 311-334.

Higate, P.R. (2001) 'Theorising Continuity: From Military to Civilian Life', *Armed Forces & Society*, 27(3), 443-460.

Hinojosa, R. (2010) 'Doing hegemony: military, men, and constructing a hegemonic masculinity', *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 18(2), 179-194.

Hoffman, D. M. (1998) 'A therapeutic moment? Identity, self, and culture in the anthropology of education', *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 29(3), 324-346.

Holland, D., & Lave, J. (Eds.) (2001) 'History in person: Enduring struggles, contentious practice, intimate identities', Santa Fe, NM: *School of American Research Press*; Oxford, UK: James Currey.

Holmes, R. (2002) *Redcoat: The British soldier in the age of horse and musket*, London: Harper Press.

Home Office (2006) *Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour*, National Audit Office report by the Comptroller and Auditor General dated 7 December 2006.

Howard, M. (2001) *War in European History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hughes, J. (1990) *The philosophy of social research*, London: Longman.

Hunt, A. (1999) *Governing Morals: A Social History of Moral Regulation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hunt, T. (2014) *Schooling for the Future - Speech by Tristram Hunt*, www.press.labour.org.uk accessed 20 Jan 15.
- Hunter, A. (1992) 'Same door. Different closet', *Feminism and Psychology*, 2, 367-387.
- James, D. & Coffey, A. (2013) 'Masculinity and Education', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Virtual Special Issue, www.tandfonline.co.uk/bjse accessed 3 Mar 16.
- James, D. (2015) 'How Bourdieu bites back: recognising misrecognition in education and educational research', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 45(1), 97-112.
- Janowitz, M. (1960) *The Professional Soldier*, New York: Free Press.
- Johnson, B. (2010) 'A Few Good Boys: Masculinity at a Military-Style Charter School', *Men and Masculinities*, 12(5), 575-596.
- Jones, O. (2011) *Chavs - The demonisation of the Working Class*, London: Verso.
- Kelly, P. (2012) 'A Socio-cultural analysis of insider and outsider perspectives in comparative pedagogic research', Paper presented to the *British Association for International and Comparative Research Conference*, University of Cambridge, September 2012.
- Kenway, J. & McLeod, J. (2004) 'Bourdieu's reflexive sociology and 'spaces of points of view': whose reflexivity, which perspective?', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4): 525-544.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lauriala, A., & Kukkonen, M. (2005) *Teacher and student identities as situated cognitions*, In P. Denicolo & M. Kompf (Eds.), *Connecting policy and practice: Challenges for teaching and learning in schools and universities* (pp. 199–208), Oxford: Routledge.
- Lave, J. (2012) 'Changing Practice', *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 19:2: 156-171.
- Laws, D. & Hammond, P. (2013) *New routes for talented ex-armed forces personnel to become teachers*, Department for Education and Ministry of Defence, published 7 June 2013.
- Le Gassick, P.J. (2012) *An Evaluation of the United Kingdom's Troops to Teachers' Policy*, Doctoral Assignment Submissions, Plymouth University.
- Lewis, J. (2004) 'In defence of snobbery', *The Daily Telegraph*.
- Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

London Evening Standard (2008) 'Brown says young people carrying knives must be prosecuted', www.thisislondon.co.uk accessed 4 Dec 2011.

Mac an Ghail, M. & Haywood, C. (2011) 'Schooling, masculinity, and class analysis: towards an aesthetic of subjectivities', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 32(5): 729-744.

Malderez, A. , Hobson, A.J. , Tracey, L. and Kerr, K. (2007) 'Becoming a student teacher: core features of the experience', *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 30:3: 225-248.

Mallinson, A. (2009) *The Making of the British Army*, London: Transworld Publishers.

Martino, W. & Meyenn, B. (2001) *What about the boys? Issues of masculinity in schools*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Maton, K. (2003) 'Reflexivity, relationalism & research - Pierre Bourdieu and the epistemic conditions of social scientific knowledge, space & culture', *Space & Culture*, 16(1): 52-65.

Miller, T., Birch, M., Mauthner, M. & Jessop, J. (2012) *Ethics is qualitative research*, London: Sage.

Moon, G., Twigg & L., Horwood, J. (2010) *The Societal Impact of Cadet Forces*, University of Southampton and University of Portsmouth.

Moran, D. (2011) 'Edmund Husserl's Phenomenology of Habituality and Habitus', *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 42(3): 53-77.

Morgan, N. (2015a) *Character education: apply for 2015 grant funding*, Department for Education and Skills News Story published 12 January 2015.

Morgan, N. (2015b) *Rugby coaches to be drafted in to help build grit in pupils*, Department for Education Press Release, published 31 May 2015.

Morris, C. & Evans, N. (2001) 'Cheese makers are always women: Gendered representations of farm life in the agricultural press', *Gender, Place and Culture*, 8(4): 375-390.

Moskos, C. & Butler, J.S. (1996) *All that we can be*, New York: Basic Books.

Murphy, J. (2013) *Labour's Policy Review - The Service Ethos*, www.yourbritain.org.uk accessed 20 Jan 15.

Naidoo, R. (2004) 'Fields and institutional strategy: Bourdieu on the relationship between higher education, inequality and society', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25:4: 458.

Nauright, J. & Chandler, T.J.L. (1996) *Making men: rugby and masculine identity*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Nayak, A. (2006) 'Displaced Masculinities: Chavs, Youth and Class in the Post-Industrial City', *Sociology*, 40(5): 813-831.

NIACE (2012) *Armed Forces Basics Skills Longitudinal Study*, Department for Business Skills & Innovation and Ministry of Defence, Leicester: NIACE.

Ofsted (2008) *White boys from low-income backgrounds: good practice in schools*, London: Ofsted.

Ofsted Inspection Reports *College*, www.reports.ofsted.gov.uk, accessed 5 Jan 15.

Okasha, S. (2002) *Philosophy of Science – A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olsen, B. (2008) *Teaching what they learn, learning what they live*, Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Parliamentary Business (2013) www.parliamentary.uk, Written Answers to Questions, Friday 18 January 2013 accessed 21 Oct 14.

Passy, R. (2013) 'Surviving and flourishing in a neoliberal world: primary trainees talking', *British Educational Research Journal*, 39(6): 1060-1075.

Patton, G. (2013) 'Teaching in primary schools still seen as a woman's job', *The Daily Telegraph*, 5 February, www.telegraph.co.uk accessed 20 August 2013.

Peshkin, A. (1990) *Qualitative inquiry in education: the continuing debate*, London: Teachers College Press.

Plowright, D. (2011) *Using mixed methods: frameworks for an integrated methodology*, London: Sage.

Polkinghorne, D.E. (1998) *Narrative knowledge and the human science*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Press Association report 2 Dec 2011, 'Knife crime figures show 16% drop', www.thepressassociation.co.uk, accessed 4 Dec 2011.

Putnam, R.D. (1995) 'Bowling alone: America's declining social capital', *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1): 65-78.

Quinn, J., Thomas, L., Slack, K., Casey, L., Thexton, W., Noble, J. (2006) 'Lifting the hood: lifelong learning and young, white, provincial working-class masculinities', *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(5): 735-750.

Quinn, J. (2010) *Learning communities and imagined social capital*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Reay, D. (2004) 'It's all becoming a habitus': beyond the habitual use of habitus in education research', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4): 431-444.

- Reay, D. (2006) 'The Zombie Stalking English Schools: Social Class and Educational Inequality', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 54(3): 288-307.
- Reay, D. (2012) 'What would a socially just education system look like?', *Centre for Labour and Social Studies*, London: CLASS.
- Reay, D., Crozier, G. & Clayton, J. (2009) 'Strangers in paradise? Working-class students in elite universities', *Sociology*, 43(6): 1103-1121.
- Reid, J. (1997) 'The Armed Forces and Society', *The RUSI Journal*, Vol 142, Issue 2, p.31.
- Richardson, H. (2008), 'School knife crime overplayed', BBC News, www.bbc.co.uk/news, 19 June accessed 4 December 2011.
- Roth, W.D. & Mehta, J.D. (2002) 'The Rashomon Effect: Combining Positivist and Interpretivist Approaches in the Analysis of Contested Events', *Sociological Methods Research*, 31(2): 131-173.
- Roth, W.M. (2004) 'Identity as dialectic: Re/making self in urban school', *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 11(1): 48-69.
- Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism* (London, Penguin).
- Sartre, J.P. (1964) *Words*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Sasson-Levy, O. (2002) Constructing identities at the margins: masculinities and citizenship in the Israeli Army, *The Sociology Quarterly*, 43(3): 357-383.
- Schirato, T. & Webb, J. (2003) 'Bourdieu's concept of relexivity as meta-literacy', *Cultural Studies*, 17(3/4): 539-552.
- School Workforce Census 2010 (2011), *Education Standards Analysis and Research Division*, Department for Education.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2003) *Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretativism, hermeneutics and social constructionism*, In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y (Eds.), *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and issues*, (pp. 292-331), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sfard, A., & Prusak, A. (2005) 'Telling identities: In search of an analytic tool for investigating learning as a culturally shaped activity', *Educational Researcher*, 34(4): 14-22.
- Skelton, C. (2002) 'The 'Feminisation of Schooling' or 'Re-masculinising' Primary Education?', *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 12(1): 77-96.
- Sleeter, C. (2008) 'Equity, democracy and neo-liberal assaults on teacher education', *Teacher and Teaching Education*, 24(8): 1947-1957.
- Smith, P. (2008) 'Meaning and military power: moving on from Foucault', *Journal of Political Power*, 1(3): 275-293.

Smith, P.H. (2012) 'Troops to Teaching: lessons from English teaching assistants' experiences of foundation degree study', *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 38(5): 525-537.

Stones, R. (2008) *Key Sociological Thinkers*, Second Edition, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Swain, J. (2000) 'The Money's Good, The Fame's Good, The Girls are Good': The role of playground football in the construction of young boys' masculinity in a junior school, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21(1): 95-109.

Swinford, S. & Farmer, B. (2014) 'Public school funding for military cadet forces diverted to state sector', *The Telegraph*, www.telegraph.co.uk accessed 20 Jan 15.

The Daily Express (2008) 'Labour fails on pledge', 19 January, www.express.co.uk, accessed 4 Dec 2011.

The Guardian (2006) 'Blair launches 'respect' action plan', 10 January, www.theguardian.co.uk, accessed 4 Dec 2011.

The Guardian (2008) 'Brown toughens controls on knives after spate of fatal stabbings', www.theguardian.co.uk, accessed 4 Dec 2011.

Tipping, A. (2013) 'Troops to Teachers: implications for the coalition government's approach to education policy and pedagogical beliefs and practice', *Educational Studies*, 39:4: 468-478.

Verschuren, P.J.M. (2003) 'Case study as a research strategy: some ambiguities and opportunities', *International Journal of Research Methodology*, 6(2): 121-139.

Waldron, N.L. & McLeskey, J. (2010) 'Establishing a collaborative school culture through comprehensive school reform', *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation*, 20: 58-74.

Weber, M. (1949) *Objectivity in the social sciences and social policy*, in: E.A. Shils & H.A. Sinch (Eds), *The methodology of the social sciences* (New York, Free Press).

Wittgenstein, L. (1921/2001) *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Oxon: Routledge.

Wood, H. (2014) *Combined Cadet Forces in State Funded Schools: Staff Perspectives*, Department for Education Research Report.

Woods, R. (2010) 'UK: the reality behind the 'knife crime' debate', *Race and Class*, 52(2): 97-103.

Woods, P. & Jeffrey, B. (2002) 'The reconstruction of primary teacher's identities', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(1): 89-106.

Woodward, R. (1998) 'It's a Man's Life!: Soldiers, Masculinity and the Countryside' *Gender, Place and Culture*, 5 (3): 277-300.

Yin, R.K. (2009) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4th Ed), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Young G. M. & Hancock W. D. eds. (1956), *English Historical Documents, XII(1), 1833-1874*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp.911-915.

Young, R. (2012) 'Can neds (or chavs) be non-delinquent, educated or even middle-class? Contrasting empirical findings with cultural stereotypes', *Sociology*, 46(6): 1140-1160.